DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES
BUREAU OF ENTERPRISE SYSTEMS AND TECHNOLOGY
55 Farmington Avenue, Hartford, CT 06105
1:00 – 3:00 PM

M I N U T E S

June 5, 2017

Commission Members in Attendance

Raymond, Mark – Commission Chair, CT DAS-BEST, Chief Information Officer
Casey, Doug – Executive Director, CT Commission for Educational Technology
Bailie, Colleen – Director, West Haven Library (Connecticut Library Association)
Caruso, Nick – Senior Staff Associate for Field Service, Connecticut Association of Boards of Education (CABE)
Cohn, Ellen – Deputy Commissioner, State Department of Education
Dillon, Thomas – Founder, Flagship Networks (Minority Leader of the House)
Elsesser, John – Town Manager, Town of Coventry (Connecticut Council of Small Towns)
Mavrogeanes, Rich – Discover Video (President Pro Tem of the Senate)
Mundrane, Michael – Chief Information Officer, University of Connecticut
Provencher, Maura – Director of Programs, Connecticut Conference of Independent Colleges (for Jennifer Widness)
Shanley, Scott – General Manager, Town of Manchester (CT Conference on Municipalities)
Shellard, Susan – Chief Administrative Officer, Department of Economic and Community Development (for Commissioner Catherine Smith)
Vallee, Bill – State Broadband Policy and Program Coordinator (Office of Consumer Counsel)
Wiggin, Kendall – State Librarian, Connecticut State Library
Zak, Scott – Senior Director of Learning Technologies, CT Board of Regents for Higher Education

Facilitators, Presenters, Guests, and Others in Attendance

Cattaruzza, Lisa – Sales Representative, Curriculum Associates
Kocsondy, Ryan – Director, Connecticut Education Network (CEN)
Paolucci, Michael – Founder and CEO, Slooh

Agenda Items

Welcome

Chairman Mark Raymond opened the meeting and welcomed the Commission members and guests. He acknowledged the continued dedication of everyone in attendance and thanked them for their participation, especially during this busy season. He also shared some changes in the makeup of the Commission membership.

Jeff Kitching, the Executive Director of EdAdvance, recently announced his resignation from the Commission starting July 1. Jeff is a Governor's office appointee with a substantial set of new responsibilities that have taken him away from direct involvement with the Commission as a member, though he has expressed interest in staying involved and contributing to the cause of the Commission, as he is able.

Lisa Pellegrini, formerly First Selectman in Somers, resigned from the Commission May 1, given her relocation to Westerly, Rhode Island, to assume the position of Director of Development Services in that town. The Minority Leader of the Senate appoints her position.

Finally, Isabelina Rodriguez, the former Chief Academic Officer of the State Department of Education (SDE) and the SDE's Commission member, has left that agency to assume the role of Executive Director of the Paulo Freire Social Justice Charter School in Holyoke, Massachusetts. Ellen Cohn, Deputy Commissioner of the SDE, joins the Commission today to represent that agency.

Mark acknowledged the insights and dedication of all three Commission members and pledged to work with the offices of the Governor and the Senate Minority Leader to find representatives to replace the vacant seats. Nick Caruso voiced his appreciation for Jeff Kitching and encouraged the selection of another superintendent to take his place. Mark thanked Nick for his comments and underscored the importance of having the perspective of educational leaders to the Commission's mission and work.

Approval of Meeting Minutes

Nick made a motion to accept the minutes of the March 6, 2017, Commission meeting as written, and Scott Shanley seconded the motion. Having no discussion, the members unanimously approved the minutes. Rich Mavrogeanes and Scott Zak, who were not present at the March 6 meeting, abstained.

Policy on Commission Endorsements and Support

Mark turned the discussion to an item from the March meeting regarding the need for a policy to govern how the Commission responds to requests by outside organizations for endorsement or support. He pointed to the draft policy shared electronically with members the week of May 21 and made available in hard copy at the meeting. Scott Shanley made a motion to approve the policy, and Nick Caruso seconded that motion. Mark asked for any discussion of the policy from the members, and all agreed that the new policy reflected the understanding and suggestions shared during the March meeting. The members unanimously voted to approve the new policy, with no opposition or abstentions. That policy now appears on the Commission Web site, http://www.CT.gov/CTEdTech, under the "Bylaws & Policies" section.

