DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES
BUREAU OF ENTERPRISE SYSTEMS AND TECHNOLOGY
Legislative Office Building Room 1C
210 Capitol Avenue, Hartford, CT 06106
1:00 – 3:00 PM

M I N U T E S

September 10, 2018

Commission Members in Attendance

Raymond, Mark – Commission Chair, CT DAS-BEST, Chief Information Officer

Bailie, Colleen — Director, West Haven Public Library (CT Library Association)

Casey, Doug – Executive Director, CT Commission for Educational Technology

Caruso, Nick — Senior Staff Associate for Field Service, Connecticut Association of Boards of Education (CABE)

Dillon, Thomas – Founder, Flagship Networks (Minority Leader of the House)

Dumais, Charles — Executive Director, Cooperative Educational Services (Office of the Governor)

Elsesser, John — Town Manager, Town of Coventry (CT Council of Small Towns)

Fortuna, Carl — First Selectman, Town of Old Saybrook (Minority Leader of the Senate)

Mundrane, Michael — Chief Information Officer, University of Connecticut, and Commission Vice Chair

Provencher, Maura — Vice President of Research and Administration, Connecticut Conference of Independent Colleges (CCIC)

Shanley, Scott — General Manager, Town of Manchester (CT Conference of Municipalities)

Shellard, Susan — Director of Administration, Department of Economic and Community Development (DECD)

Stanco, Bart — Vice President, Gartner (Office of the Governor)

Vallee, Bill — State Broadband Coordinator, Office of Consumer Counsel

Wiggin, Kendall – State Librarian, Connecticut State Library

Facilitators, Presenters, Guests, and Others in Attendance

Bruckhart, Dale — Digital Back Office

Chatterjee, Supriyo "SB"

Hall, Aleshia — Assistant to the State Chief Information Officer

Kocsondy, Ryan – Director, Connecticut Education Network (CEN)

Note on Video Access

As of the publication of these meeting minutes, a video archive of the meeting was available through the Connecticut Network (CT-N) at the following address: http://ct-n.com/ctnplayer.asp?odID=15591

Agenda Items

Welcome

Chairman Mark Raymond called the meeting to order and remarked on the fall as "back to school" season. Many schools and universities are introducing new and expanded forms of technology into classrooms, bringing about greater concerns about the effective use of these tools. He underscored the importance of ensuring that educators and students develop the competencies they need to take them into the 21st century. These priorities make the Commission's work as the State's educational technology policy advisor more important with each academic year.

New Member Introduction: Carl Fortuna

Mark welcomed new member Carl Fortuna, First Selectman of the Town of Old Saybrook, to the meeting. To acquaint Carl with the group, Mark asked others in attendance to introduce themselves. He also expressed apologies for the Commission's meeting being scheduled on Rosh Hashanah, which prevented several Commission members from attending. Commission meeting organizers will attempt to avoid such conflicts in the future.

Approval of Meeting Minutes, June 4, 2018

Mark requested a motion to approve the minutes from the Commission's June 4 meeting. Bill Vallee made the motion, with Nick Caruso offering a second. Mark asked for any discussion or changes regarding the minutes. With none offered, the Commission members unanimously approved the minutes, with no abstentions.

Executive Director's Report

Mark turned the floor over to Doug Casey to provide the Executive Director's report. Doug began with a reminder that his updates and those of the Commission Advisory Council chairs stem from the State Educational Technology Goals and Plan. That document and all of the Commission's publications and resources are available from www.CT.gov/CTEdTech/Publications. He encouraged members and the audience to follow Commission updates and announcements via Twitter (@CTEdTech). He also pointed to the common theme of equity across many of the topics covered in the September meeting agenda, including equity of access to skills, connectivity, high-quality learning materials, and funds to support learning.

- ISTE Standards Campaign
  The Commission has endorsed both the ISTE Standards for Students (September 2016) and Standards for Educators (September 2017) to define the competencies necessary for 21st century teaching, learning, and digital citizenship. More recently, Doug shared that the Connecticut State Board of Education adopted the Standards for Students at its June meeting.

