



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

**MINUTES**

**March 5, 2018**

**Commission Members in Attendance**

Raymond, Mark – Commission Chair, CT DAS-BEST, Chief Information Officer  
Casey, Doug – Executive Director, CT Commission for Educational Technology  
Caruso, Nick – Senior Staff Associate for Field Service, Connecticut Association of Boards of Education (CABE)  
Cohn, Ellen – Deputy Commissioner, Connecticut State Department of Education  
Dillon, Thomas – Founder, Flagship Networks  
Dumais, Charles – Superintendent, Amity (Region 5) Public Schools  
Feinmark, Russell – Connecticut General Assembly  
Mavrogeanes, Rich – President, Discover Video  
Mundrane, Michael – Chief Information Officer, University of Connecticut  
Shanley, Scott – Town Manager, Town of Manchester  
Vallee, Bill – State Broadband Coordinator  
Wiggin, Kendall – State Librarian, Connecticut State Library  
Zak, Scott – Senior Director of Learning Technologies, Connecticut Board of Regents

**Facilitators, Presenters, Guests, and Others in Attendance**

Chatterjee, Supriyo “SB”  
Giammarco, Peter – Government Account Manager, Verizon Wireless  
Hall, Aleshia – Assistant to the State Chief Information Officer  
Kocsondy, Ryan – Director, Connecticut Education Network (CEN)

**Agenda Items**

**Welcome**

Chairman Mark Raymond greeted the attendees and noted the tremendous progress made through the Commission for Educational Technology, from a thorough review of the Bylaws and technology proficiency to student privacy and the Connecticut Education Network (CEN). He thanked the members for their ongoing commitment to this important work to promote the effective use of technology in education.



### **Approval of Meeting Minutes, December 4, 2017**

Members had received a copy of the [December 4 Commission minutes](#) following that meeting, with print copies available for review at the March 5 meeting. Nick Caruso made a motion to accept the minutes as shared, with Scott Shanley offering a second. Mark asked members if they had any changes to suggest to the minutes, with none offered. He then put the motion to approve the minutes to a vote, with no objections and one abstention (Rich Mavrogeanes, not present at the December 4 meeting).

### **Executive Director's Report**

Executive Director Doug Casey provided a report that included the following items:

- **CyberStart**  
With the intent of connecting high school girls to advanced study and careers in cyber security, the Office of the Governor, Commission, and various State agencies worked together to have Connecticut participate in the national CyberStart program ([www.sans.org/CyberStartUS/](http://www.sans.org/CyberStartUS/)). Run by the SANS Institute, the program engages high school girls in the area of cyber security through online team challenges where participants work together to solve problems in a fun, virtual gaming environment to win prizes such as Chromebooks, Beats headsets, and gift certificates.

More than 400 girls in 175 teams across Connecticut took part in the competition that ran February 20 – 25, with five Connecticut teams placing in the top 100 teams across 17 participating states. Representatives from our State agencies have followed up with the teams to send congratulations and encourage them to pursue study and careers in cyber security. Mark underscored the success of the program, with one team in Waterbury boasting 61 members. CyberStart has engaged the traditionally underrepresented female student population in considering careers in cyber security, which in our state has an estimated 4,000 unfilled jobs. Graduates with 2-year as well as 4-year degrees in cyber security have many opportunities within Connecticut in this dynamic profession.

- **Educational Software Hub**  
In an effort to support schools and educational software companies in complying with state privacy statute, the Commission launched the Connecticut Educational Software Hub ([Connecticut.LearnPlatform.com](http://Connecticut.LearnPlatform.com)) last August. Doug shared that the more than 1,400 registered educators and leaders continue to make good use of the Hub, which allows companies to learn about and pledge compliance with our state laws governing student data privacy. Educators can use the Hub to search for products whose developers have pledged compliance and to weigh in on the effectiveness of software that they use in their own schools. Scott Shanley asked how the number of registrants aligns with



targets for registered users, with Doug offering that virtually all of the 169 school districts are using the Hub. The Commission now sees district curriculum directors, technology directors, and teachers using the platform as their “go-to” starting point for vetting software for compliance, efficacy, and grade-level alignment.

