

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

**DATE:** September 12, 2011  
**TIME:** 10:30 AM  
**PLACE:** EW41

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Reed DeMordaunt, Brian Duncan, Christopher Campbell, Christine Donnell Salvatore Lorenzen, Bicker Therien, Rich Wills (for Bob Nonini)

Chairman Reed DeMordaunt called the subcommittee to order. The Committee further discussed the One-to-One survey results that were given in the general task force meeting. It was recommended providing a survey to students as well, with changes made to avoid leading questions. Many of the committee members were surprised by the feedback on the lack of keyboard. The committee felt that a keyboard is important and could be a separate item that could be attached if needed. Christine Donnell recommended that outreach be done in the next few days to students. State Department of Education (SDE) staff will work to provide outreach to students for feedback and have the results ready for the October subcommittee meeting. Questions for students will also be included in all site visits.

Matt McCarter, SDE Staff, reported on action items from last month's meeting. Mr. McCarter has reached out to the other subcommittees to discuss policy related to their assignments and will continue to do so. The Request for Information (RFI) will address the tracking and assignment of devices. Chris Campbell recommended postponing the creation of a policy around tracking and assigning devices until the RFI and Request for Proposal (RFP) have been returned so the policies can be specific. Discussion took place with Professional Technical Education on how they dispose of old devices. The devices are wiped cleaned and then put out to schools to purchase for nominal value and remaining devices are sent to a recycling center. The RFI includes language to require the devices to be recycled. Chair DeMordaunt wanted to assure the district that students will be able to acquire the device at the end of the life. A policy will need to be put in place to assure the devices are sanitized. This will be discussed with the procurement subcommittee.

The RFI addresses building readiness. Each school will be responsible to get the building ready based on the minimum vendor solution. The biggest issues will be around power and whether the students will be able to take home their device to charge overnight. The Idaho Education Network (IEN) will pay for the wireless. Site visit protocol was presented during the full committee meeting. In researching information on screen resolution for standardized testing, Mr. Campbell mentioned that the ISAT is going away by the year the 1:1 is implemented. Mr. Therien pointed out the need for SchoolNet to run on

whatever device is selected. Filtering will be handled in compliance with Idaho Code 33-132. This information needs to be included in the RFI. Questions arose regarding whether a local district will be able to adjust their internet access level or if this will be controlled by the IEN.

The subcommittee adjourned at 12:00 p.m. for a lunch break and reconvened at 1:30 p.m.

Chairman DeMordaunt reconvened the subcommittee and led the subcommittee in a discussion regarding the subcommittee's priorities. State Department of Education Chief of Staff, Ms. Luci Willits joined the committee for the afternoon. For full priority language, please see the June 13th subcommittee minutes.

Priority #1: Determine what type of capabilities the 1:1 devices should have. The committee felt they had reached this objective by collecting information via the One-to-One Survey as well as presentations by other states.

Priority #2: Develop model policies for 1:1 device usage.

This has been the primary issue the subcommittee has been working on. After today's meeting, all of the committee's recommendations will be collected so SDE staff can work to craft language for each of these policies. This language will be provided for committee's final review by the October meeting.

Priority #3: Determine what type of professional development will be delivered to teach school staff how to use 1:1 devices.

It was decided this priority was outside the subcommittee's scope of work, and is being addressed by the Classroom Technology Integration subcommittee.

Priority #4 Communicate to the public that 1:1 devices will compliment instruction.

The committee felt that this priority has not been reached. Other than the one-to-one survey and personal discussion, no outreach has been done. Discussion took place on the intent of this priority and how to communicate with the public. The committee will look at putting together a press release at the end of the task force assignments to include some of the policies that have been decided on and answer public concerns.

Chairman DeMordaunt led the subcommittee in a discussion regarding policy recommendations. DeMordaunt indicated his hope that Idaho would be able to select the best of what is happening in other states and adopt those policies for Idaho.

At 4:30 pm the subcommittee adjourned for the day.