In the coming months, Doug will be coordinating a "campaign" around the standards to help districts apply them to core teaching and learning. He mentioned a series of Webinars, hosted by the Commission, with guest speakers from around the state as well as speaking opportunities at the upcoming conference of the [Connecticut Educators Computer Association (CECA)](#), our state's ISTE chapter. Nick and Doug will also present on the ISTE standards at the annual joint conference of the Connecticut Association of Boards of Education (CABE) and Connecticut Association of Public School Superintendents (CAPSS). He noted the close alignment of the ISTE Standards with other national academic standards, such as Common Core, Next Generation Science, and Social Studies, among others. Messaging and resources will also provide insights and supports around the development of the ISTE Educator and Educational Leader Standards.

- Communications and Repository OER Work Groups
  The Commission has discussed the benefits of open education resources (OER) in past meetings and adopted work in this area as part of its five-year Educational Technology Goals and Plan. Doug highlighted some of the benefits of OER for K – 12 and higher education, as well as adult and lifelong learning: cost savings to institutions and students, equity of access to high-quality materials, the currency and relevancy of materials, the ability to use materials in flexible ways, and encouraging content creation among educators and students across institutions.

  He shared updates on the Commission's work in this area, as part of Connecticut's commitment as one of 20 [GoOpen states](#). Doug recently convened several in-person and online meetings among OER advocates and practitioners around two scopes of work: (1) communicate the value of OER to various audiences (2) and determine the costs for developing a statewide platform for sharing OER materials. With nearly 20 volunteers working on these initiatives, next steps include the development of a benefits-driven, one-page overview of OER for state institutions as well as a Web page of available resources. The group will also conduct a survey of current OER usage, and estimate the sunk and recurring costs of running an online OER repository.

- Connecting Connecticut Classrooms (C3) Campaign
  Doug shifted to the topic of maximizing Connecticut's return on its investment in the federal Universal Services Fund (E-rate) program, which provides offsets to help schools and libraries connect to the Internet and build internal networks. Historically, Connecticut schools and libraries have not taken advantage of available funding, especially for Category 2 funds to pay for internal networks. Doug shared that, based on E-rate data, Connecticut schools over the past five years have been eligible for $49M in Category 2 funding but have only applied for $27M in products and services.

To raise awareness of the availability of funds and encourage E-rate filing, the Commission is working again with nonprofit Education Super Highway to provide technical design and procurement consulting services to districts. To spread the word about the program — free to districts and the State — Doug will be sending outbound communications to administrators, board members, and technology directors. Last year, the Office of the Governor and the State Department of Education (SDE) gave high praise for the C3 program. This year's campaign should continue to encourage further participation in E-rate.

Scott Shanley asked about the underutilization of E-rate as a general phenomenon or if there were specific barriers to use. Doug mentioned the E-rate survey conducted this summer, to gather feedback from schools and libraries on the program. Designers of the survey, specialists in K – 12 and library technology from across the state, had strong theories about why participation levels have not been higher. For example, the program's requirement of matching funds — calculated based on the percentage of students in each district who are eligible for free or reduced lunch — remains a barrier to some communities. Initial review of the survey responses validate this unwillingness to provide matching funds, as well as other assumptions. Commission members will have the opportunity to review the response data and recommendations at a future CET meeting.

Mark thanked Doug for his report and acknowledged his ongoing efforts to advance multiple strategic initiatives in coordination with the Commission's members and Advisory Councils.

CEN Updates
Following the Executive Director's Report, Mark turned the floor to Ryan Kocsondy, Director of the Connecticut Education Network (CEN), for his updates. He provided the report in printed form, a digital copy of which appears on the Commission's Web site.

- Staffing: Posting for an additional technician to support the current team's efforts will take place in the next quarter.

- Budget: The team is conducting a technical review of routers intended to connect hub sites to the Network. Upon completion of that review, Ryan expects to spend the $1.5M allocated through the State Bond Commission on new hardware. He has also submitted totals for the FY 20 – 21 Biennium budget and expects to release the updated member service rates by November.

