

ITC Working Glossary: Educational Technology Terms

Intentional Tech Coalition. Draft for discussion, October 2026.

Shared language for conversations about technology in Concord Public Schools and the Concord-Carlisle Regional School District. Where a definition already exists in law, peer-district policy, or research, ITC adopts it. ITC-written definitions build on those sources. Numbered notes point to precedents, and full sources are listed at the end.

Each definition is labeled one of two ways:

ITC proposed

Language drafted by ITC, building on existing sources.

Existing definition

The language comes from a statute, regulation, research, or another district.

1. Educational technology (EdTech)

ITC proposed

Any digital hardware, software, platform, application, website, or online service that the district purchases, licenses, issues, adopts, or directs students to use in connection with their education, whether paid or free. This includes features added to a product after it was adopted, such as generative AI features.

Student-facing EdTech is technology a student directly operates or views. *Educator- and operations-facing EdTech* (gradebooks, student information systems, family communication platforms, hall-pass and movement-tracking tools, attendance systems, cafeteria point-of-sale systems, ID badge and building-access systems, and visitor management systems) does not count toward screen time but is covered by data safety, contracts, and vetting, because it holds student information.

Includes school-issued and shared devices, instructional software and apps, digital curricula and e-textbooks, adaptive practice and intervention programs, online assessment platforms, learning management systems, video and streaming content assigned or shown to students, and classroom display hardware. **Excludes** the items listed in Term 2.¹

2. Assistive technology and other exclusions

Existing definition: IDEA, 34 CFR 300.5

“Assistive technology device means any item, piece of equipment, or product system, whether acquired commercially off the shelf, modified, or customized, that is used to increase, maintain, or improve the functional capabilities of a child with a disability. The term does not include a medical device that is surgically implanted, or the replacement of such device.”

ITC proposed: exclusions

The following are excluded from screen-time limits and EdTech reduction goals:

1. Assistive technology whose use is documented in a student's IEP or Section 504 plan.
2. Language-access tools, such as translation and bilingual supports, used by multilingual learners to access instruction.
3. State-mandated assessments administered on computers, such as MCAS.

Excluded technology remains subject to data safety (Term 6).

The same product can be assistive technology for one student and general EdTech for another; the deciding factor is the documented individual need. District and classroom assessments are not excluded (Term 4a).²

3. Artificial intelligence

3a. Artificial intelligence

Existing definition: 15 U.S.C. 9401(3)

“A machine-based system that can, for a given set of human-defined objectives, make predictions, recommendations or decisions influencing real or virtual environments.”

3b. Generative AI

Existing definition: NIST

“The class of AI models that emulate the structure and characteristics of input data in order to generate derived synthetic content. This can include images, videos, audio, text, and other digital content.”

3c. Non-generative AI

ITC proposed

AI that classifies, predicts, recommends, ranks, or makes decisions rather than producing new content. School examples include adaptive engines that select a student's next problem, content filtering and activity-monitoring software, AI-detection tools, and early-warning or risk-scoring analytics.³

3d. Student-facing and educator-facing generative AI

ITC proposed

Student-facing generative AI

Any generative AI tool or feature in which a student enters prompts or directly receives generated content, including chatbots, AI tutors, AI writing feedback, and AI features embedded in otherwise-approved platforms.

Educator-facing generative AI

Generative AI used by staff to plan or prepare materials, with no student interaction. Data safety applies whenever student work or student information is entered.

3e. Embedded AI

ITC proposed

AI features added to a product the district already uses, whether turned on by the vendor, the district, or an individual educator. Embedded AI is a material change (Term 10a) and triggers re-review under Term 10.⁴

4. Screen time

ITC proposed

Time a student spends viewing or interacting with a digital screen as part of school, whether or not a teacher is directing the use. Screen time has two parts, measured and reported separately and assessed together:

School-day screen time

During the school day (Term 4c): individual device time (a student operating a school-issued or shared device, whether 1:1, cart, or lab) and whole-class viewing (students collectively watching video, animation, games, or other media on a shared display).

Out-of-school screen time

Any use of a school-issued device outside the school day, and time spent on school-assigned homework on any device.

Teacher display use (projecting agendas, directions, slides, document-camera images, or live annotations) is not counted.