Report of the Executive Director

Doug Casey provided a report detailing progress around supports to districts on student data privacy, as well as the education innovation study endorsed by Commission members in 2016.

Doug mentioned the discussion from the March 2017 meeting around the establishment of a registry of software that complies with the requirements defined in Connecticut's student data privacy law, Public Act 16-189. The registry should dramatically reduce the burden on districts of reviewing hundreds and sometimes thousands of sets of legal terms to ensure compliance of the software they use to support teaching, learning, and operations. Results of a statewide survey he conducted early this year point to the likely collective effort among K – 12 districts of between 80,000 and 100,000 additional staff hours to conduct compliance activities as a result of the law. The registry will afford software providers a single point of reference on current Connecticut state law and the ability to vouch for compliance. Districts will then have a single list of software titles developed by providers that have attested to meeting the requirements of Connecticut law.

The privacy registry will operate on the Learn Trials platform, designed to support the types of registrations and searches that its users will need to conduct. Doug acknowledged the funding support by the RESC Alliance to offset the first year of Learn Trials startup and license costs and thanked Jeff Kitching specifically for advocating for this support among his peers. The Learn Trials team looks to have the registry live within the month of July, and Doug will provide updates to the Commission as progress continues.

Doug also thanked Rachel Whitesell, counsel with the Department of Administrative Services (DAS), for her efforts to engage with educational technology providers that have a significant presence in the state, such as Microsoft and Google. She and Dan Dion of DAS have expended significant efforts to help ensure that the data and privacy terms of the products that educational technology companies provide comply with

Connecticut law. A list of approved software now resides on the [Commission's Programs and Services Web page](#), with new titles added as companies accept the changes that Rachel has suggested to align their terms with Connecticut's statutory requirements. Once the privacy registry launches, that platform will become the channel through which software providers will review and attest to compliance. The effort to engage directly with education software providers stemmed from a need for immediate resolution of compliance questions with companies that house sensitive student data among many Connecticut school districts.

Scott Shanley asked if any of the software providers changed their terms to comply with Connecticut law. Doug shared that in some cases companies did change the language in their terms, and in other instances the discussions with these providers simply addressed clarification of ambiguous terms. Mark acknowledged that the work through these discussions and the establishment of the registry will significantly benefit school districts statewide.

Next, Doug provided an update on the education innovation study funded by the Jacquelyn Hume Foundation, now underway with two partners, education consultancy Innovation Partners of America and the Connecticut Association of Public School Superintendents (CAPSS). Work continues in this initiative, with the goal of identifying the factors that contribute to, and vie against, innovation in Connecticut schools. While many districts have adopted technology-rich approaches to teaching and learning such as project-based, mastery-based, and personalized learning, the key question remains as to why our state has not seen a more systemic adoption of these practices.

The project partners have developed an assessment for educational leaders in our state to complete, with the goal of identifying some of the barriers to innovation and, ultimately, supporting personalized learning at scale with a focus on speed, quality, agility, efficiency, and sustainability. Interviews with these educational leaders, structured around the aforementioned assessment, will take place beginning this week, with a report and recommendations expected in September. This work should also position Connecticut as having both a need for further support and a promising environment that would attract educational investors. Scott Shanley remarked that the initiative was "deep," taking on the challenge of identifying the cultural and other factors that may impede innovation within our schools.

Review and Approval of State Educational Technology Goals and Plan

Moving onto the review of the Commission's draft State Educational Technology Goals and Plan, Mark noted some of the prior work that informs the document, including the formation of the Commission's three Advisory Councils, input from members, and the sharing of the draft document on May 25. He turned the topic over to Doug for a facilitated review.

As background, Doug summarized some of the steps that led to the drafting of the plan, including member responses to a survey asking them to prioritize the Commission's proposed initiatives, gathered in February and shared at the March meeting. Mark and Doug had asked members to share those priorities with their constituents and look for feedback and ideas about resources to support the work. He also described at a high level — with details in the meeting minutes of the May [Digital Learning](#), [Data and Privacy](#), and [Infrastructure](#) Advisory Council meetings — the input provided by those groups around the Commission's planned work.

As a final word of introduction, Doug described the intent of the document as describing the multi-year goals of the Commission across all three focus areas, with specific details on eight (8) strategic initiatives the Commission would undertake over the next two years. He called attention to the strategic planning process (framework) driven by the Commission's vision and mission, supported by people, organizations, and frameworks, with work across the three focus areas producing outputs (work products) that benefit students, educators, and educational institutions across the state.

