

EORC Meeting Minutes October 28, 2016

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, Ann Joslin and Scott Woolstenhulme.

Absent: Andy Mehl

Scott Woolstenhulme moved to approve the minutes of September 19 as amended. Ryan Zimmerle seconded, motion carried.

There was a discussion on adopting minimum and maximum bandwidth levels for the libraries. Some libraries are not using E-rate as their connectivity is contracted through their cities.

Mr. Woolstenhulme asked if people bring their own devices or use the public access devices. Ms. Joslin said people do both, which makes it difficult to define required bandwidth.

The Chairman turned the meeting over to the Vice Chairman.

Mr. Goodman asked if population (patron count) could be used as a determiner of bandwidth. Ms. Joslin said it may not necessarily be population based; some libraries have more wireless activities. Determining required bandwidth is a national issue for libraries; there is no agreement on how to set standards.

Mr. Woolstenhulme made a motion to set the library minimum at 4 megabytes and the maximum at the FCC target for E-Rate modernization. Ms. Joslin seconded. Mr. Goodman said the Committee should look at the cost/megabyte. Motion carried.

The Vice Chairman turned the meeting back over to the Chairman.

Mr. Woolstenhulme made a motion to use the same appeals/denials process for the libraries as is used for the schools. Mr. Layne seconded, motion carried.

Libraries which go over the target set will have to go through the appeals process for this year. The appeals/denials for libraries were tabled until the schools' appeals were completed.

Appeals:

Mr. Woolstenhulme made the motion to take no action on "not funded" entities-those entities who did not file for E-Rate. Ms. Joslin seconded, motion carried.

Dietrich/Gooding School District - Mr. Woolstenhulme made a motion to have the SDE pay for the internet portion of the appeal, but not the one-time costs. Mr. Goodman seconded, motion carried.

West Bonner School District - West Bonner receives a single invoice from their provider with a total cost of \$5400/month for all internet services. Mr. Zimmerle made a motion to deny the appeal until more information is provided from their provider. Ms. Joslin seconded. Mr. Goodman amended the motion to add "including cost breakdown". Mr. Woolstenhulme seconded. Amended motion carried, original motion failed.

11:55 lunch break, return at 12:35.

Appeals Continued:

Wilder School District – Mr. Woolstenhulme made a motion to approve the Wilder School District appeal as they are requesting the next higher-tier bandwidth they can get. Mr. Layne seconded, motion carried.

Mr. Goodman made a motion to automatically approve any appeals that are below the cost per student/megabyte and within 2x the maximum value for this year for K-12 entities. Mr. Zimmerle seconded, motion carried.

Firth School District - Firth's appeal was automatically approved because of the above motion.

iSucceed – did not apply for E-rate, even though they are eligible. Mr. Woolstenhulme made a motion to deny their appeal pursuant to the requirement in IC § 33-5602 (c) that states: "E-rate eligible entities apply for and pursue, in good faith, E-rate funding." Mr. Goodman seconded, motion carried.

Three Creek School District – did not apply because they said a consultant was too expensive. Mr. Goodman made a motion to deny the appeal pursuant to the requirement in IC § 33-5602 (c). Mr. Woolstenhulme seconded, motion carried.

Upper Carmen School District – Mr. Zimmerle made a motion to deny the appeal pursuant to the same requirement as stated above; IC § 33-5602 (c). Ms. Joslin seconded, motion carried.

Mountain View School District – their application was denied by USAC. The first quarter reimbursement was sent out before the SDE was aware of the denial, so they will receive no additional funds until their denial is resolved.

Mr. Woolstenhulme made a motion to hold all further payments for those whose E-rate applications have been denied and appealed. Mr. Doramus seconded, motion carried.

Mr. Woolstenhulme made a motion to amend the previous motion related to the Dietrich/Gooding School District to pay the non-e-rate portion of the non-recurring costs. Ms. Joslin seconded, motion carried.

Mr. Goodman made a motion that any district's request for reimbursement of one-time costs, where the state's portion is greater than or equal to \$5000, need to be pre-approved by the committee prior to the Form 471 closing date. Mr. Woolstenhulme seconded, motion carried.

This means any request for reimbursement of one-time costs, where the state's portion is less than \$5000, can be approved by the Library Commission or the SDE.

Mr. Goodman made a motion to automatically approve appeals that meet the following conditions:

Districts and Schools

1. The cost per Mbps is less than the statewide aggregate cost per Mbps (currently \$6.19/Mbps for FY2017), as calculated for reimbursed districts and schools, and
2. The Mbps per student is less than 2 Mbps per student.

Libraries

1. The cost per Mbps is less than the statewide aggregate cost per Mbps, as calculated for reimbursed libraries, and
2. The requested bandwidth is less than twice the maximum bandwidth.

Mr. Zimmerle seconded, motion carried.

There was a discussion on E-rate support for the entities and what the entities may need help with. One suggestion was to have webinars throughout the E-rate process, potentially one for each form and to have them throughout the state.

Out of 143 school districts, 51 use consultants for E-rate submission.

It would be helpful to have a strategy for bandwidth increases. Many districts do not realize how much bandwidth they could really use.

The Request for Proposal (RFP) process is very challenging, but the SDE and the Commission cannot provide legal guidance. There was a discussion on what denotes a "good" RFP. Perhaps the Committee could compile a list of potential sites which have helpful information as a reference for districts.

There was a discussion on Security Guidance; would there be potential operational funding dollars available to support entities in procuring security audits and recommendations from third-party organizations. FERPA (Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act) has three main components: physical, logical and administrative security. Do school districts understand their responsibility under this law and the Idaho Privacy Act?

Ms. Joslin stated the Library Commission would like to work with the SDE to support all entities; however, the Library Commission appropriation is only for reimbursement, not operations.

Ms. Joslin said the libraries would like to have network assessments and support in designing Wi-Fi networks. She also said the libraries had a survey done in 2014 which asked libraries to discuss any technical assistance needed. Ms. Joslin will bring the results of that survey to the next meeting.

The last topic for discussion was what data is needed for decision making in bandwidth usage. Some of the items discussed were: the number of devices that are wired vs wireless, does the

entity use a cloud solution, and do districts allow “bring your own devices” or only allow district-supplied devices on their network?

The meeting was adjourned at 3:35 pm.