

EORC Meeting Minutes June 7, 2017

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Campbell at 9:05 am.

Present: Chris Campbell, Chairman; Will Goodman, Vice Chairman; Ryan Zimmerle, Dale Layne, Jim Doramus, Scott Woolstenhulme and Andy Mehl.

Absent: Ann Joslin

Others Present: Michael Bartz, State Department of Education (SDE); Jo Ann Bujarski, SDE; Kate Haas, Kestrel West; Garry Lough, ENA; Mike Vance, ENA; Roger Sargent, SDE.

The agenda was approved by unanimous consent.

Mr. Mehl made a motion to approve the minutes as amended by the committee. Mr. Layne seconded, motion carried.

Ms. Joslin was unable to attend, but sent a status report. She said the Commission has expended just over 80% of their appropriation this year. They are still waiting for documentation from three libraries in order to reimburse them. The appropriation for next year is the same amount.

As of the last EORC meeting, there were still two libraries that had been denied funding, and the Commission was waiting on appeals from the libraries in question. No appeal has been submitted.

Mr. Bartz said the remaining FY2017 broadband reimbursements have been sent out; there are three districts the SDE is still waiting on; two of them had bandwidth increases and the SDE needs their invoices.

The WAN reimbursements have been sent out as well. The SDE is waiting on information from two districts in order to reimburse them. The total of WAN reimbursements will be just under \$1.6M.

There was a lengthy discussion on the Post Falls school district reimbursement request. The district currently has dark fiber and they are in the process of lighting it, so the invoices from Ednetics include equipment. E-Rate was filed in category 1 and this was approved by USAC.

The goal of the discussion was to set the general boundaries as to what would be included and what would not for WAN reimbursement. It was determined to table this discussion for a few minutes while more information was received from the school district.

The discussion was then directed to the history of the wireless project. Mr. Sargent said that in 2013, the Legislature appropriated \$2.25 million for a wifi program. In May of 2013, an RFP was released. The contract was awarded to Education Networks of America.

The initial term of the contract was for five years with language in the terms of possible contract extensions. Wireless coverage was provided in all instructional areas and all administrative areas where grades 9-12 are served. The contract also included common areas such as gymnasiums and shop rooms. A user was defined as any student 9-12 and any certified staff serving those students. The contract covered a 60-month term per building based on activation date. Billing was prorated on all contracts that started the first year. The service end date with each school district is 60 months after the install.

Users in grades 9-12 were the only ones who counted for billing purposes; if there was a school that had 7th and 8th grade along with 9th grade, only the student counts for 9th grade were used for invoicing from ENA. There were roughly 13,000 students who benefitted from the contract at no cost to the state.

In 2014 HB 643 added options for schools. There were three options:

- Continue with appropriations (contract) for existing schools
- Distribute \$21/user to schools who did not opt-in and whose system met the requirements of the wireless system and were certified
- Allow schools who had originally opted-in to opt-out and receive funding

The schools who opted-out after the end of fiscal 2014 were not eligible for a reimbursement.

The committee then continued the Post Fall School District reimbursement discussion.

Mr. Woolstenhulme made a motion to approve the Post Falls School District request and pay the non-E-rate portion of the invoice for the equipment to light the dark fiber. Mr. Mehl seconded, motion carried 4-3. Chairman Campbell, Vice Chairman Goodman and Mr. Zimmerle opposed the motion.

After this was completed, the discussion turned again to wireless and the two-day planning meeting in July. Chairman Campbell said, ideally, the goal of the two-day meeting is to have these questions answered:

- Are the committee's recommendations going to include covering K-12?
- Is the \$21/user amount for opt-out schools adequate?
- What are some of the overarching recommendations from the committee?

Mr. Woolstenhulme asked how the metrics were determined and why? Chairman Campbell said the metrics were put in place to guarantee equity among all participants of the contract.

Vice Chairman Goodman said the original wireless contract was not based on technology, but rather on serving students. EORC needs to have that same goal and the metrics should reflect the goal of serving students. It needs to serve all students and cover their learning. There are technical industry standards that can be used as a baseline.

There are requests for wireless in areas such as green houses and outside sports areas, but none of these areas is covered under the current contract specifications. The scope could be expanded to include those areas in the future.

What other information does the committee need for the meeting in July?

- What are K-12 wireless options used in other states? (North Carolina, Utah, etc.)
- What are the dates each school's current contract will end?
- Request Deputy Attorney General Kay Christensen to come speak to the committee.
- A list of all appropriate legislation.

Objectives for July Meeting:

- What are the options available with the current contract?
- Schools will not want to transition to a new system during the school year. How would a transition be handled?
- The focus will be on wireless for all K-12 students.
- Review all current legislation related to the wireless contract.
- If the solution is a managed one, a model of what that could look like.
- The committee requested that the current vendor present regarding services rendered under the existing contract and trends in wireless.

Meeting adjourned at 2:05 pm.