

NEWFOUND AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT
TECHNOLOGY COUNCIL MEETING
February 2, 2009 5:00 PM
NMMS

In attendance: District - Marie Ross, Daniel Rossner, Kristin Paterson, Eric Chase, Nancy Mills, Chris Hunewill, Vincent Paul Migliore; Public – Sandra Heaney, Mary Markert; Also attending - Joshua Mulloy.

Marie Ross called the meeting to order at 5:04 pm
Salute to the flag

Draft minutes of the meeting of December 30th, 2008 were reviewed. After some discussion and minor corrections, motion by Rossner, Second by Chase to approve as corrected. *Motion Approved 8-0-2-2.*

1. First order of business was to elect a council Chairperson. Motion by Chase, Second by Migliore to nominate Daniel Rossner. *Motion Approved 10-0-0-2.*
2. Ross reported on her investigation into quorum structure and conflict of interest issues raised at the previous meeting. It was decided by the group that the basic Council structure would be twelve members, with a quorum of seven. Of the twelve “Base” members six would come from the district, and six from the Public. With this structure, we are assured of having representatives from both groups for a quorum to exist. In addition, additional members of the public shall be welcome to participate in discussions at all meetings. With regard to conflict, no voting member shall be allowed to vote on any matter in which they may have an interest outside that of the council. The initial council membership shall be as follows:

<u>District</u>	<u>Public (Any 6 at one time)</u>
1) School Board Rep (Migliore)	1) Sandra Heaney
2) SAU Administrator (Ross or Rossner)	2) Mary Markert
3) IT Rep (Paterson)	3) Todd Westfall
4) Elementary Rep (Hunewill)	4) Jay Meegan
5) Middle School Rep (Chase)	5) David Rose
6) High School Rep (Mills)	6) Clay Dingman
	7) Royce Robertson
	8) Steve Favorite

3. Rossner reported on progress of RFC to date. Clarification offered on the difference between RFC and RFP. Advice was offered to solicit more feedback. Heaney questioned how the needed numbers were derived, e.g. “Gap Analysis”. Directed to review Tech Plan. Additional Questions regarding need for cameras in every unit. Some concerns raised re: lateness in the school year. Migliore noted appreciation of the comprehensive RFC response from Government Connection, reiterated suggestion we try and elicit more of same from other vendors. Ross suggested taking content from Government Connection response and incorporating into the RFP. Migliore spoke of developing vendor relationships which outline our 5 year plan with “Market Central Philosophy”.

Heaney remarked you can't put a \$ figure on relationships, and aren't we bound by lowest bid. Distinction between fixed price bid and proposals were discussed. General discussion ensued about how can we get the resources that were budgeted for this year into hands of students? Queries regarding existence of State pricing contracts (as in NY), Kristin discussed her experience with Government Connection, others.

4. Kristin shared her feedback in response to the Tech Council's earlier request to survey other districts. (Alton, Londonderry, Gilford, Laconia, Plymouth HS, Raymond, & Tilton School.) Migliore requested that all copies being deliberated tonight be distributed digitally.
5. We reviewed Kristin's memorandum of a revised plan for computers as it related to our contemplated purchasing. Discussion about what was going to happen to the existing carts, they would be repurposed. Discussion of the abilities of Skype and NetMeeting as it related to the specifications detailed in the RFC. Also whether or not we should consider off-lease and other types of used equipment.
6. Rossner requested that the Council move the discussion to the subject of the contemplated RFP, which would be the natural progression following a RFC which we have completed. Discussion ensued. General agreement that the concept of an "X" class machine. Business office and IT will explore opportunities or vendors who participate in a State Standards Contract; who can service and warranty to that level? We need to be clear that all contemplated types and quantities are subject to government funding. Migliore questioned whether we should buy with or without O/S; Mullloy suggested that with imaging process needed, it was probably more efficient to buy without. Migliore expressed concern about total timeline. Requested (and received) commitment from IT that if we fast track the procurement process, deployment would occur rapidly as well. Rossner offered the following rough timeline (If agreement could be reached on basis for RFP): a) RFP Issued by end of week. b) Vendors would have three (3) weeks to respond. c) Business Office and IT would confer on responses, complete evaluation of options, and initiate procurement by March 10. d) Subject to vendor timelines, IT will have resources in the classrooms by April 1. Discussion resumed about the specifications to be included in RFP. Discussion of the need for cameras. Mills and Chase elaborated on curriculum requirements for Digital Portfolios, Artifact Creation, and Webcam utilization. Additional discussion about the life time of the contemplated assets, and changing requirements. Other ideas as to what to drop to achieve savings. Revisited concept of off-lease or otherwise used equipment. Group preferred full warranty procurement, particularly in light of IT staff reductions and goals for extended lifetimes. Agreement by group that RFP should ask for pricing @ 3, 4, & 5 year warranties, with options for years 6 & 7.
7. Motion by Mills, Second by Paterson: Tech Council support for Business Office to issue RFP reflective of the Council dialogue for the contemplated procurement. *Motion Approved 9-0-1-0.* Markert recused herself from vote.
8. Next Meeting set for March 24, 5:00 – 7:00 pm, NMMS
9. Motion to Adjourn by Ross, second by Heaney. *Motion Approved 10-0-0-2.*