To date, companies have registered 100 educational software applications on the Hub. Doug is pursuing funding to support and expand the use of the Hub as a means of sharing what works in educational technology. These plans include the ability for users to provide — and share with all other members of the Hub — reviews of product efficacy and costs. Chip Dumais asked if Doug was looking to have the RESC Alliance pay for the Hub next year, as it did this current fiscal year through a generous donation. While not the first option on the table, support from educational stakeholders may represent part of the long-term sustainability model behind the Hub.

- **Connecting Connecticut Classrooms (C3)**  
The Commission has partnered with the Office of the Governor and nonprofit Education Superhighway to launch the Connecting Connecticut Classrooms program to help schools maximize their potential returns on the federal E-rate program that funds broadband and wireless networks. Doug noted that, according to data provided by administrators of the E-rate program, more than \$24M in funds are available to Connecticut schools for “Category 2” purchases, which support internal school and wireless networks.

The Education Superhighway team has reached out to 77 districts to provide purchasing and technical assistance, with special attention paid to districts that have not filed for Category 2 funding. Of those districts, 22 have filed a Category 2 “470 Form” requesting funding this year. Doug shared positive feedback from districts, including one story that a Litchfield Public Schools leader shared last week. The Education Superhighway team provided extremely valuable assistance in reviewing her request for proposal, leading to revisions that should help to maximize her district’s award for wireless networking equipment.

- **ISTE Student Standards**  
Doug provided updates on the review and approval of the ISTE Student Standards for technology proficiency, to support college and career readiness of all learners. He noted our statutory charge ([CGS Chapter 61a](#)) to “ensure, in cooperation with the State Board of Education, competency in computing skills by the sixth grade for all students.” That legislation also calls the Commission to define “competency in specific computing skills and the integration of technology into the curriculum for all public school teachers.” To those ends, we have endorsed the internationally acknowledged ISTE [Standards for Students](#) and [Standards for Educators](#) in previous Commission meetings.



To achieve a broader application of the Student Standards into Connecticut classrooms, Doug is working to have the Standards adopted by the State Board of Education. He thanked Deputy Commissioner Cohn and her team in the Academic Office, as well as members of the State Board's Standards and Assessment Subcommittee, who are working with him to review the Standards and likely submit them for approval to the full State Board later this spring or summer. Given that the Board is also reviewing a proposed [Computer Science framework](#), plans are underway to communicate how these different standards align with and complement each other. Doug pointed to the ISTE Standards as the "how" we teach, deepening learning through the use of technology. The Student and Educator Standards support all other subjects and standards, including the Connecticut Core, Next Generation Science, Social Studies, and proposed Computer Science framework. Ellen underscored the importance of communicating how the standard sets align, suggesting that members envision a Venn diagram of related competencies and mastery in content areas.

To support the adoption of the ISTE Student Standards, Doug solicited public comment with the help of Judy Carson, who serves as the School-Family-Community Partnerships lead in the Connecticut State Department of Education (SDE). A statewide survey of educators, school leaders, and parents provided valuable feedback and support for adoption, with the Standards receiving an average of 4.41 out of 5.00 (88%) approval rating to support college and career readiness.

In partnership with Judy and the Connecticut Science Center, he also ran a community input session on February 14. During this workshop, Doug provided an overview of the ISTE Student Standards and then led more than 20 parents and community leaders through hands-on exercises using tablets and laptops to put the Standards into practice. These activities included the analysis of Web sites for authenticity, with participants presenting their findings using digital tools and tying the lessons they learned back to the ISTE Standards. Board members of the Connecticut Educators Computer Association (CECA), Connecticut's ISTE chapter, provided guidance and assistance to the workshop participants. Session attendees expressed a deep appreciation for putting the Standards into practice, giving them a clear sense of the types of skills students should be developing as part of mastering other core content areas (e.g., math, language arts, science, social studies, etc.). Several participants, representing local boards of education, asked for assistance in facilitating similar workshops in their own districts, an offer Doug welcomed.

Following the organization's release of student and educator standards in 2016 and 2017, respectively, ISTE will release its Administrator Standards this summer. Doug shared that he serves on the technical working group currently drafting the Administrator Standards, which will provide guidance and best practices for



superintendents, principals, and other K – 12 leaders in effectively using technology in their schools.

### **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. Ryan referred to the [one-page handout](#) for details on the topics he planned to share, as follows.