Units: minutes per day and per week, by grade level and by application. Measurement: device data covers school-issued devices only, so whole-class viewing needs teacher reporting and homework on family devices needs assignment-level estimates or family surveys. Out-of-school device data is reported only in aggregate, de-identified form, by grade band.^{5,6,7,8}

4a. Categories of screen use

Every minute of screen time falls into one of four categories. All four count toward screen time.

ITC proposed

Instructional use

Screen use as part of teaching and learning a subject, in two forms. Teacher-led use: a teacher directs the activity in real time, whether students are on individual devices or viewing together. Independent practice: a student works alone on a device, such as adaptive practice programs, digital reading, or assigned skill practice.

Organizational use

Student use of technology to access, organize, track, and submit schoolwork, such as learning management systems, digital planners, and assignment portals.

Assessment use

Taking a test, quiz, diagnostic, or benchmark on a device, including classroom assessments and district-administered assessments such as adaptive diagnostics. State-mandated assessments are excluded from limits (Term 2).

Non-instructional use

Screen use not tied to a specific curricular objective, including rewards, transitions, movement breaks, indoor recess, and filler.⁹

4b. Cumulative measures

ITC proposed

Cumulative daily exposure

A student's total school-day screen time across all classes and settings in a single school day. No single teacher sees this total.¹⁰

Total school-related screen time

Cumulative daily exposure plus out-of-school screen time, reported per day and per week.

4c. School day

ITC proposed

From arrival to dismissal, including class periods, passing time, lunch, recess, study halls, and school-sponsored activities held during that time, and district-run before- and after-school programs. Time a student spends off campus with permission during the day, such as an off-campus free period or a medical appointment, is not included.

5. Personal electronic devices and phone policies

Existing definition: Massachusetts S.2581 (Senate-passed bill)

A personal electronic device is “any portable electronic device that: (i) is capable of providing voice communication, text messaging or other data communication between 2 or more parties or devices; or (ii) is capable of connecting to a smartphone or other personal electronic device, the internet or a cellular or Wi-Fi network.” The bill excludes school-issued or sanctioned devices used for a legitimate educational purpose.

Existing definition: New Jersey Department of Education

Bell-to-bell: student internet-enabled devices are “securely stored upon entry to the school building or classroom and returned at dismissal.” New Jersey also names off and away and limited use as less stringent approaches.

ITC proposed

Bell-to-bell

No student access to personal electronic devices from arrival to dismissal, including lunch and passing time, with devices stored where students cannot reach them.

Off and away

Students keep devices in their possession, powered off and out of sight. The difference from bell-to-bell is possession, not only use.

Under the Massachusetts definition, smartwatches, wireless earbuds, and other wearables are personal electronic devices, because they connect to a smartphone or to a network. A bell-to-bell or off-and-away policy that names only phones leaves these devices out.

Massachusetts status: the Senate passed S.2581 38 to 2 on July 31, 2025, and the House passed an amended version 129 to 25 on April 8, 2026. As of mid-September 2026 the two versions had not been reconciled.¹¹

6. Student data safety

ITC proposed

The full lifecycle of student information in any EdTech product:

1. Collection: what is collected, including usage, behavioral, device, location, voice, and image data, and inferences drawn from them.
2. Access: who can see or receive it, including subcontractors.
3. Use: what it is used for, including profiling, advertising, and developing or training products and AI models.
4. Retention and deletion: how long it is kept, and how and when it is deleted.
5. De-identified data: whether data is de-identified, and what the vendor may do with it afterward.
6. Security: protections against breach, and notification if one occurs.
7. Transparency: what families can see about their own child's data.

A product can comply with a standard data privacy agreement and still use de-identified student data to improve its commercial products after the contract ends.¹²

7. Gamification and persuasive design

Existing definition: Deterding et al., 2011

Gamification is “the use of game design elements in non-game contexts.”

ITC proposed

Game-based learning

Using a complete game as the learning activity itself, as distinct from adding game features to non-game work.

Persuasive design (the AAP term is “engagement-based design”)

Design features whose primary function is to extend or increase use of a product, such as autoplay, infinite scroll, recommendation feeds, streaks, points or badges tied to time on the platform, variable rewards, leaderboards, virtual currency and avatar rewards, and push notifications.

Rewards tied to demonstrated learning differ from rewards tied to time spent or logins.¹³

8. Minimum use clauses and recommended dosage

ITC proposed

Any contract term, license condition, vendor implementation plan, or district or school directive that sets a minimum, target, or recommended amount of student use of a product, measured in minutes, lessons, sessions, or logins. This includes “recommended dosage” and “implementation fidelity” benchmarks, whether or not they appear in the contract.

