

THE COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY

**THURSDAY, MARCH 2 and
FRIDAY, MARCH 3, 2000
GRANT SAWYER BUILDING
ROOM #4405
555 EAST WASHINGTON AVENUE
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA**

Minutes

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT ON MARCH 2, 2000:

Moises Denis, Chairman
Daniel Combo, Member
Fred Dugger, Member
Shawn Franklin, Member
Dori Jensen, Member
Sara Jones, Member
Bart Mangino, Member
Katrina Meyer, Member
Assemblyman Kelly Thomas, Member
Mary Peterson, Ex-officio
Marlene Lockard, Ex-officio

COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT ON MARCH 2, 2000:

Brian Herr
Senator Bill O'Donnell

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT ON MARCH 3, 2000:

Moises Denis, Chairman
Daniel Combo, Member
Fred Dugger, Member
Shawn Franklin, Member
Dori Jensen, Member
Sara Jones, Member
Bart Mangino, Member
Katrina Meyer, Member
Senator Bill O'Donnell
Mary Peterson, Ex-officio
Marlene Lockard, Ex-officio

COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT ON MARCH 3, 2000:

Brian Herr
Assemblymen Kelly Thomas

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION STAFF PRESENT
MARCH 2 & 3, 2000:**

Douglas Thunder, Deputy Superintendent, Administrative and Fiscal Services
Frank South, Team Leader, Human Resources & Technology
Mark Knudson, Technology Consultant
Jane Crawford, Management Assistant
Bill Strader, Library and Learning Resources Consultant

**NEVADA LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL BUREAU STAFF PRESENT
MARCH 2 & 3, 2000:**

Pepper Sturm, Research Analyst

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE ON MARCH 2, 2000:

Duane Barton, Elko County School District
John Croslin, Humboldt County School District
Jerry Atkins, Storey County School District
Randy Robison, Lincoln County School District
Bob Janka, Nevada Youth Training Center
Elmer Porter, Eureka County School District
Lee Peterson, Mineral County School District
Janice Towns, Carson City School District
Valerie Dockery, Carson City School District
Karen Layne, Edna Rose Crane Educational Foundation
Lee Solonche, KLUX, Clark County School District
Carrin Halfman, Clark County School District
Jhone Ebert, Clark County School District
Steve Hutchin, Eureka County School District
Patrick Goff, McDermitt
Leslie Fritz, Nevada State Education Association
Lisa Frazier, Northern Nevada Technology Consortium
Christy Falba, Clark County School District
Roger Cramer, Douglas County School District
Terry Lizotte, Clark County School District
Bob Pistner, Lander County School District
Randy Robison, Lincoln County School District
Bill McLeod, Elko County School District

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE ON MARCH 3, 2000:

Lee Peterson, Mineral County School District
Lee Solonche, KLVX, Clark County School District
Lisa Frazier, Northern Nevada Technology Consortium
Bill McLeod, Elko County School District
Duane Barton, Elko County School District
Dan O'Barr, Churchill County School District
Bob Pistner, Lander County School District
Christy Falba, Clark County School District
Kendall Hartley, University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Patrick Goff, McDermitt School, Humboldt County School District
John Croslin, Humboldt County School District

CALL TO ORDER:

Chairman Moises Denis, Grant Sawyer Building, Hearing Room #4405, Las Vegas, Nevada, called the meeting of the Commission on Educational Technology to order at 12:30 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL:

Members who were present and absent are listed above.

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:

Mr. Fred Dugger made a motion to approve the agenda and Mr. Bart Mangino seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

Dr. Katrina Meyer made a motion to approve the minutes of the February 7 and 8, 2000, with the stipulation that the suggested corrections would be made. Ms. Sara Jones seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

4. REPORT FROM TELECOMMUNICATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE, INCLUDING RECOMMENDED BUDGET FOR THE STATE TECHNOLOGY PLAN: (Location on tape: 60)

Mr. Dan O'Barr reported that the task of getting the information from all the school districts is taking longer than was originally thought. Also, the costs are varying widely on the T-1 lines and fiber. There are no firm numbers because of the time constraint. There have been questions raised about the school districts that are not on the Interstate 80 corridor and how they will be connected. There is more variance than originally thought on how complete the school districts are on their telecommunications plan. For example Elko County School District does not have wiring to all of their schools. At the next meeting there will be firm numbers to report.

