K-12 TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVE COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date	January 28, 2010
Meeting Location	Division of State IT, 4430 Broad River Road
Facilitator	Barbara Teusink
Note Taker	Gay Hoyer
Attendees	Barbara Teusink (DSIT), Dean Byrd (SCETV), Afton Ellison (Verizon), Dee Appleby (SCDE), Paul Koch (DSIT), James MacDougall (DSIT), Catherine Morgan (SCSL), Sharron Myers (DSIT), Beth Shull (AT&T), David Goble (SCSL), Valarie Byrd (DSIT), John Bane (SCETV), Amy Durenberger (SCSL), Gary West (SCDE), Sandra Wilkie (DSIT), James Gordon (DSIT), Ray Stemmes (York 1), Jeff Salters (Lexington 1), Harriet Zwart (Lexington 1), Diane Sigmon (Darlington Co. Schools), Tom Olson (SCDE), Charlie Zeberlein (DSIT), Petra Turner (DSIT)

AGENDA ITEMS

AGENDA ITEM 1	Approval of Minutes	PRESENTER	Barbara Teusink

DISCUSSION

1. Barbara Teusink called the meeting to order and asked for approval of or discussion/corrections to the minutes from last month's meeting.
2. The minutes were approved with no changes.

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
NONE		

AGENDA ITEM2	E-Rate Status	PRESENTER	Valarie Byrd/ Sandra Wilkie

DISCUSSION

E-Rate Issues
Sandra Wilkie

1. Sandra Wilkie addressed the committee to report that she had met with some staffers from the legislature to give them information on how much bandwidth is provided to schools. Demand for bandwidth is increasing whereas funding is decreasing.
2. Work for the last 6-8 months has been on devising a new formula to determine how to assess cost shares for bandwidth for the districts/libraries because the old baseline of a T1 level of bandwidth is no longer sufficient to meet the needs of the school districts.
3. The plan is to develop a process to evaluate bandwidth based on each school and the student headcount for that school and to establish a bandwidth per student formula. (The state must be able to fund their part of the cost of the bandwidth that is not covered by E-rate).
4. Ultimately, the goal is to make cost shares more uniform across the state so that those districts in independent territories where the rates are extremely high are not penalized but can have their baseline funding be in line with what the local exchange carrier actually charges.
5. Many school districts have expressed their willingness to pay the cost share to upgrade their bandwidth in order to receive upgrades faster. It is the intent of the committee that districts should be able to have this choice to ensure they receive the bandwidth they need even if committee funding is not currently adequate to cover the full expense.

Valarie Byrd

1. **KPMG Audits**
   A. Round 2 KPMG Audit – USAC requested detailed information we cannot provide until after the filing window closes. They will provide us with a straight line impact summary.
   B. Round 3 KPMG Audit – We responded to USAC's group of managers and noted one audit finding item we disagree with.

2. **2008-09 (current year) Application**
   A. Still no change on the Trillion FRN of $785,520 ($596,995 E-Rate funds) that was not funded. No BEAR's filed for FY 2008-09-EST monetary value $474,587.10.
   B. Of the outstanding BEAR's filed for FY 2008-09: Final BEAR payment received.
   C. Form 500 will be filed during the first quarter of 2010 to return any unused funds.
3. **2009-10 Application** – BEAR's will be filed during the first quarter of 2010 for July-December 2009 reimbursements.
4. **2010-11 Application-**Application filing in process.
5. **K-12 Technology Initiative website –**We are working on implementing a RSS feed and Twitter account for this site. Site address: **http://www.sck12techinit.org/E-rate.html**
6. **Contract Conversions – IBAP to MPLS**. We will be issuing credit to IBAP sites converted to the MPLS contract on July 1, 2009 to reflect the new contract rates.

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
NONE		

AGENDA ITEM 3	Security Project Status	PRESENTER	James MacDougall

DISCUSSION

1. K-12 Security Subcommittee met 1/21/10 to review the Internet bandwidth monitoring results for outstanding potential "upgrade/downgrade" sites. Security reports were distributed to school districts 1/7/10. ISAC has also been communicating with districts over the past several months.
2. Recommendations for upgrades for the following districts were approved:

District	Grade	Eligible BW	Current BW	Peak BW	Request	Recommendation
Marion 7	A	10	10	8	20	Upgrade to 20 Mb with a $715 Cost Share
Oconee	B	30	30	40	40	Upgrade to 40Mb with a $805 Cost Share
Reviewed But Upgrade Not Recommended:						
District	**Grade**	**Eligible BW**	**Current BW**	**Bandwidth Request**		**Recommendation**
Charleston	C	80	100	150		Improve Grade
Chesterfield	D	20	20	30		Improve Grade
Darlington	D	30	30	50		Improve Grade
Fairfield	C	10	10	20		Improve Grade
Georgetown	D	30	20	30		Improve Grade
Greenwood 52	C	10	10	20		Improve Grade
Lexington 1	D	50	30	50		Improve Grade
Lexington 5	C	40	50	70		Improve Grade
Spartanburg 1	D	20	10	20		Improve Grade
Spartanburg 3	D	10	10	20		Improve Grade
Spartanburg 5	C	20	20	30		Improve Grade
Spartanburg 6	C	30	20	30		Improve Grade

* ISAC group will distribute current report card and notify districts it will be reviewing during the month of February.

3. The districts above that were reviewed but not recommended will be reviewed again for next meeting in addition to 3 libraries.
4. Two of the schools mentioned above (Charleston and Darlington) were not recommended because they asked for the upgrade late in the review period and Security was not able to get a full cycle for review. They may, in fact, be eligible but not enough data was available in time for this month's meeting. The criteria looked at by the Security Group includes:
   a) Perimeter Controls
      - Perimeter Firewall(s) operate with effective ingress and egress rules
      - IDS/IPS appears to be monitoring all Internet traffic and operating effectively
   b) Unauthorized Traffic
      - Critical malware prevention/correction is effective
      - Other malware prevention/correction is effective
      - Core services are documented and effectively managed
   c) Bandwidth Efficiency
      - A caching web proxy is installed, managed and used
      - DNS and mail is limited to internally managed services
      - Excessive suspicious/unknown traffic is effectively minimized
      - 80% or more of Internet traffic is HTTP
   d) Security Controls
      - Reduction of wasteful/malicious software
      - Responsive to security reports, notifications, and bulletins
      - Web filtering
      - Mail filtering
      - Antivirus
5. Because the review conducted by the Security group is thorough there often is a great deal of back and forth discussion between the district/school/library and Security. This has resulted in some schools facing a substantial gap in time between the initial upgrade request for bandwidth and the approval of the request. In order to help reduce this gap, the committee adopted the following :

   District requests for an increase in bandwidth received between regular committee meetings will be automatically approved if:

   a) the requestor has a passing grade on their security report card

   b) the request is for an increase either up to their approved standard baseline bandwidth level OR if the district signs an agreement to pay 100% of the expense above their approved standard baseline bandwidth level until the committee funding is adequate to include the additional bandwidth in E-Rate filing/cost share model, AND

   c) there are no other variables or factors inherent to the request that may create additional expense for the committee

   All other requests for an increase in bandwidth will continue to be brought before the full committee at the next regularly scheduled monthly meeting.

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
NONE		

AGENDA ITEM 4	Network Status	PRESENTER	Sharron Myers

DISCUSSION

1. No outstanding tickets.

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
NONE		

AGENDA ITEM 5	Budget	PRESENTER	Barbara Teusink
DISCUSSION			
1. Current expectations are that we should anticipate another 15%-20% budget cut effective July 1. 2. Committee partners should prepare to start work on next year's budget for the committee soon.			
ACTION ITEMS		PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
NONE			

AGENDA ITEM 6	Electronic Transcripts	PRESENTER	Tom Olson
DISCUSSION			
1. This is a grant funded program that gives high school students the ability to have their transcripts sent electronically to any secondary institute within the system. 2. Thirty-six school districts are already utilizing the system and five districts have not signed up to participate in the program. 3. The State will pay for sending transcripts to institutes within the state, but there is a $3 fee for sending transcripts to institutes outside of the state. 4. The Department of Education is currently trying to set up a record exchange system with all levels of schools participating. This would allow for the transfer of student records (PDF format) between various schools within the state. The system is expected to be in place within this school year. 5. These programs will need to be tweaked as they were initially set-up to run with the SASI program but now must be compatible with the PowerSchool system.			
ACTION ITEMS		PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
NONE			

GUESTS	Ray Stemmes (York 1), Jeff Salters (Lexington 1), Harriet Zwart (Lexington 1), Diane Sigmon (Darlington Co. Schools)
RESOURCE PERSONS	
SPECIAL NOTES	Next Meeting: February 25, 2010 Location: Division of State Information Technology, 4430 Broad River Road