Minimum use targets are screen-time commitments, so they should be disclosed and counted against any screen-time limits.¹⁴

9. Contracts, licenses, and terms of service

ITC proposed

Any agreement under which students or staff use an EdTech product, whether paid or free: purchase and license agreements, subscriptions, data privacy agreements, click-through terms of service accepted by an individual educator, free or “freemium” accounts, pilots and trials, and products provided through grants or bundled with curricula or hardware.

Budget review catches only purchases, so free tools reach classrooms without review unless vetting explicitly covers them.¹⁵

10. Vetting

ITC proposed

The district's documented process for approving, reviewing, and renewing any EdTech product (Term 1) under any agreement (Term 9), before students use it, at each renewal, and after any material change (Term 10a). Vetting covers four domains:

1. Cost: total cost, including devices, licenses, training, and staff time.
2. Data safety: as defined in Term 6.
3. Efficacy: independent evidence at ESSA Tier 3 or higher (Term 10b) that the product improves learning outcomes for students comparable to the district's students, plus the district's own outcome data after adoption. Findings produced or declared by the vendor do not count as evidence of efficacy, including vendor-produced studies, case studies, white papers, testimonials, marketing claims, and ESSA tier ratings a vendor assigns to its own product.
4. Well-being safety: effects on attention, emotional well-being, sleep, and development, including review of persuasive design (Term 7) and content exposure.

Expedited review for assistive technology

When assistive technology is documented in a student's IEP or Section 504 plan (Term 2), the district reviews it on an expedited timeline so the student's access is not delayed. Expedited review is a faster process, not a lower standard: data safety, cost, and well-being safety are reviewed in full. For efficacy, the IEP or 504 team's documented determination of the student's individual need takes the place of the ESSA tier requirement. If review is not complete when the service is due, the student may use the tool while review finishes.

The four domains map to ITC's three tests: safe (domains 2 and 4), effective (domain 3), and value-aligned (all four).¹⁶

10a. Material change

ITC proposed

Any change to an EdTech product already in use that affects its features, the data it collects, who it shares data with, its AI features, its design features (Term 7), or its terms of service, privacy policy, or data privacy agreement, whether the change is made by the vendor, the district, or an individual educator. A change in the vendor's ownership, such as an acquisition or merger, is a material change.

10b. ESSA evidence tiers

Existing definition: ESSA, ESEA Section 8101(21)(A), summarized

Tier 1, Strong evidence: at least one well-designed and well-implemented experimental study showing a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes.

Tier 2, Moderate evidence: at least one well-designed and well-implemented quasi-experimental study showing a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes.

Tier 3, Promising evidence: at least one well-designed and well-implemented correlational study, with statistical controls for selection bias, showing a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes.

Tier 4, Demonstrates a rationale: a rationale based on high-quality research findings or positive evaluation that the product is likely to improve student outcomes, with ongoing efforts to examine its effects.

ITC proposed

In plain terms

The tiers rate how strong the research behind a product is. Tier 1 is the strongest: students were randomly assigned to use the product or not, so the results can be credited to the product. Tiers 2 and 3 show positive results with less certainty about the cause. Tier 4 means no study has yet shown the product improves learning; there is only a reason to expect it might.

Minimum standard

Student-facing EdTech (Term 1) shows independent evidence at Tier 3 or higher before adoption (Term 10, domain 3). A Tier 4 rationale alone does not meet this standard.

A tier describes a study, not a product. The same product can have strong evidence for one grade or subject and none for another, so it matters which students were studied (Term 10, domain 3). Tier ratings a vendor assigns to its own product do not count as evidence (Term 10).

11. Technology education and instructional technology

ITC proposed

Technology education

Teaching students about technology as a subject, including digital literacy, computer science, keyboarding, file management, search and source evaluation, and AI literacy. In Massachusetts this is anchored in the Digital Literacy and Computer Science (DLCS) Framework. AI literacy instruction does not require students to use AI products. It can be taught through discussion, teacher demonstration, and unplugged activities.

Instructional technology

Using technology to teach other subjects (Term 1).

The two are accounted for separately. A limit on instructional screen time is not a limit on technology education, which can be taught with shared devices, labs, and unplugged methods.