- **Staffing**  
With the hiring of Rachel Collard, CEN's Publicity and Marketing Coordinator, Ryan has filled all open positions within the Network. He provided details about Rachael's background in a separate handout and indicated that she is getting up to speed quickly with CEN activities, especially planning for the annual conference on Friday, May 18.
- **Budget**  
Ryan noted that reductions in General Fund appropriations and sweeps from operational funds have resulted in a net loss this fiscal year of \$143,000. During the February 16 meeting, the Bond Commission authorized \$1.5M for use against capital expenses. Michael Mundrane added that, while the State has prompted the Network to adopt a self-sustaining operational model through the planned elimination of General Fund allocations, it remains committed to supporting CEN through capital investments through bond funding. Mark agreed and reminded the members that the Network would not have existed without the State's initial and ongoing support through capital investments. Scott Shanley acknowledged these points but urged the State not to conduct sweeps of operational funds, which affect the Network mid-year.
- **Policy Review**  
The CEN will review and post updates to four policies to reflect current Network standards. Ryan provided members with a copy of the draft Participant and Acceptable Use Policy for review.
- **CEN Engagement**  
Ryan has invited CEN members to serve on one or more of the three Advisory Councils he has designed to address the service management, technical advancement, and professional development needs of the Network and its members.

He also reminded Commission members of the upcoming CEN Conference and offered them complementary admission, as has been the practice in years past. Registration totals remain high, and the Conference Committee is reviewing session proposals to offer a diverse set of topics of interest to the K – 12, library,



higher education, and municipal member communities.

- **Threat Management**  
The CEN team are testing the Akamai Prolexic service to provide burst capacity for distributed denial of service (DDoS) attacks. Ryan noted the largest DDoS attack on record last week, perpetrated against GitHub.org and measuring 1.3 terabits per second. Michael encouraged the Commission to acknowledge the value of CEN's DDoS services to all members, most of which could not afford the mitigation that the Network provides at no additional cost on a daily basis.
- **New York City Buildout**  
Work progresses on this initiative, connecting CEN and its members to one of the largest commodity Internet hubs in the world. Despite delays in resolving carrier agreements, Ryan expects to complete the project through the NEREN partners in Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Rhode Island, and Vermont by summer 2018. Connecting into New York City will then open the door to negotiate volume Internet access rates and to cut Internet usage and costs in some instances through peering agreements with content providers.
- **Connecticut Library Fiber Consortium**  
The Bond Commission has provided funding for the final phase of library connections. Meanwhile, buildouts have reached 49 of the 56 libraries defined in the current phase of the multi-year project. A total of 136 of 193 libraries statewide now connect to fiber through CEN. Colleagues from research and education networks in other states have lauded this work and have asked Ryan for insights into how the Network achieved this level of connectivity, in partnership with the Connecticut State Library and local libraries.
- **New Members and Customers**  
Ryan provided a list of connections established since the December meeting. Mark added that CEN now serves as the primary Internet provider for Connecticut State agencies.

### **Data and Privacy Advisory Council Report**

Doug began his report by noting that the Data and Privacy Advisory Council does not have a chair. He expressed appreciation for the work of Jeff Kitching, the Advisory Council's former chair, and encouraged any Commission members with interest in serving in that capacity to speak with Doug after the meeting. He then provided highlights from the discussion on February 6, with [detailed minutes](#) available from the Commission's Meetings page.

- **Trusted Learning Environment**  
K – 12 schools need to have a best-practice framework for managing the privacy and security of students and staff. To that end, the Commission has



partnered with the Consortium for School Networking (CoSN), the national K – 12 technology directors group, and its state chapter, Connecticut Educational Technology Leaders (CTETL), to promote the Trusted Learning Environment (TLE) program ([www.TrustedLearning.org](http://www.TrustedLearning.org)). This initiative provides a low-cost framework for district leadership teams to use in developing a privacy and security program, in partnership with other district teams from Connecticut and across the country.

On February 22, CTETL hosted a statewide orientation to the program, attended by representatives of more than 70 school districts. Doug provided opening remarks to the event, facilitated by CoSN's TLE lead, Linnette Attai. Districts that decide to pursue TLE certification will work collaboratively to strengthen policy and practice in the areas of leadership, business practices, data security, classroom applications, and professional development.