As he began the review of the strategic initiatives, Doug walked the members through the standard template used to structure each initiative:

- Challenge: The problem we are solving, the audience(s) it impacts, and evidence that quantifies it
- Solution: Approaches, participants, and required resources
- Outputs: Intended body of work, such as contracts, standards, frameworks, media, plans, programs, publications, research studies, etc.
- Measures: Baseline metrics as well as demonstrable benefits and impact, such as engagement, expansion, gains, usage, etc.
- Risks: Dependencies and environmental factors that could help or hinder the effort
- Tasks and Timing: Detailed list of activities and timing

Mark encouraged members to look at the plan as a whole, stressing the importance of assessing the scope of the proposed work, not just priorities around specific initiatives. With this background in place and no questions from the Commission members, the group began a review of the strategic initiatives, starting with Open Education Resources (or "OER," Strategic Plan, page 5).

Open Education Resources
Doug summarized the challenge of providing high quality, affordable materials to schools and colleges, noting progress so far with the Commission's endorsing the GoOpen framework at the March Commission meeting, his assembly of a statewide OER steering committee, and a successful OER session at the CEN conference in May.

Following this introduction, the group engaged in a spirited conversation across a number of themes related to OER.

- <u>Current Practice and Demand</u>: Scott Shanley opened by questioning the demand for an OER framework. Doug noted that successful practices are already in place statewide, whether under the official "OER" or "GoOpen" framework or not. He cited the work of Joe Campbell at the Connecticut Technical High School System as well as the Greenwich Public Schools, both of which have taken the district GoOpen pledge. Other districts such as Stafford have approached Doug with interest about Connecticut becoming a GoOpen state and are looking for leadership resources in this area. Glastonbury has embraced an open approach to developing and sharing curriculum within and across its schools using the Apple iBooks platform, with stipends offered to teachers who produce lesson and unit plans.

  The movement has strong support and leadership at the national level, born out of district- and state-level demand. The U.S. Department of Education, State Educational Technology Directors Association (SETDA), and Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) have all contributed significantly to, and remain committed to supporting, the OER movement. International technology organizations such as the Consortium of School Networking (CoSN) and the International Society of Technology in Education (ISTE) have also pledged support of open education, as has the Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD), the national professional group for directors of curriculum.

  Universities and libraries have also embraced OER. For example, Michael Mundrane mentioned efforts underway at the University of Connecticut to adopt open textbooks as a means of appreciating savings over the cost of materials offered by commercial publishers, which, in his opinion, charge an inordinate amount of money for books at the K – 12 and higher education levels.

  Ken Wiggin acknowledged that OER remains a complex concept but has exemplars already in Connecticut, such as the State Library's eBook platform and researchIT (formerly iCONN). The approach allows for the creation of repositories of individual content elements (e.g., text passages or audio and video clips) as well as full-form textbooks. The need exists for sharing these elements.

  Ellen Cohn felt that OER could solve problems for districts around cost savings, and the approach would support standards uniformity. She stated that Connecticut should enact and support this approach, given that forward-thinking districts are already using OER materials and approaches, and supporting the movement is a "no-brainer" if people can access high-quality, free and low-cost materials. Doug stated that championing OER makes sense for

the Commission, given that the initiative serves our core constituents: K – 12 schools, libraries, and higher education.

- Quality and Governance: Rich Mavrogeanes expressed concern over the vetting of materials in a shared repository to ensure quality and alignment to existing standards. In his experience of providing platforms for video broadcasting, users often produce a significant amount of low-quality content. He suggested the creation of a "czar," or librarian who reviews and oversees content at a state level.

  Michael Mundrane disagreed that adopting an OER approach would lead to the development and use of low-quality educational materials, noting that, as a state, we collectively have the professors, teachers, and leaders to vet and produce quality educational materials in an open, collaborative, and crowd-sourced approach. He suggested that participating in the creation and curation of content represents a form of professional development and might support educators' arguments for receiving tenure and other forms of professional acknowledgment and rewards.