5. REVIEW AND POSSIBLE APPROVAL OF DISTRICTS' SB555 APPLICATIONS: (Location on tape: 163)

A roll call was taken to see what school districts were present in the audience for questions and answers about their applications for Senate Bill 555 funding. The representatives from school districts present were: Ms. Janice Towns and Ms. Valerie Dockery of Carson City School District; Mr. Dan O'Barr of Churchill County School District; Ms. Jhone Ebert, Dr. Christy Falba, Ms. Carrin Halffman, and Terry Lizotte of Clark County School District; Mr. Roger Cramer of Douglas County School District; Mr. Bill McLeod and Mr. Duane Barton of Elko County School District; Dr. Don Francom of Esmeralda County School District (available by phone;) Mr. Elmer Porter of Eureka County School District; Mr. John Croslin of Humboldt County School District; Mr. Bob Pistner of Lander County School District; Mr. Randy Robison of Lincoln County School District; Mr. Shawn Franklin of Lyon County School District; Mr. Lee Peterson of Mineral County School District; Mr. Will Booker of Nye County School District (available by phone;) Mr. Phillip Seager of Pershing County School District (available by phone;) Mr. Jerry Atkins of Storey County School District; Mr. Gary Mancuso of Washoe County School District (available by phone;) and Mr. Dan Noss representing White Pine County School District (available by phone.)

Mr. Denis reviewed Senate Bill 555 for the Commissioners and the audience. The decision was made by the Commission to review all the applications first and have the school districts list their priorities. Then the Commission would discuss funding allocations.

Ms. Mary Peterson stated that Carson City School District's application is in the parameters of the law. They are asking for level one workstations and maintenance of their operating system. Ms. Peterson asked Carson City School District to expand on their annual teacher computer use survey and the exit testing for students at their grade level to test their computer knowledge. Ms. Valerie Dockery stated that the technology committee has been working on the student testing for grades five, eight and twelve, which are the grades that students take computer literacy. Some of the teachers in the Carson City School District have piloted the testing over the last two years. This year will be the benchmark for data. The district has data from a pretest given to teachers in the fall on their technology use and knowledge. Another test will be given in the spring and this will be a continuing process. Ms. Peterson stated that what Carson City School District has done with teacher and student technology evaluation has a lot of promise and that other school districts may be able to use it. Assemblyman Kelly Thomas asked why the cost of the maintenance of product hardware was so high. Ms. Janice Towns stated that was the amount that was given to them to upgrade their desktop operating system to Windows 98, office professional products and other Microsoft products. The amount works out to be \$2.50 per student. Mr. Dugger asked exactly how many computers Carson City School District. Ms. Towns stated that there are older computers being used in the elementary school if you include all of those then there are about 1,000 computers but if you take those out then there are about 400 Pentium computers. Carson City School District's priorities for software would be *Accelerated Reader* and *Accelerated Math* program. Carson City uses the State contract for the procurement of computers and they do buy managed computers. Ms. Towns stated their priorities:

1. *Accelerated Reader and Math*
2. *Novell*
3. *Productivity Software*
4. *Library Automation Software*

Ms. Peterson stated that before funding is released all school districts must have their final financial reports into the Nevada Department of Education (NDE). Mr. Frank South agreed with Ms. Peterson and stated that no funding will be released until all final financial reports are in. Mr. Mark Knudson added that the QED report and previous funding reports must be submitted to NDE before funding would be released.

Dr. Katrina Meyer stated her concern about using this funding to equip new schools with technology, because several of the applications wanted to use funding for technology in new schools. She stated that the new school should have had that equipment initially inclusive of computers. If the new schools do not, then the State will never get past level one. Ms. Peterson stated that school districts could pay for the infrastructure and wiring from bond issue money but the bond could not be used to purchase equipment.