- Value-Added Services: The Network will soon release a cut sheet describing the managed firewall service, developed with the assistance of Commission member Tom Dillon. Ryan pointed to firewall management as essential to any local (member) network and expected the service to provide a scalable solution tailored

to individual member policies and practices.

- CEN Engagement: Members received a document detailing the [CEN Advisory Group structure](#). The Network has received many responses from volunteers to serve on its Advisory Councils, which include the Services Management, Technical Advancement, and Education & Development groups. These advisories have convened and are in the process of setting priorities for future work. Chairs are in place for two of the three groups. On a related note, Ken Wiggin called the Commission's attention to the State Library's [Digital Library Advisory Board](#), the governing body of the researchIT digital library. That group has served for years in guiding the policies and programs around digital content delivery via CEN. Ken offered to provide minutes of the Board meetings to inform the work of CEN, which Ryan appreciated as another important voice of Network members.

- CEN Strategic Planning: Prompted by John Elsesser at the June meeting with regard to the development of a strategic plan for the Network, Ryan shared that he has revisited the documentation around CEN's strategic planning process several years ago and sees some valuable insights, along with some suggestions that may no longer be relevant. Much has changed since that planning began, including the addition of a Commission executive director and the elimination of the General Fund appropriation to offset CEN operational costs. Ryan emphasized the importance of soliciting member feedback in the development of the next plan, which he hopes to share with the Commission at the next meeting and to finalize and share broadly by the May 2019 CEN Conference.

- Threat Management: Ryan provided a [sample report](#) of distributed denial of service (DDoS) attacks at the June 2018 meeting to offer a sense of the threats and mitigation efforts underway. The number of attacks has decreased over the summer, with activity understandably increasing since the beginning of the academic year. He did share that burst capacity to assist with DDoS mitigation is in place through an offsite provider.

- New York City Buildout: Completion of this project, in partnership with the [North East Research and Education Network](#) (NEREN) should take place in the winter of 2019. Contracting issues have led to delays that have extended the expected completion date. Ryan shared multiple benefits of connecting directly with the New York City and Boston regions, including cost reductions and efficiencies on peering, caching, and other bandwidth-intensive network costs. Mark asked if Ryan would appreciate any assistance from the Commission to help mitigate current or future delays. Ryan appreciated the offer and planned to share it with his NEREN partners.

  John Elsesser called attention to the potential of the buildout to attract businesses and organizations to Connecticut. He felt a need to discuss the role of CEN as an economic driver, with appeal to a broader audience beyond education and

municipal customers. He stated that only 10 – 12 locations nationwide have the bandwidth capabilities that CEN offers, positioning the state as a hub between and connected directly with New York and Boston. When asked for clarification by Mark as to his suggestion, John expressed the importance of articulating in multiple ways and venues the value delivered through CEN to the broader community. This message remains acutely relevant in the context of Connecticut government facing significant budget cuts and remaining committed to attracting new businesses and organizations. John asked members to consider the long-term impact of the Network to attract and retain organizations to the state.

Mark expressed his appreciation for John's comments and noted the current election cycle. He encouraged Commission members to share the benefits of CEN and the Commission's work with new leaders who will take office in January, especially those assuming the role that originally appointed the Commission members to the body. Mark also encouraged communicating directly with members of the General Assembly to highlight the value of CEN to legislators' own communities and the state as a whole. He noted ongoing work with Commissioner Smith and Deputy Commissioner Kollen of the Department of Economic and Community Development (DECD) to position CEN as an asset to attract businesses to the state. Susan Shellard of DECD echoed this sentiment, underscoring the Department's messaging behind the many benefits to businesses of moving or expanding to Connecticut.

Michael Mundrane pointed to the New York City buildout as an example of how improving infrastructure has benefits to the overall ecosystem of businesses, education, and civil life, rather than a single constituency. He agreed with Mark of the need to relay this message to the state leaders and lawmakers who will take office in January 2019. On that note, Nick Caruso asked Ryan about preventive measures CEN's team was taking to protect against election tampering. He noted that voting takes place in schools and town halls, many of which connect to the Network. Ryan commended the work of the office of the Secretary of State, which has worked with CEN to provide secure tunnels back from polling locations to protect data exchange and so mitigate against tampering.