  Ellen Cohn doubted the tie between OER and teacher evaluation in particular. On the topic of quality, she questioned the value versus cost of some commercial materials. She expressed the most concern for the lack of availability of reading materials, especially at the K – 3 level. She explained that students who fail to reach a level of reading proficiency by the third grade face great challenges with future success in education and careers. Colleen Bailie echoed this need and noted that some Connecticut libraries have received grants from the New Alliance Foundation to pilot K – 3 reading programs. The SDE has developed a Web site of resources to support the implementation of the Connecticut Core Standards (ctcorestandards.org), where educators can access materials across six subject areas. Expanding on this work through a statewide portal, part of the Commission's work in this area, would help to have, for example, Civil War and Geometry unit resources available at teachers' fingertips. She also noted the usefulness of having smaller pieces of content such as one-page overviews or worksheets. She noted the success of peer-to-peer sharing networks such as TeachersPayTeachers.com.

  Concerning the question of quality, Doug pointed to the requirement of Connecticut's OER platform to be able to draw on and share materials with other state portals. Twenty states have already developed or have started the development of OER platforms that interface with other state portals. He noted that states such as New York, North Carolina, Georgia, and Florida have all taken the GoOpen pledge and offer millions of vetted, standards-aligned materials Connecticut schools will be able to access through our OER portal.

Regarding this spirit and approach to sharing resources, Mark noted a corollary in state agencies partnering to accomplish difficult initiatives. He reiterated that the work of the Commission regarding OER is not to create demand but to facilitate and support initiatives already underway, providing a platform and resources to do so. Michael concurred and noted that, at the intersection of decision-making and technology, the Commission should provide high-level strategy, with applications and long-term supports taking place at the individual district, library, and university level.

To this point, Bill Vallee asked about the cost of an OER sharing platform. Doug reminded the group that adopting one of the platforms endorsed by the U.S. Department of Education, all of which leverage the Learning Registry standard set for sharing, would have no direct upfront or recurring costs, aside from configuration and management.

- Promotion: A number of Commission members expressed the importance of explaining and promoting the adoption of OER in the state. Scott Shanley noted that municipal leaders, though not directly involved the operation of school districts, should know about the cost savings of OER from a budgetary standpoint. John Elsesser asked that the draft Goals and Plan include in the Tasks and Timing a line item articulating activities around promoting OER statewide. (See list of changes to the Goals and Plan, page 13 of these minutes.) He expressed the need for boards of education and superintendents to support and provide incentives to adopt OER in the form of teacher stipends, for example. Doug and other Commission members should leverage groups such as CABE and CAPSS as communication and promotion channels and consider presenting to municipal groups prior to the official rollout.

    Nick noted the description of promotional activities in the Plan's narrative, and Doug shared some of the work he has already completed in building awareness and support of OER. He has used forums such as the CAPSS Technology Committee, on which he and Nick serve, RESC presentations, and the CEN conference to introduce and explain the benefits of OER. He has also sought out and assembled leaders across the state already embracing OER to learn from their best practices. Finally, in recognizing that at the K – 12 level, curriculum leads need to champion OER, he sought out and has met with the state's co-chairs of the CAPSS assistant superintendent group on curriculum. In his meeting with Erin McGurk of Ellington and Erin Murray of Simsbury, he was able to introduce the idea; explain the quality, cost-savings, and flexibility benefits of OER; dispel misconceptions about the approach (e.g., that it threatens teachers' jobs); and secure an opportunity to address their broader membership this fall.

Education Innovation Study

Doug reiterated the intent of this initiative, already described in the [Executive Director's Report](#): to research and define the assets and barriers to widespread adoption of innovative educational practices that benefit students in K – 12 schools. Members agreed with the steps defined in the initiative and offered no further comments or questions.

Student, Teacher, and Administrator Standards

The adoption and support of educational technology proficiency standards stem from section 33.2.E of the Commission's governing statute and remains an ongoing priority for the group. Doug noted progress taken in this initiative, with the Commission's endorsement in September 2016 of the most recent [ISTE Student Standards](#). Ellen commented that the State Board of Education should adopt these standards in early 2018, according to that body's calendar of agenda items. The action steps defined in this initiative include endorsements as well active supports to help students, educators, and leaders learn and practice the technology-related skills needed for effective teaching and learning.