12. Healthy use and digital citizenship

ITC proposed

Healthy use (tech hygiene)

Instruction that helps students recognize healthy and unhealthy technology use in themselves, including effects on attention, multitasking, sleep, and mood; how persuasive design works (Term 7); and practice regulating their own use.

Digital citizenship

Instruction on how students treat other people online, including conduct, safety, and responsibility.

A digital citizenship course does not by itself satisfy healthy-use instruction.

13. High-quality screen use

Existing definition: Cambridge Public Schools, 2026

Screen use that is instructionally purposeful and aligned to lesson goals; active rather than passive; cognitively demanding; supportive of discourse, collaboration, and creation; developmentally appropriate; and intentionally time-bound.

Applied as a quality standard in addition to (not instead of) the quantity measures in Term 4.

14. School social media and public-facing communication

Existing definition: FERPA, 34 CFR 99.3

Personally identifiable information includes a student's name, family members' names, address, personal identifiers such as a student number or biometric record, indirect identifiers such as date and place of birth, and “other information that, alone or in combination, is linked or linkable to a specific student that would allow a reasonable person in the school community, who does not have personal knowledge of the relevant circumstances, to identify the student with reasonable certainty.”

ITC proposed

School-affiliated account

Any website, social media account, page, channel, or public newsletter maintained by the district, a school, a department, a team, or a staff member acting in their school role. This includes classroom accounts run by teachers, and staff members' personal accounts when they post about school activities.

Public-facing

Visible to anyone beyond current students, staff, and their families. This includes accounts that are public by default and accounts that accept followers who are not verified members of the school community.

Student image

Any photograph, video, or other likeness in which a student appears. This includes group photos, images taken from behind or at a distance, and images where faces are blurred or covered.

Image-free standard, grades K to 8

School-affiliated accounts do not post student images on social media or public-facing websites, with or without family consent. Posts may show student work without names, classrooms, events, and adults.

Opt-out standard, grades 9 to 12

School-affiliated accounts may post student images unless a family has opted out. The opt-out is a standalone checkbox on the annual consent form in the district's student information portal, separate from the directory information opt-out and written in plain language. The district tells families about the choice each year, and families can change it at any time during the year. Students 18 or older make their own choice. When a family opts out, the district removes existing posts of that student on request. Posts do not pair images with student names, do not tag students, and have location data removed.

Photographs are not on the Massachusetts list of directory information, and neither standard depends on the directory information notice.¹⁷

Additional terms

ITC proposed

Active and passive use

Active use is creating, coding, composing, or problem-solving; passive use is watching, scrolling, or clicking through. Useful for quality, but not a substitute for counting minutes.¹⁸

Unstructured time

Free choice, indoor recess, early-finisher time, lunch, and passing periods. Unstructured time is device-free.

Screen time as reward

Use of screen time or device access as an incentive, reward, or behavioral consequence.

Overnight lockout window

The hours during which school-issued devices are disabled overnight.

Opt-out from device-based instruction

A pathway for a family to decline device-based instruction without academic penalty, with a named low-tech alternative.

Generative AI defaults

Whether generative AI features in district platforms are on unless someone turns them off, who made that decision, and what the opt-out is.

Ad-free requirement

No application used for instruction or installed on a school-issued device may serve advertising to students.

1:1 device program

Every student is assigned an individual device, as distinct from shared carts or labs.

Opt-in 1:1 model

An approach in which shared devices (carts, labs, or classroom sets) are the default, and an individually assigned device is available only when a family actively chooses it. Families who do not opt in are not asked to decline anything, and their children are not academically disadvantaged.¹⁹

Take-home device

A school device that leaves the building.²⁰

Per-application consent

Family consent given app by app rather than as a blanket opt-in.²¹

Additional Services (Google)

Google services outside the core Google Workspace for Education suite that are designed for consumer use, such as YouTube, Google Maps, Google Photos, Google Translate, Google Books, and Google Earth. Under Google's terms, the district must obtain parental consent before turning these services on for students under 18 and must reconfirm that access every year. Each Additional Service enabled for students is an EdTech product (Term 1) and is covered by per-application consent and vetting.²²

Transparency

Public disclosure of the district's product inventory, contracts, data privacy agreements, and aggregate usage data.