- **Resources for Student and Family Privacy and Security**  
This topic arose out of the Advisory Council members' acknowledgement that many K – 12 schools dedicate time and resources to sharing privacy and security best practices to students and staff, yet families, college students, and members of the public may not have access to such resources. The group agreed that all learners should have access to digital literacy, cyber hygiene, and privacy training and resources, in line with conclusions from the [State Cybersecurity Strategy](#). To this end, the group agreed to conduct a review of resources from other organizations (e.g., parent-teacher organizations, Scouts, state agencies, libraries, etc.) and provide a list of references on the Commission's Web site.
- **Ensuring Safe Computing and School Climates**  
Just days before the shootings in Parkland, Florida, the Advisory Council members discussed the ways in which technology can help schools become aware of and possibly prevent similar incidents. Michael Swaine of Gaggle ([www.Gaggle.com](http://www.Gaggle.com)) raised this issue, in the context of his company providing notifications to districts that have helped prevent a large number of attempted suicides and incidents of school violence. He suggested to the group that the [Children's Internet Protection Act](#) (CIPA), enacted in 2000 to help block inappropriate content through Web filtering tools, should reflect the current state of the "read-write" Web. A substantial amount of potentially inappropriate content, or content indicating imminent danger to students (e.g., suicide notes, threats to students, and bullying), stems from learners themselves. Michael pointed to the availability of tools that districts could — and he argues, should — leverage to help flag potentially harmful situations.

Doug has reached out to several national organizations to determine whether similar discussions have taken place around changes to CIPA or other legislation to protect students. Organizations such as the Future of Privacy Forum ([www.fpf.org](http://www.fpf.org)) caution that some may see the use of technology applications



(e.g., artificial intelligence and monitoring) as a breach to individual privacy.

Scott Shanley noted that the desire for monitoring and intervention by public entities extends beyond public schools. He gave the example of citizens posting updates on Facebook about car break-ins, with the assumed expectation that police would take note and intervene. Ken cautioned that any use of technology remains imperfect, that the appearance of protections using artificial intelligence may lead to a false sense of security. Michael acknowledged that most fair-minded individuals would welcome a balanced approach to allow for the use of technology to flag events based on rules designed to protect students. The challenge lies in differentiating between proactive protections and what some would see as invasive monitoring.

Doug reminded the group that schools have authority over the systems they provide to students, much in the same way employers do. Mark concurred, noting that once individuals move from using their privately owned or procured technology devices and connections to those of their employer or host organization, there should be no expectation of privacy. Michael pointed to case law in which decisions have found in favor of individuals who had the expectation of privacy, regardless of whether they had actual legal protections of privacy. He recommended a balanced approach to exploring and articulating a Commission stance on these issues. Ken also issued a word of caution, noting that what may start as the monitoring of e-mail and cloud-hosted content (e.g., Google Drive) could extend, for example, to the capture and analysis of conversations through microphones. He pointed to CIPA as failed legislation and noted that fear and emotion often drive legislation.

Nick drew a parallel to school lockers, provisioned to students who maintain these as relatively private spaces but that school officials have the right to inspect. He noted the many warning signs — digital and analog — that existed prior to the Florida shootings. He also pointed to consumer expectations of privacy with the use "Internet of things" devices such as Google Home or Amazon Alexa, which serve as search engines and interfaces to control other Internet-enabled hardware (e.g., security systems, lights, and appliances). Many people assume anonymity in using these devices.

Mark appreciated the thoughtful dialog on this topic and encouraged members to consider that the Commission issue a reasoned opinion on the matter that expresses multiple viewpoints.



## Digital Learning Advisory Council Report

Nick Caruso, Chair of the Digital Learning Advisory Council, shared the following highlights from the February 12, 2018 meeting of that group, with [detailed minutes](#) available on the Commission's Meetings Web page.

- ISTE Standards  
Reflecting some of the earlier discussions from the Executive Director's report, Nick emphasized the Digital Learning Advisory Council's efforts to ensure that schools have the resources to implement the ISTE Student Standards. He noted three areas of activity to bring about true adoption of the Standards in classrooms: standards integration, teacher preparation and professional development, and policy.

The Advisory Council members have expressed a need to infuse the Standards into existing best practice guidelines, such as the SDE's Evidence Guides of exemplary instruction, posted on the Educator Effectiveness Web site at [www.ConnecticutSEED.org](http://www.ConnecticutSEED.org). Updating the Guides would require significant resources, but Nick and others believe that collective efforts could provide useful revisions to resources that educators already use. He emphasized that such efforts would target ways to infuse the ISTE Standards into existing supports for other standards (e.g., Connecticut Core, Next Generation Science, etc.) rather than creating what educators and leaders might see as a separate set of instructional requirements.