Mr. Denis asked Mr. Dan Noss, representing White Pine County School District, to prioritize their technology needs:

1. Upgrade network operating system
2. Software maintenance support for SASI
3. Software support for AS-400

AS-400 is for support of finance function in the administrative part of the school district. SMART program implemented SASI but there is no funding for contracts to continue the software support for SASI.

Mr. Pepper Sturm requested Mr. Knudson to read remarks made by Mr. Dugger to the Legislative Joint Sub-committee K-12 Human Resources meeting on April 8, 1999. Mr. Dugger stated at this meeting

that the first priority for the Commission was repair and replacement of maintenance software contracts to keep computers operational. Also stated on this day by Mr. Dugger was that some funding is required to protect the initial investment and that we cannot expect the classroom hardware and software to continue at a zero maintenance cost. The point is that it stipulated classroom hardware and software. Ms. Jeanne Botts verified this, that the SMART project was never intended to fund any continuing cost for that software and neither was the Senate Bill 555 funding.

Mr. Dugger brought up the issue of the funding being used for administration cost or classroom cost. Traditionally the Commission only dealt with classroom cost. Senate Bill 555 (SB555) did not clearly state that it could not be used for administration costs but the intent of SB555 was for classroom use. This could have caused some confusion for the school districts because some of them have requested funding for administrative technology use.

Mr. Dugger asked White Pine if the Commission does decide to only allow classroom software is there any classroom software maintenance they would need? Mr. Noss stated that no other maintenance software was needed. They have Windows 95 on all of their systems that are connected to their network.

Mr. Denis asked Mr. O'Barr, representing Churchill County School District, to prioritize their technology needs:

1. *Cyber Patrol* which is a networking filtering software.
2. Continuation of the network monitoring software.
3. Classroom software that is listed.
4. Productivity software listed.

Churchill County School Districts needs no funding from SB555 24.1 (a). They do have computers in all classrooms.

Ms. Peterson stated that their request was well within the law and they have been very frugal with the request for funding. Ms. Peterson inquired about the teacher surveys and student evaluations that they are using. Mr. O'Barr stated that Ms. Carol Johnson, who is the Education Computing Strategists (ECS) in the school district, has been developing the surveys with the teachers. The Assistant Superintendent and Curriculum Director are developing the student evaluations but nothing is being used now.

Mr. Denis asked Ms. Jhone Ebert and Dr. Kristy Falba representing Clark County School District to prioritize their technology needs:

1. Computers
2. Productivity software *ClarisWorks* for K through eighth and *AppleWorks* for Macs and *Microsoft Office* for ninth through twelfth.
3. Cables that allow the computer to talk to the network.
4. Installation and integration of the computer, which is the imaging of the computer, delivery, installation and the configuration of the computer, removal of the trash, inventory of the computer and the branding of the computer.

Clark County School District's baseline price for computers is \$1,356.00.

Clark County School District's priorities for maintenance software are:

1. Upgrade from operating system 95 to 98. Macintosh to the OS9.
2. Upgrade licenses

Mr. Dugger asked why they wanted to upgrade from Windows 95 to 98?

Dr. Falba stated that they surveyed the Educational Computing Strategist at the schools and their answer was that it would be a great benefit to have the same system on all of the computers. Ms. Peterson asked when will all of the schools in Clark County be networked? Dr. Falba in some cases with the older schools, they have had contractor problems but the prediction is that all the schools will have networking completed by 2001.

Mr. Shawn Franklin stated that the Commission needs to know what is the total cost of maintenance software before they go to the Governor with a budget.

Mr. Denis asked Gary Mancuso representing Washoe County School District to state their priorities. No SB555 24.1(a) funds were requested by Washoe County School District.

1. Library Software
2. SASI software
3. ISES software
4. UNIC software
5. *Reformax* software
6. *Reflections* software

Also, they would need Novell maintenance contract to upgrade, which is a cost per student.