- CT Library Fiber Consortium: Ryan highlighted progress in connecting the state's libraries to high-speed links to the Internet via the Library Fiber Consortium. The fourth phase of this project is underway, with 139 out of 193 libraries now connected to CEN. Most of these remain at the lowest levels of bandwidth use. The initiative has helped bridge the equity gap by providing robust broadband connections in many areas where no alternatives exist.

Ken shared copies of a report from the State Library, "Impact of Fiber to Libraries Grant Program." The document includes maps detailing fiber buildouts by phase, including eligible libraries that have declined pursuing connections at this time. He

expressed the common barrier in some communities of not wanting to assume long-term, ongoing fiber-maintenance costs. He clarified that Connecticut has 164 "principal public libraries." This number reflects the total of each town's main library, with five Connecticut towns without a main library. He noted that some towns have up to five libraries and branches. To date, Fiber Consortium funds have gone to connecting principal libraries only, though future awards will connect branch libraries as well. Including branch and association libraries, Connecticut has 223 libraries statewide.

- New Member Connections: Ryan concluded his report by directing members' attention to the list of new member connections since the June Commission report. These connections reach members across institutions of higher education, towns, public safety facilities, and libraries.

Infrastructure Advisory Council Report

As chair of the Infrastructure Advisory Council, Tom Dillon shared updates since the last Commission meeting, primarily regarding the Universal Services Schools and Libraries Program, or "E-rate." As mentioned earlier, the program provides offsets to help schools and libraries connect to the Internet and to build and manage local networks that connect students and patrons. Based on publicly available E-rate filing data, Connecticut schools and libraries have not applied for millions of dollars of matching funds. To identify some of the barriers to filing, the Infrastructure Advisory Council designed, distributed, and collected responses to a statewide survey of school and library leaders. Response rates were strong, with 86 public school districts and 38 libraries completing the survey. At the [August 6 Infrastructure Advisory Council meeting](#), attendees shared their thoughts on the survey responses. For the most part, responses point to problems that the Advisory Council members had previously discussed in designing the survey. A lack of local matching funds to cover the balance of costs for circuits and networks remains a key barrier to program participation.

Tom also highlighted another barrier: the complexity of understanding, filing, and tracking extremely detailed forms to specify and procure data circuits and network equipment. Michael, who participates actively through the Advisory Council, noted other challenges including the need to coordinate timing from submissions to awards and buildouts. He did hold up the work of the State Library E-rate Coordinator, Maria Bernier, as exemplary. Maria's ability to take the extremely complex and exacting challenge of filing for E-rate and distilling it into an understandable, repeatable process has proven invaluable to libraries that depend on her. Several other members echoed these sentiments, with Ryan noting her significant impact in helping libraries to connect through the Connecticut Library Fiber Consortium. He described her as "cheerfully persistent" and an enormous asset to the State.

Mark noted that, oftentimes, when organizations do not commit matching funds to support an initiative, leaders might not understand the value of the investment. He

suggested that the group develop shared communications pieces that help make the case for utilizing the E-rate program by committing local, matching funds.

On the topic of ensuring connectivity, Ken mentioned the work of U.S. Senator Patty Murray (D-WA) to draft a Digital Equity and Inclusion Bill. The proposed legislation would provide funding for state-level digital equity grants; a national digital equity grant program; and other efforts to support policy research, data collection, and analysis (e.g., broadband mapping). He agreed to share more details as the bill develops.

Digital Learning Advisory Council Report
Nick Caruso, Chair of the Digital Learning Advisory Council, shared the following updates from the August 9 meeting. He began by commending the work of the Advisory Council members, all of whom volunteer their valuable time and insights to further the work of the Commission.

