

MINUTES
TECHNOLOGY TASK FORCE
One-to-One Governance and Instructional Integration Subcommittee

DATE: August 9, 2011

TIME: 8:30 AM

PLACE: EW41

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Reed DeMordaunt, Vice-Chair Brian Duncan, Greg Cheetham (for Eileen Lento), Salvatore Lorenzen, Christopher Campbell, Bicker Therien

Chair DeMordaunt welcomed back the committee, and they continued work on policy recommendations (see One-to-One Governance sheet).

Chair DeMordaunt recommended the adoption of Maine's asset management policy. Lauren Morando Rhim asked if this would be a vendor requirement. Chair DeMordaunt asked that the State Department of Education (SDE) work with Maine to use the same system.

The subcommittee discussed imaging cycles. Some devices allow for re-imaging and some do not. Due to the limited tech support in some districts this will likely be a challenge. Basic images can be set up on devices. Currently, iPads do not allow for connections to server for application/software uploads. Not to say this will not change in the future but for now this is not the case.

Student first and last names were not used in Maine's asset management system. Chair DeMordaunt would like to know why Maine did this. It was pointed out that some of the vendors may have access to student names, which violates privacy. Assigning the devices through a unique student identifier would also avoid complications due to duplicate names.

Matt McCarter will look at how Maine rolled the devices out.

Bicker Therien asked whether schools with a small number of students could roll out devices to all 9-12 grades at once. Chair DeMordaunt responded it was an idea worthy of exploration, but the challenge comes in establishing a threshold for 9-12 deployment.

The subcommittee discussed supplementing basic solutions with additional software/hardware. Districts have the responsibility for hardware and software additions and are to be managed at the district level. The subcommittee would encourage bidders to include a separate price list of peripherals that can be purchased.

Chair DeMordaunt noted some schools have opened up the purchasing to families at the same price the school was paying or with a small increase.

Previous discussions have explored letting schools purchase additional computers, such as for 7th and 8th grade on their own, but that may cause concern among local businesses if they felt they could not compete.

Concerning resale of the devices, final legislation did not include language that students would keep the computer. Chair DeMordaunt recommended that policy be in place that the student is able to purchase the device for nominal fee. If the students did not want to take the device, the school district could purchase the device also a nominal fee. Christopher Campbell indicated that a policy needs to be in place for disposal of computers and cost associated with disposal. Luci Willits, SDE Chief of Staff, suggested this was a policy decision that should be left at the district level, but that the State owns the devices. Louie Konkol, SDE Chief Financial Officer, told the group that before disposal of the device it needs to be determined if the device has a nominal value. If the computer has a value of roughly \$100 it must go through a surplus process. The subcommittee recommended that the RFP be structured that the device is likely to have a nominal value making it possible for the computer to be purchased by the student.

The subcommittee discussed policy regarding the students taking the devices home. Acceptable use policy will need to address the following possible issues: whether parents will be allowed to use the device for personal use and whether parents will be required to purchase insurance if the device is allowed to go home. It was decided to leave this to the local district.

Parent involvement and community outreach are a key part of the one-to-one program. As a matter of policy, a parent orientation must be provided. McCarter will find out what Maine includes in their parent meetings and begin working on policy around parent involvement and training. McCarter will work with the Classroom Technology Integration Taskforce on parent involvement.

The committee discussed what local school buildings will need to do in order to be building ready for one-to-one. Some districts do not have the capacity or funding to upgrade buildings. Troy Wheeler, SDE Information Technology Director, will be invited to next month's meeting to discuss what building readiness means at the local level. Chair DeMordaunt would like to ensure all new school building specifications allow for sufficient capacity to accommodate one-to-one power issues.

The balance of policies not addressed in this meeting and other business will be discussed via the project site discussion board.

Chair DeMordaunt reminded the subcommittee to keep the focus on high school programs when looking at locations to conduct site visits and future committee presentations.

The subcommittee adjourned at 10:30 am to meet with the full Technology Task Force.