Mr. Denis asked Mr. Phillip Seager, representing Pershing County School District, to prioritize his district's technology needs:

1. *Office 2000*
2. Upgrading computer hard drives
3. Software maintenance contract for the Library and Novell maintenance contract
4. Upgrading of two HPLH PRP Servers, which are their network servers.

Mr. Denis asked Mr. Roger Cramer, representing Douglas County School District, to prioritize his district's technology needs:

1. *Novell* and *McAfee* operating Systems
2. Four computers with printer
3. One new file server

Mr. Denis asked Mr. Will Booker, representing Nye County School District, to prioritize his district's technology needs:

1. Power for two buildings
2. Internet service to every classroom
3. Fifteen computers the first fiscal year and thirty-five the next fiscal year.
4. Run a T-1 line to Duckwater School for interactive video and Internet connectivity.
5. *Novell* licensing
6. Upgrade all of the servers

Mr. Franklin asked Mr. Duane Barton to explain the cost of the *Novell*. Mr. Barton stated the \$2.00 per student cost includes the *Novell* license, *ZenWorks* and *Boarder Manager*. After the first year there is \$10,000 of software. If you cancel after the first year you keep a third of the \$10,000. If you continue the next year it would work the same.

Mr. Denis asked Dr. Don Francom, Superintendent of Esmeralda County School District, to prioritize his district's technology needs:

1. Professional technical services to bring them up to level 1. The cost of the technical service is \$35,000.00. The firm wants \$150.00 per hour.
2. Transportation for people to go to Las Vegas for parts
3. Internet access
4. *Novell* licensing
5. Software maintenance
6. Training for staff and other individuals

Mr. Dugger suggested to Dr. Francom to contact some other firms in Las Vegas for the technical service. Also he suggested that Dr. Francom contact Clark County School District Channel 10 for the technology video training tapes for the teacher. They do have level 1 computers in every classroom. Mr. Knudson will visit Esmeralda County School District on March 14, 2000.

Mr. Denis asked Mr. Bill McLeod and Duane Barton, representing Elko County School District, to prioritize their district's technology needs.

1. Electrical Infrastructure
2. Classroom personal computer hardware
3. *Novell*
4. *McAfee* network virus software
5. NCS administrative software

Elko County School District needs 150 computers to be at level 1. Mr. McLeod stated that every school has limited electrical capabilities. In the low-end classrooms such as Wells Elementary, Wells High School and Elko Junior High School there are electrical outlets but they already have things plugged into them. At some schools they do not have adequate electrical service so their electrical service panels need to be upgraded. Each of these schools is designed by an electrical engineer and then they go out to bid for the electrical upgrades. Ms. Sara Jones asked to explain the cost of \$50,000 per year for virus protection. Mr. Duane Barton stated that it is an annual fee that *McAfee* charges that covers all computers and servers. It also allows all the teachers and students to use the virus protection in their homes. Assemblyman Thomas requested a detailed list of what items were bid on in order to see what the funding would be used for.

Mr. Denis asked Mr. Elmer Porter, representing Eureka County School District, to prioritize his district's technology needs:

1. 20 computers
2. Upgrade desktop and server software
3. Microsoft comprehensive software support
4. CCC software support
5. Sonic system annual maintenance

Mr. Denis asked what the Sonic System was. Mr. Porter stated that it is the firewall and content filtering for the school district. Ms. Jones inquired about Crescent Valley Elementary. Crescent Valley Elementary did get a new infrastructure and now they are waiting for a T-1 line to be installed by Nevada Bell.

Mr. Denis asked Mr. John Croslin, representing Humboldt County School District, to prioritize his

district's technology needs:

24.1(a) FY00

1. Six classroom computers
2. Electrical upgrades
3. Networking

24.1(a) FY01

1. Electrical upgrades

24.1(c) FY00

1. Productivity software for classrooms
2. *Norton & Cyber Patrol* virus protection
3. Network operating system upgrade
4. Maintenance contract for an overall check of the entire network system

24.1 (c) FY01

1. Operating System Upgrades
2. *Norton & Cyber Patrol* virus protection
3. Network operating system upgrade
4. Maintenance contract for an overall check of the entire network system

All of these priorities are just for desktop purposes.