Doug shared that partner organizations such as the Connecticut Educators Computer Association (or CECA, Connecticut's ISTE chapter, where Doug serves as a board member); Connecticut Educational Technology Leaders (or CTETL, where Doug also serves as a board member); and others have expressed strong interest in promoting and supporting current educational technology standards. For example, CECA's strategic plan points back to the work of the Commission and includes efforts to curate and promote resources (guides, videos, etc.) that support educational technology proficiencies. Other creative ways to operationalize and contextualize educational technology standards include the suggestion of Digital Learning Advisory Council member Shannon Marimón, the SDE's Division Director for Educator Effectiveness and Professional Learning, to embed these standards in the [Evidence Guides](#) that teachers use as exemplars for effective instruction.

During the member discussion of this initiative, John Elsesser called for the addition of the word "Technology" before "Standards" for clarification. Michael Mundrane agreed and emphasized the importance of building strong digital literacy skills among learners of all ages. Doug noted that instruction in many types of literacies — digital, financial, and others — remains a key initiative of public libraries. To that end, Ken suggested that a future iteration of the Goals and Plan document include clear definitions of and best practices in teaching digital literacy skills to all learners. Colleen Bailie underscored the importance of digital literacy skills for library leaders, some of whom do not recognize the key role that technology plays in general literacy standards.

Scott Shanley made the point that educators need professional development to understand and integrate educational technology standards into instruction. He also

questioned the term "Administrator" versus, for example, "Administrative." The group confirmed that the term "Administrator" at the K – 12 level refers to school-level as well district-level leaders. Nick concurred that principals and others charged with supervision and evaluation must have the ability to understand and assess teacher proficiencies.

Ken pointed to the importance of working with teacher preparation programs in higher education, highlighted in the Goals and Plan under the Advocacy section on page 15, as a lever for ensuring that educators have the proficiency skills needed to teach and support learners in today's classrooms. John Elsesser encouraged the same approach for librarian training, noting that during the summer months, libraries become the primary centers of learning for children.

As chair of the Digital Learning Advisory Council, Nick mentioned that group's enthusiasm to adopt and leverage the work of the ISTE standards. Doug echoed the importance of using existing resources and frameworks rather than trying to create our own. He has promoted and collected input statewide on the draft Teacher standards, due out later this month, and has been asked to participate on a national ISTE working group to design the Administrator standards, expected in June 2018.

eRate Maximization

According to data from the Universal Service Administrative Company (USAC), which operates the Universal Services Fund, or "eRate," schools and libraries in Connecticut spent $6 million less on data circuits than they were collectively awarded. The apparent underutilization of the eRate program remains the focus of this initiative.

Ken agreed that this apparent imbalance between what Connecticut pays into the program and how well we leverage eRate merits further study. He also suggested that the initiative include efforts to gather input about and provide recommendations on overcoming barriers to using eRate. For example, he cited the difficulty that Connecticut libraries have had in navigating the overly complicated process of filing for eRate offsets. Questions arose among some members as to why districts and libraries might have difficulty in navigating the eRate filing and procurement process. One factor that contributes to this apparent difficulty is the fact that reductions in Connecticut General Fund appropriations to offset the costs of data circuits have forced districts and libraries to become adept quickly at using eRate to garner discounts on these connections.

Ken suggested that this initiative might include the suggestion that the State hire consultants to help schools and libraries maximize use of the eRate funds available to them. Doug agreed and noted that most districts in Connecticut use one of two third-party consultants. Having a small group of eRate consultants provided through the State should lead to lower total costs for support; greater efficiencies from a shared,

statewide perspective; and a higher return for schools and libraries. Ellen noted that some RESCs provide eRate support already.

Michael posed the question, "If Connecticut is paying more into the eRate program than its schools and libraries receive, what states are getting more out of the program than they contribute?" Ken noted the different tiers of usage, and Rich cited states such as Texas with large, urban districts such as Houston that capitalize well on eRate reimbursements.

Digital Equity

Doug introduced this initiative by highlighting work completed to date, including a draft Equity Toolkit to help students get online outside of school. He noted the strength of having a diverse set of stakeholders in the Advisory Councils, with the Equity Toolkit one example of creative thinking across K – 12, library, and university leaders. The Infrastructure Advisory Council members positioned the "Homework Gap" problem as one that communities could effectively help to solve. The Toolkit will provide the background, data-collection instruments, and outreach approaches to help towns identify those in need of access. The document will then point to ways to get citizens online and trained in the effective use of technology.

Doug noted the commitment of a number of external stakeholders to support this work, including Julie Evans, CEO of Project Tomorrow, a well funded non-profit dedicated to measuring access of learners to online resources. He has also engaged with Google's education team to design a statewide map of wireless hotspots that communities can help to update and manage at a local level.