One to One Governance Policy Decision Points

- Staff to flesh out and post on the task force website
- Survey- uploaded and being distributed to stakeholder groups (8/16)
- Matt is researching points of inquiry to present at Sept. Task Force mtg
- Matt identify potential sites for visitation and protocol for interviews

	Policy Area	State Policy?	Guidance for local policy development?	Collaboration with other subcommittees / experts
1.	Establishment of local Technology Advisory Councils	No state policy	Recommendations for LEAs to create local councils include the scope and composition, (flesh out some guidance), establish minimum requirements for parent orientation content, recommendation to include students and parents in Technology Advisory Councils	Maine examples? Parent involvement overlap with other areas?
2.	Standardization	State-level procurement (finite options based on vendor solution)		Discuss with Schoolnet Subcommittee for standardized assessments- other policy coming out of the Schoolnet Subcommittee related to standardization?
3.	Centralization of hardware	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State selects the hardware but allows exceptions / substitutions (e.g., school for the blind). 		Procurement Subcommittee- flexibility of device (and add-ons) for

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See asset management language below • Single device is the vision of procurement committee 		accessibility? Idaho will use Maine’s language
4.	Centralization of software	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State sets minimum and districts are allowed to add • Draft guidance related to minimum functionality. • Define minimum (e.g., word processing, graphic, spreadsheets)- “productivity suite” (pg 23 in background reading from ME RFP) • Guidelines and procedures related to supporting additional, non-standard software that impacts OS 	LEA’s provided discretion to add software, develop guidelines regarding modification and support- any software additions (purchase, support, licensing, etc...) beyond minimum requirements are the responsibility of the LEA.	Procurement Subcommittee- base software to meet functional requirements stemming from instructional use, check with Instructional Integration Subcommittee
5.	Centralization of PD			Classroom Technology Integration Subcommittee will determine this area
6.	Centralization digital content	State policy regarding adoption of Schoolnet and implications for districts that don’t adopt		Schoolnet Subcommittee
7.	Centralization assessment	State policy to be developed by Schoolnet Subcommittee		Schoolnet Subcommittee- seek policy language
8.	Centralization technical support	State policy, tech support is part of the vendor bid offering.	Districts are responsible for support for any hardware or software above/beyond standard solution	Procurement Subcommittee- RFP, part of vendor proposal
9.	Protocol for hardware inventory updates	See Canby policy regarding annually with current technology update, language in RFP about evolution of hardware, establish cycle as part of the RFP, (e.g., hardware cycle refresh- 4 years?) compatibility issues -sub-point D- Canby		Procurement Subcommittee
10	Establish policy/ expectations for anti-virus and personal firewall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Included as one of the software elements to be included in RFP (pg 54 of 		Procurement Subcommittee

	software	reading packet) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Federal law and state statute currently address this issue 		
11	Establish policy/ expectations filtering	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Abide by state (I.C. 33-131) and federal (Children's Internet Protection Act-CIPA) filtering requirements and develop references / guidance for these areas Develop policy related to appropriate usage training 		Procurement Subcommittee
12	Establish policy/ expectations for client management	Request- part of the RFP, each district would need to adopt what the vendor provides. It will be provided as part of the device		Procurement Subcommittee
13	Develop inventory tracking system	Examine ME's asset management system Adopt ME's system and customize for ID, set policy from state level Work with ME and utilize their system, not part of the RFP		Maine SDE
14	component checklists (i.e., external equipment)	Asset management system should have ability to manage	LEA's responsible for managing components	
15	Imaging cycle- restore to base	Minimum software set/load managed and provided with standard package, State work with vendor to create, distribute and manage ability to image the device easily- part of RFP		Procurement Subcommittee
16	Establish procedures for device assignments to students	See ME system, build on existing ID unique id system. State establish a policy regarding device distribution and assignment system		Procurement Subcommittee
17	Establish procedures for device assignments to districts	See #16		Procurement Subcommittee
18	Establish roll-out process (standardized or customized based on size?)	See ME system, examine regional distribution center structure, part of RFP?		Procurement Subcommittee
19	Software oversight /	State oversight and support for	LEA's may add on but	Procurement