Notes

1. Utah H.B. 273 defines “instructional technology” as technology an LEA issues to a student in connection with the student's public education (53G-7-228(1)(a)). ITC's definition is broader so that free tools teachers direct students to use are also covered.
2. Utah exempts instructional technology use consistent with a student's IEP or 504 plan from its grade-level frameworks (53G-7-228(6)(f)). LAUSD's screen time guidelines include exceptions for students with disabilities and English Learners. Cambridge's proposed pre-K to grade 2 screen pause, as reported by the Boston Globe, would not have applied to assistive technology, translation tools, or mandatory assessments that cannot be done on paper.
3. Utah defines an “AI tool” as software or a system that generates outputs, predictions, or recommendations through machine learning, natural language processing, or other AI techniques (53G-7-1401(3)), which covers both generative and non-generative AI.
4. LAUSD Res-048-25/26 directed the district to present a list of approved student-facing applications that currently include a generative AI component.
5. LAUSD Res-048-25/26 directed the district to track and report student time on one-to-one devices by grade level and application, including time after school.
6. Cambridge's Toward High-Quality Screen Use distinguishes teacher-facing displays from student devices as meaningfully different learning experiences.
7. Cambridge's proposed rule, as reported by the Boston Globe, targeted students individually operating devices while allowing teachers to display curriculum materials.
8. Utah defines screen time as time using a device with a screen in a classroom setting when the use does not involve instruction, guidance, or interaction with a teacher (53G-7-228(1)(c)). Because nearly any classroom use can be described as teacher-guided, ITC's definition counts screen time regardless of who directs it. The AAP's January 2026 policy statement

moved beyond time limits alone toward the design and context of children's digital experiences. This glossary measures quantity (Term 4) and evaluates quality and design (Terms 7, 10, and 13).

9. Cambridge's educator survey defined instructional screen use as time directly tied to curriculum or learning goals, and non-instructional use as transitions, movement breaks, and games. Its 91.4 percent instructional figure classified applications by category, so it describes which tools were open rather than the quality of the activity.
10. Cambridge's day-in-the-life observations found screen use to be cumulative in experience across classes.
11. Status per Boston.com, September 14, 2026. The bills as reported by Western Mass News (August 12, 2026) allow secure storage pouches, geofencing, or a state-approved alternative plan.
12. The National Data Privacy Agreement (NDPA v2.1) prohibits using student data for targeted advertising or to build profiles for purposes other than providing the service, permits use for adaptive learning, and states that the duty to delete does not extend to de-identified data. Many executed agreements permit vendors to use de-identified data for product development, surviving the end of the contract. The Student Data Privacy Consortium maintains a registry of signed agreements.
13. The AAP names autoplay, endless scrolling, and targeted ads as engagement-based designs not built with children's well-being in mind. Utah requires instructional technology to be "absent of design features that interfere with learning; distract from instruction; or reduce academic focus" (53G-7-228(2)(a)(ii)).
14. Digital Promise reports that EdTech has no standard definition of dosage, that vendor recommendations vary widely, and that i-Ready's commonly cited guideline is 45 minutes per subject per week. LAUSD's resolution noted a district recommendation of roughly 45 minutes each of ELA and math i-Ready weekly with no maximum screen-time policy, and directed a review of i-Ready.
15. LAUSD's resolution directed an itemized report of classroom technology contracts, broken down by central office and school purchases.
16. Cambridge describes its approval process as evaluating educational alignment and student data privacy. Utah requires districts, before allowing instructional technology, to ensure it has significant educational value, is free of distracting design features, is supported by grade-appropriate evidence, is "safe for a student's physical, cognitive, and emotional development," is effective, does not substitute for instruction, and complies with privacy law (53G-7-228(2)(a)).
17. Massachusetts student records regulations list the directory information a school may release without consent: a student's name, address, telephone listing, date and place of birth, major field of study, dates of attendance, weight and height of athletic team members, class, participation in officially recognized activities and sports, degrees, honors and awards, and post-high school plans (603 CMR 23.07(4)(a)). Release requires public notice and a reasonable time for families to ask that the information not be released without consent. Photographs are not on the Massachusetts list. Under federal FERPA, directory information may be disclosed without consent after public notice and an opportunity for families to restrict it (34 CFR 99.3 and 99.37). Any consent-based approach built on these rules depends on families opting out. The K-8 image-free standard does not rely on consent. The 9-12 standard uses a standalone, clearly communicated opt-out so the choice is not buried in the directory information notice.
18. Cambridge's survey described active use as students thinking or creating and passive use as watching or clicking through; its observation protocol rated cognitive engagement on a four-point scale.
19. Utah's model framework prohibits a required ratio of one device to one student in grades K to 6 (53G-7-228(5)(d)). LAUSD's resolution encouraged laptop carts and computer labs for grades 2 to 5 while reducing one-to-one devices, and its guidelines let families opt in to district devices at home. Neither makes an in-school 1:1 device opt-in; ITC's term goes a step further.
20. LAUSD now requires families to opt in to take-home devices. Utah's model framework prohibits take-home devices in grades K to 6 and requires written parent opt-in in middle school.
21. LAUSD's resolution directed per-application consent for its Google tools.
22. Google's Workspace for Education Terms of Service require the district to obtain parental consent before turning on Additional Services for users under 18. Since September 2024, institutions must review and reconfirm that access each year, including confirming that the required consent was obtained. Google describes Additional Services as designed for consumer users and usable with education accounts only when a school's administrator allows them.