Scott Shanley encouraged the Commission to engage with private carriers through this initiative. He noted a recent notification from Connecticut's Public Utilities Regulatory Authority (PURA) that prevents municipalities from using their own utility poles to run town broadband (fiber) circuits. This notification may represent an example of the strong lobbying influence of commercial broadband carriers against public (e.g., town) networks. Enlisting their assistance in getting all learners online to take full advantage of digital resources would make sense, given the near-universal footprint of coverage commercial carriers have in the state. Rich agreed with this recommendation and pointed to creative programs that send mobile hotspots home with students. Doug noted these requests and pointed to an earlier suggestion by Mark that carriers provide location information for the state hotspot map.

Educational Technology Standards and Best Practices

In addition to the details behind this initiative that the Goals and Plan document offers, Doug highlighted the importance of offering school and library technology practitioners a set of curated resources to assist with managing technology in their institutions. The

group agreed with the merits of this work and suggested that the initiative include some type of credential, what Rich termed an "Adopter" badge of best practices. Doug noted this suggestion but expressed concerns about the capacity to audit compliance with best practices. He also pointed to the redundancy of creating and awarding credentials that national organizations already manage, such as the CoSN Certified Educational Technology Leader (CETL) leadership seal.

Data & Privacy Compliance and Best Practices

In summarizing the last two initiatives, Doug referred to highlights of his [Executive Director's report](#) concerning the development of the privacy registry and review of educational software for compliance with Connecticut statute. He also pointed to the likely passage of House Bill 7207 into law, a move that would delay many of the compliance requirements of our state's student data privacy law, Public Act 16-189. (At the time of this writing, the Senate had unanimously passed the bill, which awaits the Governor's signature).

He also highlighted the proposed work in supporting CoSN's Trusted Learning Environment (TLE) framework for school data security and privacy. These efforts would leverage the enthusiastic support of CoSN and its Connecticut chapter, CTETL, as well as the national TLE lead, Linnette Attai. The TLE program would also allow for the collection, tracking, and aggregate reporting on progress of schools in adopting best practices in ensuring information security.

Ken mentioned the importance to libraries as well as schools in following a trusted framework for ensuring privacy and data security. He suggested that the initiative address training and awareness of all privacy laws, such as FERPA, COPPA, and CIPA. John Elsesser seconded this suggestion. Doug agreed with both and noted the inclusion of these concerns as part of the TLE training.

Nick asked the group whether the Commission should also look at more technical cyber protection measures, not just the "human factor" elements of an effective information security program. Mark noted the forthcoming Statewide Cybersecurity Strategy that might address some of these concerns, with a focus on digital literacy and security for all citizens.

Vote

After addressing all eight initiatives, the group turned to the process of voting on the State Educational Technology Goals and Plan. Scott Shanley suggested approval of the document, with the understanding that Doug would set revisions based on the changes requested by members throughout the meeting and noted in these minutes. Ken seconded this motion. Mark summarized Scott's suggestion and put it to the members to adopt the State Educational Technology Goals and Plan. The document received unanimous approval, with no opposition or abstentions. Nick thanked Doug for the work

and noted the important milestone under the Commission's charge of having a statewide strategic plan for educational technology.

Summary of Changes

Based on the member input described in the preceding sections, Doug set changes to the State Educational Technology Goals and Plan as follows:

Initiative	Change
Open Education Resources (Page 6)	Under "Tasks and Timing," addition of "Promote OER Framework and Initiatives"
Student, Teacher, and Administrator Standards (Page 7)	Insertion of the word "Technology" in the title of the initiative for clarity: "Student, Teacher, and Administrator Technology Standards"
Student, Teacher, and Administrator Standards (Page 8)	Addition to "Outputs" section to include "with clear definitions of and supports in teaching technology proficiency and digital literacy skills for all learners"
eRate Maximization (Page 9)	Under "Outputs" section, included language that reflects the need to identify real and perceived barriers to utilizing the eRate program, as well as opportunities (e.g., dedicated eRate consultants) to provide efficiencies in supporting school and library use of the program
Digital Equity (Page 10)	Under the "Solution" heading, inserted the statement "The Commission will also enlist the resources of commercial carriers to identify and rectify the challenge of providing all learners with broadband access outside of school."
Privacy Best Practices Framework (Page 14)	Added to the "Outputs" section this statement to address the concerns of libraries and other types of educational environments: "In addition to leveraging the TLE framework, targeted at K – 12 environments, the Executive Director will curate and share best practices around privacy and security for other types of educational institutions, such as libraries and adult education centers."