Mr. Denis asked Mr. Bob Pistner, representing Lander County School District, to prioritize his district's technology needs:

1. Upgrade Operating system
2. Virus software
3. Operating system maintenance

The first year the upgrade would be done for the High School and the second year would be the remaining schools. Ms. Jones inquired about the two schools in Austin. Mr. Pistner stated they receive Internet service through a modem and there is an IP sharing device on the network so that all the computers that are on the network can access the Internet.

Mr. Denis asked Mr. Randy Robison, representing Lincoln County School District, to prioritize his district's technology needs:

1. 18 computers
2. Internet management filtering software
3. Operating system software for the 11 district wide servers
4. Microsoft maintenance support contract

Mr. Denis asked Mr. Franklin, representing Lyon County School District, to prioritize his district's technology needs:

FY00

1. Microsoft technical support
2. Productivity software upgrade
3. Server software upgrade

FY01

1. Microsoft technical support
2. Operating system upgrade
3. Network management operating software

Mr. Denis asked Mr. Lee Peterson, representing Mineral County School District, to prioritize his district's technology needs:

1. Electrical upgrades

Mineral County School District has a great need to upgrade the electrical wiring in the schools because they are over loaded and the circuits keep breaking. Electricians have told them that they are going to lose computers because the wiring is not grounded properly. The large cost is not in the building itself it is outside of the building with new transformers.

Mr. Denis asked Jerry Atkins representing, Storey County School District, to prioritize his district's technology needs:

1. Web Sense Filter
2. Guardian Firewall
3. Six Computers

Mr. Dugger recommended administrative software to be eliminated; no funding for workstation upgrades and uniform cost for computers, which would be \$1,356.00. Assemblyman Thomas suggested eliminating administration cost, consulting and operating systems. Also, he questioned the funding for the use of electrical, and whether that was the intent of the Legislature. If the electrical and the salary were taken out of SB555 24.1(a) requests, there would be approximately \$250,000 left over. This could be allocated back to the schools, who have electrical needs on a percentage basis. Mr. Dugger stated that in SB482 (1997 Legislature) there was special funding that allowed wire but some of the school districts could not do all of the wire that was necessary because of the cost. Mr. Dugger would like the Commission to let the school districts use their discretion to use the money to bring them up to level one functionally.

Mr. Thunder explained the indirect cost issue that was brought up as part of the administrative cost. It is the school district's choice to apply for an indirect cost rate and not all schools districts have an approved indirect cost rate. The percentage of an indirect cost rate does not apply to equipment, only non-equipment type of expenditures.

Mr. Knudson listed the items recommended to be removed from consideration for funding: administrative software; servers; salary; electrical; and desktop operating systems. Ms. Peterson stated that the Commission should look at how the removal of these items will effect the school districts applications.

Mr. McLeod stated that in the last biennium the precedent was set to allow the funding to be used for electrical needs. It was his understanding that when the Sub-committee met this year with the Nevada Educational Technology Consortium and this issue was discussed that the funding could be used for electrical needs.

The meeting was recessed at 5:35 p.m. on March 2, 2000 and resumed at 9:00 a.m. on March 3, 2000.

Washoe County contacted Mr. Knudson with their correct technology priorities. Their priorities are:

1. *Novell*

2. *GroupWise* upgrade

Mr. Franklin stated that in his opinion the computers should be the first priority in 24.1(a) and in 24.1(c) maintenance contracts for existing software and hardware. When these have been considered then classroom curriculum software should be the next priority. Mr. Denis agreed that networking should be the first software to be considered then go from there.

Mr. Croslin stated that the Novell structure requires at least \$5,000.00 per school district but some smaller school districts could partner up. Mr. O'Barr stated that one school district would have to be the master school district and the other school districts would come under them. He also reminded the Commission that the cost is per student not per user. He volunteered Churchill County School District to be the master school district.