**One to One Governance Policy Decision Points (updated 8/24)**

|    | <b>Policy Area</b>  | <b>State Policy?</b>   | <b>Guidance for local policy development?</b>  | <b>Collaboration with other subcommittees / experts</b> |
|----|---|--|--|---|
| 1. | Online safety<br>(7, 20)                                  |  | Capture / glean model policies...  | Reference existing statutes / rules                     |
| 2. | Cyberbullying<br>(8, 39)                                  |  | Capture / glean model policies...  | Reference existing statutes / rules                     |
| 3. | Take home device<br>(10)                                  | Implications for unfunded mandate if devices remain at school (infrastructure)   | Recommend devices go home and are fully charged next school day to overcome infrastructure issues (if they exist)<br><i>If districts chose not to have devices go home, then district will be responsible for infrastructure for charging.</i> |   |
| 4. | Local building readiness (electricity- charging stations) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RFP dealing with wireless will address</li> <li>• LEA's required to provide minimum building readiness to support the 1:1 initiative</li> <li>• Establish a specification for wireless infrastructure</li> <li>• Establish a specification for support of the device (e.g., charging options)</li> <li>• Get definition of "minimum readiness" from Maine</li> <li>• Look into fall 2011 funds for infrastructure</li> <li>• Establish infrastructure "hardship" pool for handful of districts that can't afford to build the infrastructure</li> </ul> |  | Division of Building Safety, Procurement Subcommittee   |

|    |   |   |  |   |
|----|---|---|--|---|
|    |   | (very rural districts in old buildings)<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Examine building standards- present day requirements relative to power</li> </ul> |  |   |
| 5. | Use outside of Idaho (10)                           |   | Employ Maine's language  |   |
| 6. | Network usage (11-16, 17)                           |   | Protect bandwidth for students- must sign an AUP / if open to non-school users a signed AUP is required    | Clarify issues with E-rate funded infrastructure- converse with IEN- discuss with Title 2d                |
| 7. | Student code of conduct (18, 22, 29-33)             |   | Locally crafted- require signature from students / parents identifying understanding of                    | Consult AG on non-school user, apply a sticker indicating proper use / etiquette / incorporated in login? |
| 8. | Prohibited activities (15, 18)                      |   | Locally crafted item- with examples...   |   |
| 9. | Availability of access (19)                         |   | Locally crafted item- with examples...   |   |
| 10 | Use by members of the public (19, 34, 35)           |   | See #6   |   |
| 11 | Personal (from home) computing devices in classroom |   | Locally crafted (Genessee example, Wood River), ETA group...<br><br>With examples, points of consideration |   |

|    |  |  |   |   |
|----|--|--|---|---|
| 12 | Parental use of device<br>(41)                             | Intended for student academic growth<br><br>Uses outside this definition (personal gain, etc...) are prohibited                                | Locally crafted- encourage parent participation with a focus on education of the student  | RFI to include insurance for district / parents to participate in |
| 13 | Purpose / responsibilities<br>(11, 12)                     | Intended for student academic growth<br><br>Uses outside this definition (personal gain, etc...) are prohibited                                |   | Guiding questions from Intel guidebook for change                 |
| 14 | Limitation of liability<br>(12, 20)                        | State to promulgate language for schools to treat devices as their own property for the purposes of acceptable use policy (search and seizure) | District responsible for liability issues- use Maine language for example   |   |
| 15 | Selection of digital material<br>(14)                      |  | Locally crafted- provide examples for parental notification / preview of content / options for opting out / investigating content | Refer to schoolnet integration subcommittee                       |
| 16 | Due process<br>(13)  |  | Locally crafted- provide examples   |   |
| 17 | Search and seizure<br>(13, 14)                             |  | Locally crafted- provide examples   | Refer to Ebarharti-Maki and Tappen for best practice language     |
| 18 | Intellectual property rights<br>(20, 36)                   | Students retain rights to their work if created within AUP parameters- district retains right to use products created by staff                 |   |   |
| 19 | Accounts (student, teacher, administrator)<br>(15, 37, 38) |  |   |   |
| 20 | Teacher code of conduct<br>(24-28)                         |  |   |   |
| 21 | Monitoring of student activity on device<br><br>(20)       |  |   |   |
| 22 | Personalization of device                                  |  | Locally crafted- appropriate  |   |

