Technology Oversight Committee Meeting
Technology Conference Room
1010 E. 10th
Tucson, Arizona 85719

April 19, 2011
4:35PM – 6:10PM

MINUTES

Committee Members Present:
Ashton Bergstrand
Tressa Escarpeta
Jorge Figueroa-Cocco
Harry McGregor
Robert O’Toole – Vice chair
Michael Hicks – Gov. Board Member

TUSD Staff Present:
John Gay – CIO
Andrea Marafino
Kathy Dierdorf
Leon George
John Bratcher
Martha Durkin

Committee Members Absent:
Scott Horten – Chair
R. Thomas Meyer
Mark Stegeman – Gov. Board President

Guests Present:
Clyde Maghan
MEETING CALLED TO ORDER
Bob O’Toole called the meeting to order at 4:35 and there was an adequate amount of members at the meeting to have a quorum.

New Legal Counsel, Martha Durkin was introduced and she gave a brief description about herself.

Review and discuss legal opinion on the use of Bond funds for technology purchases.

ACTION
Motion was made to approve the meeting minutes. Mr. McGregor made the motion to approve the minutes and Mr. Bergstrand seconded

Mr. O’Toole asked Ms. Durkin to review the legal opinion for the use of Bond fund money for tech. purchases. Ms. Durkin. Ms. Durkin stated the district can issue bonds to use for certain items; For building and renovating school buildings, supplying bldgs with furniture, equip and tech and for improving school grounds and transportation. A long term purchase can not be done for fixtures.- anything affixed to the building; things between the computer and the wall are not allowed to use the bond funds for. Mr. O’Toole said there was a bond for technology and allowed the use of funds for microwave and VOIP technology. In 2009 the state law said no bond funds could be used for any items that had a useful life of less than 5 years, and that law is changed. Ms. Durkin read “except as provided … bond proceeds should not be expended for items whose useful life is less than average life of bonds issued except that in no event will it be less than 5 years”. Ms. Durkin is going to ask Bond Counsel..”Does the exception allow the district to sale bonds on 5 year terms and use proceeds to purchase non fixtured technology items”. Mr. O’Toole requested Ms. Durkin ask somebody else except Bond Counsel. Ms. Durkin said she would do that.

Network Performance Graphs

A 24 hour performance graph was presented per the request of the TOC. A PDF version of this graph was sent via email to the TOC members as well. Graph represents access to the ISP and our connection to city fiber and connections of upgraded schools. The network traffic was suppressed because all video streaming was blocked. The sites that have been upgraded have had video restraints lifted. Mr. Gay stated we have not broken down what kind of traffic is going on during the day, but believe the majority of what is going on is internet. There is also student updates and file downloads going on as well. There are no really high peaks on the upgraded links. Mr. McGregor stated he was concerned about Rincon in not seeing any difference there although it shows the schools are starting to utilize the services that are being provided.
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 upgrades 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 vendor 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