Nick shared the Advisory Council's plans to help ensure that teachers receive the technology integration supports they need to adopt the ISTE Educator Standards into their own practice and to support the development of the Student Standards in all learners. These efforts would take place through partnerships with institutions of higher education, ideally making the ISTE Standards part of how professors instruct, modeling these skills for new teachers. Nick also emphasized the importance of providing professional development to current educators around technology integration, addressing the "how" and not just the "what" students learn, woven into all training opportunities. He also noted ISTE's launch of a certification program this spring. Doug elaborated on these efforts, explaining that ISTE will train, assess, and certify qualifying educators among a cohort of 30 teachers, with plans to scale this program nationally. He has begun conversations among the ISTE Standards team about ways that Connecticut colleges and universities can support this work, providing instruction through teacher certification programs statewide. Ellen embraced the certification concept and noted that Massachusetts has a professional credential for educators around technology integration.

The third set of efforts to bring about adoption of the Standards addresses changes to school policy to support best practices in digital learning. This



proposed work holds great promise, given that Nick's organization authors the [Policy Manual](#) that most Connecticut K – 12 schools use. Changes to those policies would encourage districts to put the ISTE Standards into practice.

Doug added a few details on efforts around open education resources. He plans to call together OER leaders across K – 12, higher education, and libraries to discuss a regional or statewide implementation. Concerns include the overall governance of the work, a technology platform to house and curate resources, professional development, and funding. He will pursue this work with the members of the Digital Learning Advisory Council and report back at future meetings.

### **Infrastructure Advisory Council Report**

Tom Dillon shared highlights from the February 15 meeting of the Infrastructure Advisory Council, which he chairs. Those interested may find [detailed minutes](#) available on the Commission's Meetings Web page.

Topics from this last meeting included progress in promoting the Digital Equity Toolkit ([www.bit.ly/CT\\_Digital\\_Equity](http://www.bit.ly/CT_Digital_Equity)) as well as an analysis of how Connecticut schools and libraries use the federal E-rate program, with specific attention paid to the reasons why our state has not maximized potential offsets in Category 2 funds. Tom acknowledged Maria Bernier of the Connecticut State Library for her work in supporting local libraries to file for E-rate.

The Infrastructure Advisory Council also addressed the challenge of measuring connectivity to schools, one of the Commission's statutory charges, and what broadband delivery rates do or do not tell us about digital learning. The group questioned the utility of a minimum bandwidth per student, such as the 100 Kbps rate that the State Educational Technology Directors Association (SETDA) recommends. Michael added that such a metric does provide a baseline for delivering digital content and instructional tools and serves the purpose of highlighting areas of need, such as communities in which the availability of basic broadband provision does not exist. He reiterated that broadband consumption does not equate to quality of learning. Mark agreed that the true measurement of technology's efficacy would be a rate of learning per student, rather than the use of technology in terms of kilobits per second. Michael concurred and pointed to the need for some type of approximation, such as "contact time" with technology, a measure of the availability of learning tools. It remains the role of educational institutions and teachers to ensure the effective use of technology through sound pedagogy. This points back to the importance of frameworks that guide the use of technology in learning, such as the ISTE Standards.

Mark pointed to the possible measurement of bandwidth per student, looking beyond extrapolated averages to assess the real availability of broadband and effectively used educational resources. The rate of bandwidth delivery into a building — the basis for



deriving per-student averages as reported by advocacy groups such as [Education Superhighway](#) — does not reflect other factors that could affect end user delivery, such as internal wired and wireless networks, ratios of devices to students, and the processing speed of those devices.

Rich Mavrogeanes pointed to internal broadband usage, which circuit speeds do not capture. As a provider of video services to schools, his company sees heavy use of educational content that simple measures of circuit speeds to (not within) buildings cannot reflect. Nick added that we should also assess the opportunity cost of not having adequate broadband to support learning. Mark and Michael pointed to the ability to measure congestion, the upper rates of usage of provisioned broadband. Ken framed the discussion in the context of library needs, with the challenge of estimating broadband demand for patrons who may expect to get online with one or more personal devices.