CEN Updates

Given the lengthy discussion on the Commission's Goals and Plan, Connecticut Education Network (CEN) Director Ryan Kocsondy provided an abbreviated report to members and attendees, referring them for additional details to the printed document, "Connecticut Education Network – Update," also posted to the Commission's Web site.

He opened by sharing that his first 90 days as Director (start date of March 17) have been positive, and he plans to develop a CEN strategic plan that complements and aligns with the Commission plan. Ryan also noted the strong talent and dedication of his team. He did share the news that Brynn Deprey, CEN's Marketing Communications Manager, will be leaving in June to accept a similar position with New Jersey's research and education network, NJEdge (www.njedge.net). He acknowledged her contributions to CEN, especially in organizing and running an outstanding annual conference. Mark added that this year's conference, held on Friday, May 12, had the largest number of registrants (500+) in its history, with 450 in attendance. Ken asked that these minutes reflect the Commission's appreciation for Brynn's work, with multiple members seconding this request. On the topic of staff, Ryan mentioned that he is reviewing applications for the technician opening.

Ryan updated the group briefly on the status of library connections, a major initiative for CEN, the State Library, and the many libraries in Connecticut that will appreciate significant upgrades in connectivity as a result of this project. Ryan expressed his appreciation for the work of Maria Bernier, the State Library's eRate Coordinator, for her tireless work in supporting individual libraries and deft coordination with CEN's team. Ken echoed these sentiments and pointed to Maria as a key reason for the project's success.

John Elsesser asked about the process that CEN uses to notify its members of distributed denial of service (DDoS) threats and attacks. He mentioned that the State has a master contract with Everbridge's toolset that provides for automated notifications. Ryan thanked him for this update and noted that CEN currently updates members through a manual process regarding DDoS threats and attacks but would look into the Everbridge service.

Advisory Council Reports

Mark directed members to the latest Advisory Council meeting notes, available as print copies and online at the Commission Web site, www.ct.gov/CTEdTech. The input from these meetings, taking place on May 10 and 15, greatly informed the draft Goals and Plan document the Commission reviewed earlier in the meeting. The Commission members appreciated the updates and offered no comments or questions for discussion.

Public Comment

Mark acknowledged and thanked the members of the public for their attendance and opened the floor for comment. Rich Mavrogeanes introduced Michael Paolucci, Founder and CEO of Slooh, an educational technology company based in Litchfield County. Michael took a few minutes to introduce his company to the Commission members.

Slooh provides a global network of telescopes that subscribing members can use for educational purposes. For example, a teacher might reserve one of the 10 telescopes that Slooh owns or one of 25 partner telescopes to teach a class on asteroids. While she has (remote) control of the telescope during her reserved time, others on the network can also view what she and her class see through that telescope.

Slooh has developed and patented software that offers high-definition images in real time, what Michael terms the "interface to outer space." The company has also developed 25 activities aligned with the Next Generation Science Standards, including badges for students who complete these activities. Students using the platform can track and report asteroids to the Minor Planet Center. Slooh partners with organizations such as the Planetary Society and has enlisted guests such as Bill Nye to present. The company has 80,000 members and 500,000 fans, with standard subscriptions costing $50 per classroom per year.

Michael expressed his appreciation for the forum to present as well as an interest in establishing partnerships with organizations such as CEN for content distribution and to establish a broader user base to teach astronomy. Several members expressed interest in the potential of offering Connecticut library cardholders access to Slooh, with follow-up discussions on this and other topics taking place after the conclusion of the Commission meeting.

Future Meeting Dates

The two last meetings of 2017 will take place at the Legislative Office Building, Hearing Room 1C, on the following dates:

- Monday, September 11, 2017
- Monday, December 4, 2017

Adjournment

Having no further business to discuss, Scott Shanley motioned to adjourn, and Nick seconded that motion. The members unanimously passed the motion without discussion or abstentions shortly after 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Douglas Casey
Executive Director
Commission for Educational Technology
55 Farmington Avenue
Hartford, CT 06105
(860) 622-2224
Doug.Casey@ct.gov
www.ct.gov/ctedtech