MINUTES

Technology Oversight Committee Meeting
LIRC Engineering Conference Room
2025 S. Winsett
Tucson, Arizona 85719

January 24, 2011
4:47 p.m. – 6:35 p.m.

MINUTES

Committee Members Present:
Ashton Bergstrand
Tressa Escarpeta
Jorge Figueroa-Cecco
Harry McGregor
R. Thomas Meyer
Robert O’Toole – Vice chair

TUSD Staff Present:
John Gay – CIO
Andrea Marafino
Kathy Dierdorf
Donna Mattix
John Bratcher
Leon George
Michael Hicks
Mark Stegeman

Committee Members Absent:
Theo Gomez
Scott Horten - Chair

Guests Present:
Gage Andrews – C.O.T
MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

Bob O’Toole called the meeting to order at 4:47 and there was an adequate amount of members at the meeting to have a quorum.

New student member Tressa Escarpeta was welcomed by the TOC members. Ms. Escarpeta gave brief background history.

Mr. O’Toole congratulated Mr. Figueroa-Cecco on his appointment to West Point.

ACTION

Motion was made to approve the meeting minutes. Mr. McGregor made the motion to approve the minutes as received via email. Mr. Bergstrand seconded.

Internet Content Filtering Contract

Mr. Gay passed out a paper about Internet Content Filtering Solution. The current vendor’s contract is expiring and we need to find something as good or better than what we have to make sure we comply with CIPA. We are making infrastructure upgrades and traffic volume will increase. There are a couple price ranges, the difference will be the amount of training provided by the vendor. There is an additional option for deploying another layer of protection. Without it the vendors’ solution is adequate. Mr. Mc Gregor asked if the additional cost in license cover the additional hardware needed, the answer is yes. This is not a yearly fee, its based on a 5 year life cycle. The district also already has in place anti malware and anti spyware. Mr. Meyer asked if this can be added on later in the year and Mr. Gay stated that would be a possibility. This also would not apply to intra-district.

Wireless Access for Non TUSD Devices

Mr. Figueroa-Cecco stated that wireless access is granted at UHS. It’s been broadcast for the past 3 years but has never connected to the internet. Students are not allowed to access without a TUSD laptop and this is a waste of infrastructure if it’s not allowed to be used. Mr. Gay responded most schools have wireless access and that has to be protected due to CIPA regulations.

How the E-Rate contract for QMOE was cancelled

Mr. George stated 3 years ago there was an RFP for Erate tech. solution for WAN services which was QMOE. That was awarded in 2008. Last year a decision was made to do an RFP for the same services to issue a new RFP. It’s implicit that when you issue a new contract, it replaces the old contract. You will use the new one and not the old one. Erate does not allow you to have 2 contracts for the same services. We have replaced the WAN with STC Microwave solution, and this is the one we’re asking for Erate reimbursement for.
Network Infrastructure upgrades 2011-2013

ACTION

TUSD Network Infrastructure Plan was handed out. Been working on getting the Erate prior year requests to be granted. Got a list of SLD to recover from the previous years issues. They have all the information they have asked for and they have had no comment. This school year we went through the PIA –(Program Integrity Assurance Review) and the SLD (Schools and Library Division) was satisfied with the answers they received. Next step is HATS review (Helping Applicants to Succeed). They visit to look at information and talk to people about how things are being done then offer advice. Once review is complete then they will start releasing prior year money to us in reverse chronological order. The Priority 1 money we get would be a direct reimbursement to the general fund for things we already paid for. Priority 2 requests must execute the requests exactly what we requested them for. Service substitutions can be made under certain conditions. We have had to cancel requests for things that are impossible to execute any more such as switches for schools that no longer exist. There is a 75 day calendar window of opportunity during which if you go out with an RFP for service, you have to announce your intention to do so on the SLD website, and give vendors at least 28 days to respond. This year they changed the window to Jan 11 and goes to midnight March 24. We do not have time to properly execute an RFP for services. On WAN side we have an STC contract. On priority 2 side we have state contract erate approved. That decision has to be made before and also we need time to file needed forms by March 24. People have said they can get better prices than the state contracts have. The problem is we don’t have time this year to issue an RFP. Other problem is vendors are not allowed to cut their own price on a state contract for services. As a result we would use the erate approved state contracts. We have a contract with STC for WAN upgrades, the way its laid out is it would be another 4 years before we could get WAN upgrades to all the schools. Our goal is to complete all the WAN and LAN upgraes by the end of the 2012-2013 school year. We are temporarily separating the data and voice networks. Our voice telephone will remain on the T-1’s which we will continue to pay for. The Superintendent has to certify that the matching Erate funds are available. Mr. Gay has been assured the funds have been set aside.
ACTION

Mr. O'Toole stated he has repeatedly asked to see a total cost of this program and what is the total cost annually of the system once its been built and once converged data back to the telephone. What is the cost VS. the cost of the QMOE contract? Concerned about the site upgrade switching of LANS which is being done to the existing standards the district approved. The committee wants to see the entire standard revised across the district. How much of those standards are you moving towards? Standards call for VOIP in every classroom and wireless. What are the LAN upgrades going to do? Concerned about the state contracts priority 2 infrastructure purchase. TOC has been given presentations in the past about infrastructure equipment from state contractors. The district staff has requested prices on equipment limiting the prices to one manufacturer and wants when we request pricing from state contractors that the district look at multiple manufacturers and compare prices of different manufacturers and vendors. Mr. Gay commented that it becomes very difficult to support devices like switches from multiple manufactures. Mr. O'Toole stated that if 1 manufacturer is going to be used then that decision needs to be made by the School Board.

Mr. Stegeman stated that if these are the standards that were ratified by the Board in 2009, the Board does not consider those standards operational. They were adopted during an Erate process and the Board was prepared to appeal the standards. Also, as far as the Erate funds that come to us, it doesn’t make sense to look at it as reimbursements...they should come in unrestricted and going into the general fund and subject to the same trade offs and desire to save money as in any other fund.

The next scheduled meeting is on Monday, February 28, 2011 at 4:30, site to be announced.

Committee Adjourned

CALL TO THE AUDIENCE

SCHEDULE AND CONFIRM

MEETING ADJOURNED
Meeting was adjourned at 6:35 p.m.

Approved_______________________
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APPROVED___________________________