	restrictions	basic package, vendor to outline as part of RFP response	responsible for determining compatibility and support	Subcommittee
20	Supplementing basic solution with additional hardware	See above	LEA responsibility to purchase	Procurement
21	Purchasing of additional devices (Districts, employees, families)	State policy-encourage option for additional purchasing, structure to avoid competition with traditional market Page 25, 3.3.5 from Maine		Procurement Subcommittee
22	Device ownership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish policy about ownership, when does it transfer from state to district and can district transfer ownership to a student? Establish lifecycle of devices RFP structured to allow for zero value at end of four years If device has a value (e.g., \$100+) establish guidance regarding disposal through state surplus 		Procurement Subcommittee
23	Disposal of devices after four-year cycle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> First provide a mechanism for student to purchase for nominal fee (e.g., \$5 - \$10) Second create pool for local districts 		
24	Security related to disposal (i.e., clear hard drive)	State establish policy about who is responsible for wiping hard drive Add language to RFP about "end of life" Seek guidance from ME		Procurement Subcommittee
25	Security	Establish acceptable use policy including privacy statement limiting state liability for personal use of devices (e.g., purchases from Amazon.		
26	Mobile device warranty expectations	RFP to provide basic warranty for mechanical issues		Procurement Subcommittee
27	Mobile device insurance	State to provide guidance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LEAs to decide whether 	Procurement

	expectations	regarding insurance options RFP- separate break-out of insurance options to leverage state economies of scale with vendors, voluntary participation by districts	to offer/require additional accidental damage insurance • Connect insurance to ability to take device home	Subcommittee
28	Accessibility	Establish policy for waivers from standard device should a student's IEP or disability require a special device feature RFP to include accessibility options (e.g., universal design standards)		Procurement
29	Parent involvement / community outreach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop policy language reflecting critical role of parents • Require parent orientation prior to laptops going home (see ME training agenda) • State to develop basic orientation template for districts/schools to customize • Establish minimum to be covered in orientation and training (PD part of RFP to include development of parent orientation) 	District required to offer orientation	Professional development related to training for parents
30	Technology support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish standard for support/repair (e.g., Maine's policy regarding 5 minutes and then re-image) • Establish process for return and repair of machine • State guidance regarding encouraging student support capabilities as part of their instructional program 	Establish back-up policies- acceptable use policies, personal data on a machine are never the responsibility of the district	Procurement Subcommittee
31	Wireless access / security (open or closed)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage districts to maintain secure systems that are available 24-7 to all with passwords. • Not a 24-7 guarantee 	LEAs to have discretion about whether to operate open system (e.g., not password protected)	Procurement Subcommittee, Idaho Education Network

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy requirements about open networks and filtering (e.g., youtube videos draining bandwidth) • Filtering part of the RFP 		
32	Local building readiness (hard-wire, wireless, hot-spots, electricity- charging stations)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RFP dealing with wireless will address • LEA's required to provide minimum building readiness to support the 1:1 initiative • Establish a specification for wireless infrastructure • Establish a specification for support of the device (e.g., charging options) • Get definition of "minimum readiness" from Maine • Look into fall 2011 funds for infrastructure • Establish infrastructure "hardship" pool for handful of districts that can't afford to build the infrastructure (very rural districts in old buildings) • Examine building standards, are their infrastructure minimum. 		Division of Building Safety, Procurement Subcommittee
33	Power supply safeguards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy recommendations related to back ups should power go out. • Servers • RFP 		Procurement Subcommittee
34	Patching / upgrading process			Procurement Subcommittee
35	Back-end servers and storage			Procurement Subcommittee
36	Anti-theft measures			Procurement Subcommittee
37	Configure classroom furniture to facilitate use of mobile devices and collaboration			Procurement Subcommittee
38	Teacher-student communication			

39	Personal (from home) computing devices in classroom			
40	Parental use of device			
41	Take home device			
42	Personalization (music, pix, apps)			
43	Search and seizure			
44	Parental notification			
45	Weblog			
46	Other Acceptable Use issues?			

General questions from the Procurement Subcommittee:

- 1) Are we purchasing devices or a managed service?
- 2) What procurement instrument will we use? RFP, RFI, existing contracts or a combination.
- 3) What is the duration of the vendor contract? What are the renewal options?
- 4) Will computers be required to go home at night or will schools have to upgrade infrastructure?
- 5) What is an acceptable level of down-time?
- 6) What is an acceptable level of customer service support and how will it be measured?
- 7) What are the instructional goals for the 1 to 1 devices and what software is needed to achieve them?
- 8) Will devices need to be Virtualized?
- 9) Will client management, anti-virus and firewall software be a part of the procurement? If so, at what level of standardization?
- 10) What is the timeline for specification development, the procurement process and ultimate deployment?