|    |   |   |   |   |
|----|---|---|---|---|
|    | (music, games, pictures)<br><br>(21, 40)            |   | digital content for personal use allowed but limited to music and pictures and that which does not hinder network or device   |   |
| 23 | Consequences of policy violation<br><br>(21 - 23)   |   |   |   |
| 24 | Weblog (Maine model)                                |   |   |   |
| 25 | Other Acceptable Use issues?                        |   |   |   |
| 26 | 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?<br>Parent involvement overlap with other areas? Guiding questions from Intel guidebook for change                                   |
| 27 | 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? |
| 28 | Centralization of hardware                          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>State selects the hardware but allows exceptions / substitutions (e.g., school for the blind).</li> <li>See asset management language below</li> <li>Single device is the vision of procurement committee</li> </ul> |   | Procurement Subcommittee- flexibility of device (and add-ons) for accessibility? Idaho will use Maine's language                                    |
| 29 | Centralization of software                          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>State sets minimum and districts are allowed to add</li> </ul>   | LEA's provided discretion to add software, develop  | Procurement Subcommittee-   |

|    |  |  |   |  |
|----|--|--|---|--|
|    |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft guidance related to minimum functionality.</li> <li>• Define minimum (e.g., word processing, graphic, spreadsheets)- “productivity suite” (pg 23 in background reading from ME RFP)</li> <li>• Guidelines and procedures related to supporting additional, non-standard software that impacts OS</li> </ul> | guidelines regarding modification and support- any software additions (purchase, support, licensing, etc...) beyond minimum requirements are the responsibility of the LEA. | base software to meet functional requirements stemming from instructional use, check with Instructional Integration Subcommittee |
| 30 | Centralization of PD   |  |   | Classroom Technology Integration Subcommittee will determine this area   |
| 31 | Centralization digital content   | State policy regarding adoption of Schoolnet and implications for districts that don’t adopt   |   | Schoolnet Subcommittee   |
| 32 | Centralization assessment  | State policy to be developed by Schoolnet Subcommittee   |   | Schoolnet Subcommittee- seek policy language   |
| 33 | 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   |
| 34 | 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   |
| 35 | Establish policy/ expectations for anti-virus and personal firewall software | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Included as one of the software elements to be included in RFP (pg 54 of reading packet)</li> <li>• Federal law and state statute currently address this issue</li> </ul>   |   | Procurement Subcommittee   |
| 36 | Establish policy/ expectations filtering                                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Abide by state (I.C. 33-131) and federal (Children’s</li> </ul>   |   | Procurement Subcommittee   |

|    |  |   |  |                          |
|----|--|---|--|--------------------------|
|    |  | <p>Internet Protection Act- CIPA) filtering requirements and develop references / guidance for these areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop policy related to appropriate usage training</li> </ul> |  |                          |
| 37 | 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 |
| 38 | Develop inventory tracking system                                      | Examine ME's asset management system<br>Adopt ME's system and customize for ID, set policy from state level<br>Work with ME and utilize their system, not part of the RFP   |  | Maine SDE                |
| 39 | component checklists (i.e., external equipment)                        | Asset management system should have ability to manage   | LEA's responsible for managing components                                  |                          |
| 40 | 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 |
| 41 | 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 |
| 42 | Establish procedures for device assignments to districts               |   |  | Procurement Subcommittee |
| 43 | Establish roll-out process (standardized or customized based on size?) | See ME system, examine regional distribution center structure, part of RFP?   |  | Procurement Subcommittee |
| 44 | Software oversight / restrictions                                      | State oversight and support for basic package, vendor to outline as part of RFP response  | LEA's may add on but responsible for determining compatibility and support | Procurement Subcommittee |
| 45 | Supplementing basic solution with additional hardware                  | See above   | LEA responsibility to purchase   | Procurement              |
| 46 | Purchasing of additional   | State policy-encourage option   |  | Procurement              |