Ms. Marlene Lockard suggested that the Commission should decide how much would be funded for computers, how much would be funded per student for the upgrades, and then develop a formula based on their request and allocate the funding based on that formula. Getting the school districts to level one should be the Commission's priority.

Mr. Dugger requested clarification on the amount Novell does charge per student. Mr. Croslin stated that Novell charges \$2.00 per student and with that you get the operating system support and upgrades, *Z/IN Works* and *Boarder Manager*. If the email systems run through Novell, adding this packet is an additional 50¢ per student.

Mr. Denis stated the purpose of this Commission is not to make the spreadsheet balance but to make an equitable distribution of funding for the school districts. Senator O'Donnell stated that the job of the Commission is to balance need and equity. Somewhere in the middle a determination must be made if the need out-weighs the equity issue or the equity issue out-weighs the need issue.

Ms. Lockard stated the Commission needs to decide what approach should be used to allocate the funding. Ms. Peterson added that after that decision was made then the NDE staff needs to be given clear direction. The NDE staff would then contact the school districts and come back to the Commission with the final recommendations. Mr. Dugger agreed with Ms. Peterson to go back to the school districts and get a clear picture of what part of the funding is for networking, etc.

After a lengthy deliberation by the Commission to try to balance need and equity, a motion was made by Mr. Dugger that the 24.1 (c) monies of \$500,000 per year be allocated to the various districts as detailed in option A, for each year of the biennium (attachment a). Further, that the districts be instructed that the funds be used for software to support academic uses, and not for administrative uses. Mr. Franklin seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

After deliberation by the Commission on 24.1 (a), Ms. Jones made a motion that once the total amounts for level one classroom completion are deducted from 24.1 (a) funding the remainder of the funding be made available for electrical needs as applied for by the school districts proportionally to their request. Ms. Jensen seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. (See Attachment a for the resulting distribution.)

6. **REPORT ON KLVX CHANNEL 10, DISTANCE LEARNING SATELLITE SERVICE:**

Mr. Lee Solonche gave an update on the Satellite down-link service from KLVX, Channel 10 in Clark County School District (attachment b). They are in the second phase of the project and will be installing seventy down-links throughout the State. Professional development, help desks and other resources must

be provided to the teachers and professional staff in the State. Their request that will go into the Commission's budget for funding for the next biennium is approximately \$1 million and this will be used for a support network.

7. REVIEW OF NEVADA K-12 EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY STANDARDS, DRAFT:

The last time the writing team met was in October 1999. This writing team consisted of computer education experts throughout the state and technology experts. They work together and the standards are combined that way. Mr. Knudson suggest that in the future the Commission may want to tie the State's technology standards to the national technology standards. The Nevada State Standards Council will vote on this item on March 8, 2000.

8. REVIEW AND POSSIBLE REVISION OF THE STATE TECHNOLOGY PLAN:

Mr. Knudson met with an evaluation consultant who gave Mr. Knudson an estimated figure of \$10,000 to \$12,000 to develop an evaluation component for the technology plan proposal. Also needed to help with the revision of the State technology plan is a data analyst would help in gathering and compiling data from the various need assessments and surveys that will be done.

Mr. Dugger made a motion to have NDE staff prepare a work plan and budget for a data analyst contract to assist in the preparation of a revised state plan; and, that a budget and work plan be prepared by an assessment consultant. Both should be provided to Chairman Denis to present to the Legislative Committee on Education. Dr. Meyer seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

9. STANDING REPORT ON EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY ACTIVITIES:

Mr. South gave an update on the 24.1 (b) funding for the library databases, which included training. The Clark County School District Librarians have had their training sessions. Mr. Strader is working to get training for Washoe County School District and the rural school districts.

10. STANDING REPORT ON EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY FUNDING:

Mr. Thunder reviewed the standing financial report for the Commission funding.

11. PUBLIC COMMENTS:

No public comment.

12. ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m. on March 3, 2000.

Respectfully submitted:

Douglas C. Thunder
Deputy Superintendent,

Administrative and Fiscal Services

Moises Denis, Chairperson for the
Commission on Educational Technology

Recorded by:

Jane M. Crawford