As a former K – 12 district administrator, Ellen pointed to baseline measures of connectivity — limited though they be — as levers by which school leaders can advocate for the availability of technology. Doug added that rural and underserved communities especially depend on these measures to help advocate for funding. He is part of a working group within SETDA to help provide more nuance to these connectivity measures, addressing many of the concerns expressed by the Commission members, without ignoring the utility of basic broadband targets.

Scott Zak noted that organizations tend to produce and optimize what they choose to measure, which, in the case of organizations such as SETDA and Education Superhighway, is bandwidth. This is not a bad place to start, but we need to pursue measures of true educational impact beyond circuit speeds. Mark reiterated that the Commission should continue to participate in discussions to help define what true availability looks like toward the goal of ensuring the provision of educational technology resources equitably to all students.



### **Review of Commission Bylaws**

Mark opened a discussion of the [Bylaws](#), reminding members that this initiative stemmed from a review last year of the statute that governs the Commission (see [CGA Chapter 61a](#)). He expressed the need to ensure that the Bylaws reflect the current language in the [Commission's statute](#), which has seen revisions over the past few years. Members received in advance of the March meeting at Microsoft Word version of the Bylaws, showing all tracked changes. Those revisions reflect statutory changes in membership appointments, many of which took place in 2011, as well as other minor changes, such as an updated location of the Commission's offices and corrected Web site address. Doug explained the process of revising the Bylaws, including this meeting's discussion, followed by any further revisions, and a vote to adopt the revised Bylaws at the next meeting, scheduled for June 4, 2018.

Mark explained the origin of the Vice Chair position, currently vacant, which the members elect. The Bylaws include this position as a means of helping to ensure the continuity of Commission efforts, regardless of changes in administration and Commission Chair, which the Office of the Governor appoints. He and other members acknowledged the importance of this position and pledged to take action on electing a Vice Chair at the next meeting. Regarding changes to the Bylaws, Ken asked for a review to ensure consistency in references to the Commission's statute.

Chip Dumais raised the point that almost all of the topics discussed during this meeting concern the K – 12 community, and yet the Commission's Bylaws and statute do not call for representation from this constituency, aside from an appointment by the Connecticut Association of Boards of Education. Mark acknowledged this point and suggested that such proposed changes would have to take place at the statutory level, leading to changes in the Bylaws. Those revisions in membership would start as proposed changes submitted in the late summer prior to the next "long session" of the Legislature. Mark clarified that changes in the membership occurred as a way to balance representation to include members of the municipal community. These revisions resulted in the elimination of some appointments by educational organizations (e.g., the Connecticut Association of Public School Superintendents and the Connecticut Education Association).

Mark thanked the members for their input, which the revised Bylaws will reflect when members vote on them at the June meeting.

### **Public Comment**

While the Commission's visitors offered no public comment, the members used the additional time allocated to the meeting to discuss developments in state actions on Net Neutrality. Mark noted Connecticut's participation in a multi-state lawsuit against the repeal by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) of Net Neutrality protections and asked Bill Vallee to provide any updates he had to share. Bill noted current pending state legislation addressing similar concerns, including [Senate Bill 2](#) to



ensure that state-procured service providers follow Net Neutrality principals. Mark, Bill, and Michael all acknowledged the local aspect of ensuring Net Neutrality from a procurement standpoint, that states and other entities can define these requirements as part of their purchasing activities. Michael pointed to the complexities of Net Neutrality, that we should want some levels of differentiation in service, and highlighted that providers and consumers of content already distinguish among certain types of data, such as digital phone service. He added that the [Commission's letter of December 5, 2017](#), to the FCC Commissioners urging them to uphold Net Neutrality provisions went beyond what the members of the Commission for Educational Technology agreed to in their quarterly meeting the previous day, that is, that the FCC should espouse and reinforce general principals around neutrality.

### **Future Meeting Dates**

- Monday, June 4
- Monday, September 10
- Monday, December 3

### **Adjournment**

After noting the scheduled meeting dates for 2018, Mark offered a motion to adjourn. Nick made the motion, with a second from Michael. The members unanimously approved the motion, and Mark adjourned the meeting at approximately 3:00 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](mailto:Doug.Casey@ct.gov)  
[www.ct.gov/ctedtech](http://www.ct.gov/ctedtech)

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Douglas Casey".