|    |   |   |  |                          |
|----|---|---|--|--------------------------|
|    | devices (Districts, employees, families)              | for additional purchasing, structure to avoid competition with traditional market<br>Page 25, 3.3.5 from Maine  |  | Subcommittee             |
| 47 | Device ownership                                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establish policy about ownership, when does it transfer from state to district and can district transfer ownership to a student?</li> <li>Establish lifecycle of devices</li> <li>RFP structured to allow for zero value at end of four years</li> <li>If device has a value (e.g., \$100+) establish guidance regarding disposal through state surplus</li> </ul> |  | Procurement Subcommittee |
| 48 | Disposal of devices after four-year cycle             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>First provide a mechanism for student to purchase for nominal fee (e.g., \$5 - \$10)</li> <li>Second create pool for local districts</li> </ul>  |  |                          |
| 49 | Security related to disposal (i.e., clear hard drive) | State establish policy about who is responsible for wiping hard drive<br>Add language to RFP about "end of life"<br>Seek guidance from ME   |  | Procurement Subcommittee |
| 50 | Security  | Establish acceptable use policy including privacy statement limiting state liability for personal use of devices (e.g., purchases from Amazon.  |  |                          |
| 51 | Mobile device warranty expectations                   | RFP to provide basic warranty for mechanical issues   |  | Procurement Subcommittee |
| 52 | Mobile device insurance expectations                  | State to provide guidance regarding insurance options<br><br>RFP- separate break-out of insurance options to leverage state economies of scale with vendors, voluntary  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LEAs to decide whether to offer/require additional accidental damage insurance</li> <li>Connect insurance to ability to take device home</li> </ul> | Procurement Subcommittee |

|    |   |   |   |  |
|----|---|---|---|--|
|    |   | participation by districts  |   |  |
| 53 | Accessibility                               | Establish policy for waivers from standard device should a student's IEP or disability require a special device feature<br>RFP to include accessibility options (e.g., universal design standards)  |   | Procurement  |
| 54 | Parent involvement / community outreach     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop policy language reflecting critical role of parents</li> <li>• Require parent orientation prior to laptops going home (see ME training agenda)</li> <li>• State to develop basic orientation template for districts/schools to customize</li> <li>• Establish minimum to be covered in orientation and training (PD part of RFP to include development of parent orientation)</li> </ul> | District required to offer orientation  | Professional development related to training for parents |
| 55 | Technology support                          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish standard for support/repair (e.g., Maine's policy regarding 5 minutes and then re-image)</li> <li>• Establish process for return and repair of machine</li> <li>• State guidance regarding encouraging student support capabilities as part of their instructional program</li> </ul>  | Establish back-up policies-acceptable use policies, personal data on a machine are never the responsibility of the district | Procurement Subcommittee                                 |
| 56 | Wireless access / security (open or closed) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encourage districts to maintain secure systems that are available 24-7 to all with passwords.</li> <li>• Not a 24-7 guarantee</li> <li>• Policy requirements about open networks and filtering (e.g., youtube videos draining bandwidth)</li> <li>• Filtering part of the RFP</li> </ul>   | LEAs to have discretion about whether to operate open system (e.g., not password protected)                                 | Procurement Subcommittee, Idaho Education Network        |
| 57 |   | •   |   |  |

|    |   |   |  |                          |
|----|---|---|--|--------------------------|
| 58 | Power supply / safeguards   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy recommendations related to back ups should power go out.</li> <li>• Servers</li> <li>• RFP</li> </ul> |  | Procurement Subcommittee |
| 59 | Patching / upgrading process  |   |  | Procurement Subcommittee |
| 60 | Back-end servers and storage  |   |  | Procurement Subcommittee |
| 61 | Anti-theft measures   |   |  | Procurement Subcommittee |
| 62 | Configure classroom furniture to facilitate use of mobile devices and collaboration |   |  | Procurement Subcommittee |
| 63 |   |   |  |                          |
| 64 |   |   |  |                          |
| 65 |   |   |  |                          |
| 66 |   |   |  |                          |

General questions from the Procurement Subcommittee:

- 1) Are we purchasing devices or a managed service? (Managed service)
- 2) What procurement instrument will we use? RFP, RFI, existing contracts or a combination. (Combination)
- 3) What is the duration of the vendor contract? What are the renewal options? *4 year contract, districts have the option to purchase additional devices.*
- 4) Will devices be **recommended** to go home at night or will schools have to upgrade infrastructure? *It is recommended devices go home. Districts will be responsible for infrastructure if devices are not charged in the evening.*
- 5) What is an acceptable level of down-time? *Want to handle it the same way as Maine.*
- 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?