- Alternative Learning Days
  Nick began his report by summarizing discussions around alternative learning days, approaches that districts can use to ensure continuity of learning when students cannot attend school. He noted the ongoing challenge of meeting the statutory requirement of at least 180 days of school sessions (see CGS Ch. 164, Sec. 10-16), given school closures that occur because of excessive heat or snow as well as power outages such as those that took place last spring. Some districts have cut days as a cost-savings measure as well, given local budgetary challenges. Nick shared that the SDE has reinforced the obligation of districts to provide180 instructional days, and some districts have taken creative approaches to meeting this requirement. For example, the first two days of school this fall in Danbury will count against the previous (2017 – 18) school year.

  Discussions have taken place among superintendents and technology leaders across the state on this topic, most recently at meetings of the CAPSS Technology Committee, which Commission member Chip Dumais co-chairs. Jonathan Costa, Assistant Executive Director at EdAdvance, the Litchfield County service center (RESC), has developed a framing document that describes ways to ensure learning at home on days when school is cancelled. These include non-technology approaches, such as developing lesson plans and printed materials that students can use at home, as well as digital approaches using the technology that districts have spent millions of dollars to purchase and support. The Digital Learning Advisory Council and CAPSS Technology Committee members have discussed several aspects of alternative learning day models. Both groups agree that districts should design approaches that work for their communities. Even more significantly, these groups have discussed ways to allow districts to hold alternative learning days, which may require changes to legislation. Nick promised to update the Commission on such developments (e.g., draft legislation).

- Policy Recommendations to Support Digital Learning
  Nick introduced the next topic by reminding members that the Commission has voted to endorse both the ISTE Student and Educator Standards, which define competencies in digital learning. He commended the State Board of Education for adopting the Student Standards this past June. To bring about true application of the standards, the Digital Learning Advisory Council has discussed various approaches, such as partnerships with teacher preparation programs and ISTE certification for teachers.

  Another approach is to encourage local boards of education to consider changes to policy to support the effective use of technology and strengthen the digital competencies of all teachers and learners. To that end, a sub-group of the Digital Learning Advisory Council developed the document, "Guidance on District Policy Revisions to Support Digital Learning." These recommendations encourage boards to revisit specific policies concerning topics such as student performance, use of technology, and curriculum design, among others. Given his organization's role in supporting school boards in the state, Nick saw these recommendations as an impetus for districts to strengthen their use of technology and build 21st century skills.

- ISTE Standards for Education Leaders
  As the standard-bearer for digital literacy and learning skills, ISTE released its Standards for Education Leaders in June of this year. Nick commended the Standards, developed by a technical working group on which Doug served. He pointed to the framework as providing strong guidance and definitions on leadership skills in general, not just in the effective use of technology to support learning environments. He drew a parallel to his work leading CABE's Lighthouse Project training, a program that develops the skills of members of Connecticut's boards of education. The ISTE Standards and Lighthouse framework complement each other well. The Digital Learning Advisory Council members also commended the Standards for Education Leaders and recommended that the Commission endorse them. Nick presented the Proposed Endorsement of the ISTE Standards for Education Leaders motion for consideration.

  Scott Shanley opened the discussion by asking if such a motion needed to be on the meeting agenda for consideration. Mark acknowledged this question and suggested that, if strong support existed among the members for the motion, they could waive this formality. Michael recognized the merits of the Standards but questioned whether endorsing them fell within the responsibilities of the Commission. Nick felt that defining such standards does fall in line with the Commission's charge, given the specific responsibility of defining student technology proficiencies, which requires supports at all levels, especially leadership. He used Michael's earlier "ecosystem" term to describe effective educational environments as needing coherence across all levels, with leaders supporting educators who directly support students. If learning practices need to change to leverage digital technologies, then

leaders need to understand, model, and support such best practices. Doug stated that the proposed endorsement does align with the Commission's mission, according to its statutory charges (CGS Ch. 61a). He called attention to the need for the Commission to help ensure meaningful training in technology, for example, which depends on leaders who understand and advocate for the development of digital learning skills among students and teachers.

Ken agreed that the role of the Commission is to advocate for and provide guidance on the effective use of technology for learning. This is different from delivering mandates that impose hard-and-fast obligations on leaders and institutions. For these reasons, he felt that endorsing frameworks such as the Standards for Education Leaders fits within the scope of the Commission's roles and responsibilities.