Sources

Links checked September 23, 2026. Sources added in v6 reviewed September 28, 2026. Source added in v7 (ESEA Section 8101(21)) checked October 13, 2026.

- IDEA, 34 CFR 300.5: law.cornell.edu/cfr/text/34/300.5
- 15 U.S.C. 9401(3): law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/15/9401
- NIST generative AI glossary entry (citing NIST SP 800-218A): csrc.nist.gov/glossary/term/generative_artificial_intelligence; NIST AI 600-1 (July 2024): nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/ai/NIST.AI.600-1.pdf
- Utah H.B. 273 (2026), Classroom Technology Amendments, enrolled: le.utah.gov/Session/2026/bills/enrolled/HB0273.pdf
- LAUSD Res-048-25/26, “Using Technology with Intention,” Version 4 (Final), adopted April 21, 2026: media.edlio.net (final resolution PDF)
- LAUSD Guidelines for Student Screen Time Policy (adopted June 23, 2026): edtech.lausd.org
- Francis, H., Roughton, G., & Amigone, J. (2026). Toward High-Quality Screen Use in Cambridge Public Schools. Cambridge Public Schools, June 2026: report PDF (linked from cpsd.us, Office of Academics)
- Boston Globe, Cambridge proposed screen pause (April 2, 2026): bostonglobe.com/2026/04/02/metro/screen-time-cambridge
- Boston Globe, Cambridge screen use audit (May 28, 2026): bostonglobe.com/2026/05/28/metro/cambridge-screen-time-report
- AAP, Digital Ecosystems, Children, and Adolescents: Policy Statement (Pediatrics, 2026;157(2):e2025075320): publications.aap.org; AAP family summary: healthychildren.org
- New Jersey DOE Phone-Free Schools Grant, Letter of Agreement (October 1, 2025): nj.gov (grant PDF)
- Massachusetts S.2581 (Senate-passed text): malegislature.gov/Bills/194/S2581; House vote (WBUR, April 9, 2026): wbur.org; enforcement options (Western Mass News, August 12, 2026): westernmassnews.com; status (Boston.com, September 14, 2026): boston.com
- National Data Privacy Agreement v2.1: files.a4l.org (NDPA PDF); Student Data Privacy Consortium registry: sdpc.a4l.org
- Deterding, Dixon, Khaled, & Nacke (2011), “From game design elements to gamefulness: Defining gamification”: doi.org/10.1145/2181037.2181040
- Digital Promise on EdTech dosage (April 22, 2025): digitalpromise.org
- ESSA evidence tiers (National Center on Improving Literacy): improvingliteracy.org
- ESEA Section 8101(21), definition of “evidence-based” (20 U.S.C. 7801(21)): law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/20/7801
- FERPA, 34 CFR 99.3 and 99.37: ecfr.gov (Title 34, Part 99); U.S. Department of Education, Directory Information: studentprivacy.ed.gov/content/directory-information
- Massachusetts student records regulations, 603 CMR 23.07: doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr23.html
- Google Workspace for Education, Additional Services and parental consent: support.google.com/a/answer/6356441; Manage access to additional services for users designated as under 18: knowledge.workspace.google.com (Admin Help); Workspace Updates, consent reconfirmation for under-18 users (March 14, 2025): workspaceupdates.googleblog.com