Michael respected other members' comments and offered that the Commission could make recommendations across many different areas of education, including funding and the very structure of educational institutions that may not fit within the scope of its work. What should drive the Commission's recommendations is relevancy to its core mission.

Mark expressed appreciation for the discussion and, to hearken back to Scott's original point about whether to move forward with the motion to adopt the Standards, suggested that members take the time to consider the motion against the Commission's charge. He put forth a motion to table the discussion until the December meeting. No discussion ensued, with Nick motioning and Chip seconding the proposed tabling of the topic. All members signified their approval to take up the issue at the next meeting.

Mark expressed his appreciation for the work of the Advisory Council members and especially for the ongoing efforts and leadership of Tom and Nick as the chairs of those groups.

Educational Software Hub Sustainability
Mark introduced the next topic, calling on member input regarding funding to support a key resource that the Commission put in place in August 2017 to support district and vendor compliance with the State's student data privacy statute (CGS 10-234aa – dd). Since its launch, the Connecticut Educational Software Hub has provided enormous value to schools, helping to reduce the estimated 80,000 staff hours that districts collectively spend annually to comply with the law. The Hub serves as a registry of products developed by companies that have pledged compliance with the state law. Districts can use the Hub's search engine to find compliancy-pledged products and then formalize compliance in the form of a contract with each vendor, as the statute requires. Based on Commission survey responses as well as Hub usage data, the solution

has had the following other positive impacts:

- Delivers statewide savings of approximately 10,000 staff hours annually, or close to $1M in indirect costs across all districts
- Serves about 2,500 registered Hub users, including educators and school leaders from virtually every school district in the state
- Supports continued growth, with nearly 1,000 site visits monthly, a total that has increased 25% quarter over quarter since its launch

Mark pointed to other benefits that the solution offers, including the ability of users to score the instructional value and efficacy of specific apps and to review scorecards that other educators post on more than 5,000 educational technology products in the Hub library. In terms of cost, the RESC Alliance covered the first year of expenses, and CEN has paid for the last six months of licensing for LearnPlatform, the software on which the Hub operates. Daily support and troubleshooting continues to come from Doug Casey, the Commission's Executive Director.

Mark concluded his introductory remarks by reiterating the significant positive impacts of the Hub on the constituents that our state statute identifies — school districts and educational software companies — and the lack of funding appropriated through that same law. He then asked the Commission members for their thoughts and suggestions on sources of long-term sustainability for the Hub.

Ken opened the discussion by asking about the annual license fees for the LearnPlatform and whether the Commission had approached the SDE for support. Mark shared that the licensing costs of the Hub total $24,000 annually. The Executive Director has approached the SDE for support but, as Mark clarified, the Hub currently does not fit above other, higher-priority initiatives at the SDE. Michael asked if there might be an opportunity for the SDE to reconsider, given its role in supporting K – 12 school districts, one of the key constituents in the law. Chip agreed, commenting that, as a representative of the K – 12 community, he sees many unfunded mandates yearly. Rather than asking schools to decide which mandates to follow based on limited funding, he agreed with having the SDE share in some of the cost, given the agency's role in supporting the K – 12 community. Scott Shanley agreed that the SDE should share in the cost burden but expressed concern about the agency through with the Hub would operate. Doug clarified that the Commission would continue to run the Hub and support daily operations; the point of today's topic was to address long-term funding for LearnPlatform licensing fees.

Mark clarified that the law does not task the SDE with directly supporting compliance, only in offering guidance to districts (see PA 18-125). He reiterated the reason for bringing up this agenda item, to solicit input as to what organizations might share in the responsibility for paying for the Hub, given the parties that it serves, i.e., boards of education and educational technology providers.

John Elsesser suggested that K – 12 CEN members provide a voluntary contribution solicited through their quarterly CEN bills. He saw the net cost per district as being less than an hour or two of billable hours by their attorneys, costs they are already incurring because of the law. The Commission could consider sending a letter to districts underscoring the value of the Hub and encouraging them to contribute to offset its license costs. Towns make donations every year to non-profit and social services organizations, simply as "the right thing to do."

Michael applauded the design, launch, and subsequent impact of the Hub, producing good outcomes among districts struggling to comply. However, he felt that not all CEN members should bear this cost if only K – 12 customers benefit from its use. Ken disagreed with having voluntary contributions fund the Hub and suggested a formula-based approach. He also recommended that the Commission create and submit to the Legislature a budget to support its services to the constituents it was charged by statute to support. Doing so may well raise the awareness of and appreciation for the Commission's work.

Taking another approach, Ken asked if the Hub technology platform could support charges to vendors to offset license fees. Doug replied that such a chargeback model might be technically possible. However, he expressed concern that, given Connecticut's small market size (~200 districts), such a fee would pose a barrier to companies currently serving our schools. Some firms offering free versions of software are now charging districts a fee for those products as compensation for signing contracts that comply with Connecticut law.

Mark echoed these thoughts, reminding members of Doug's efforts to encourage larger educational technology providers (e.g., Google, Microsoft, Apple, etc.) to comply with Connecticut statute. Educational technology companies — especially smaller ones — have shown an unwillingness to spend much time and attention to comply with data privacy laws that differ state by state. Streamlining compliance by removing district and vendor costs to participate in the Hub will therefore continue to support a vibrant online community of district users and providers.

Mark concluded the discussion by thanking those in attendance for their input. He also invited them to share other Hub sustainability solutions that might occur to them at a later date.

Libraries and the Digital Divide

Michael provided updates on his work mentioned at the June meeting to champion the role of libraries in connecting patrons of all ages to the Internet. He has shared ideas with several Commission members as well as the broader education community, including leaders from the University of Connecticut Hartford campus and the Hartford Public Library. Michael is coordinating efforts on multiple fronts, with one example being his work with the University of Connecticut Academic Senate regarding considerations for connecting students as part of the first-year scholars program in writing. These discussions and collective work will lead to the development of a resolution articulating the key strengths of libraries to address the digital divide. Colleen Bailie commended the work and welcomed any efforts to build public awareness of what libraries are doing to connect members of traditionally underserved communities. Michael concluded the discussion by committing to share a draft resolution with the Commission members by the December 3, 2018 meeting.

Public Comment

During the period for public comment, Dale Bruckhart, President of Digital Back Office in Milford, Connecticut shared some thoughts. He acknowledged the value that CEN provides to various constituencies, including school districts, towns, and industry (open access) members. He suggested that CEN should have a distinct private sector advisory council, with the intent to coordinate efforts regarding member needs and emerging technologies. Mark commented that CEN does have three advisory councils, which Ryan reviewed earlier in the meeting, with members of those groups representing a variety of different organizations, public and private. Ryan added that in forming the CEN advisory councils, he reached out to and encouraged participation by private sector representatives. Such advisory council members must follow the same protocols that others do, which is to commit to identifying and sharing general best practices rather than using those groups as a venue to promote specific products or services. He also pointed to the annual CEN Conference in May as a means of supporting learning and the exchange of ideas among a diversity of speakers and attendees.

Dale also shard his view that the community of K – 12 technology directors in Connecticut lacked representation, either through an affinity group or association. Doug addressed this concern by providing information about [Connecticut Education Technology Leaders (CTETL)](), the Connecticut chapter of the [Consortium of School Network (CoSN)](), the national association for school technology leaders. The Commission also hosts a listserv for nearly 300 K – 12 technology leaders, who use the platform on a daily basis to exchange ideas around the effective use of technology in Connecticut schools.

Scheduled 2018 Meeting Date
Mark concluded the meeting by reminding members of the last scheduled Commission meeting, scheduled to take place on Monday, December 3.

Adjournment
With no more agenda items or comments from members or the public, Mark requested a motion to adjourn. Nick made the motion, with a second from Tom. The members unanimously approved the motion, and Mark adjourned the meeting at approximately 2:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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