

**EduTech Steering Committee**  
**November 5, 1999**  
**Rochester Marriott Thruway**  
**Chris Manaseri, Facilitator**

**Members Present:**

Joe Backer, Supt. Letchworth	Tiffany Phillips, Supt. Bloomfield (9:10 a.m.)
Gary Hammond, Asst. Supt. GV BOCES	Bob Smith, Supt. Elba
Chris Manaseri, Supt. Romulus	Camille Sorenson, Director of EduTech
Dr. J. Marinelli, District Supt. W-FL BOCES	Dr. Stephen Uebbing, Supt. Canandaigua
Jack McCabe, Associate Supt. W-FL BOCES	
Bev Ouderkirk, District Supt. GV BOCES	

**Members Absent:**

Yvonne Watkins, Supt., Geneseo

**EduTech Presenter:**

Chris Saxby, Office Manager, EduTech

**2000-2001 EduTech Budget** - Camille Sorenson, Jack McCabe, and Chris Saxby presented the first draft of the 2000-2001 expenditure budget.

- Factors Driving the 2000-2001 Budget
  1. Continued intense demand for microcomputer local area network installation, technical support and training.
  2. Ever expanding base in units of hardware and software applications, geographically dispersed over nine counties which require training, technical and software support.
  3. Relentless change and evolution of computer technology resulting in:
    - a. continual raising of the customer's expectations
    - b. rapid obsolescence of equipment and software packages.
  4. Competing with the business sector for limited supply of trained specialists.
  5. Increasing demand for support in Application Services area (student, financial).
  
- EduTech supported 7,000 workstations in 1996 to over 13,000 workstations in 1999.
  
- Help Desk Calls- number of calls the Customer Assistance Center receives continues to go up. The mix of calls is still higher in the student and finance areas with 50 to 60%.
  
- Internet Addresses Accessed - on a daily basis from our schools through LAKENet we generate 2,250,000 URL hits to the Internet.
  
- Number of Installs
  1. In 1997 245 installs and in 1998-99 332 installs.
  2. Of the SAA's , 87% or 290 were implemented within 4 months
    - a. Of the 42 SAAs that did not make the 4 month install benchmark
      - 9 SAAs were related to EduTech scheduling.
      - 6 SAAs had to do with the Vendor not delivering the materials in time
      - 27 SAAs were late due to District site readiness

- EduTech Budget
  1. Total expenditure budget is \$8,463,729 up \$339,956 or + 4.18%.
  2. Compared to previous year's increase
 

1999-2000	-----	+6.8%
1998-1999	-----	+5.8%
  3. District pricing will be presented at the 12/8 Steering Committee meeting
  
- Changes Influencing Budget Increases
  1. Salary Increases (admin/supervisory) +\$7,489
  2. Salary Increases (Other Salaries) +\$235,876  
 In addition to annual increase, 4 positions are added in Application Support for Student, Part 200, and financial support.
  3. Fringe Benefits +\$89,281
  4. Internal Services (O&M Increases) +\$7,310
  
- Major increase addition of 4 application support (2 student , 1 financial, 1 Part 200) All tied to increase demands on staff, as well as increase number of schools in those areas Increase in number of people using mark reporting and attendance.
  
- Camille asked for input on how to present budget info to districts. Suggestions included -
  - hard figures instead of all percentages.
  - put the info out to school chiefs and ask if they want presentation.
  - presentation would be helpful in for GV BOCES districts
  - presentation last year was fine, but superintendents look for pricing,

**II. EduTech Planning** Jack McCabe and Camille Sorenson presented an overview of the various planning instruments and distribution of the EduTech department plan developed in conjunction with the Wayne-Finger Lakes organizational plan.

Two years ago the State required each Regional Information Center to submit a 793 plan. The plan includes the goals and process for achieving those goals in each area of EduTech. This plan was reviewed and updated last year. GV BOCES developed a regional vision for technology and shared with EduTech in December of 1996. Have had two updates since then. Jack McCabe stated that W-FL BOCES went through an extensive strategic plan process for the whole organization. Then charged each department to develop a plan.

EduTech Department Plan

- Developed in light of comments from customer surveys, focus groups, and steering committee and input from people out in the district everyday.
- EduTech looked inside at some of the areas we needed to improve on, to improve efficiency.
- Look at how EduTech provides services to the districts.
- Speaks to improving internal and external communication.
- Intended to be a 3-5 year plan.
- This plan will be driving EduTech

Bob Smith stated that he is hearing people are now more concerned about follow up service instead of installation being completed on time.

Tiffany Phillips mentioned that the committee had talked about doing another survey. Camille said she would probably do it in the spring.

### Issues Raised Concerning past EduTech Customer Survey

- Definition of Customer (different levels)
- Consistency of how each districts administers
- directions included on how to fill out
- should we only distribute to administrators or to teachers, users.
- Depends on what you want to find out. (Are people happy with our service)
- different surveys to different users
- do we know the requirement or expectations of all those people.

Jack McCabe explained that EduTech is trying to improve all the services. There are still complaints at times on how problems are solved. There is motion to improve. Expectations people have and part of the issue for this group is helping in managing those expectations. How was the expectation in May (large number of SAAs signed) managed in the school districts?

Steve Uebbing stated – the system is stressed during heavy periods of installation also a time stretching satisfaction. There are only two or three people in every district where expectations are met. Don't know if there is any reasonable way for superintendent to manage EduTech expectations. Project Coordinator needs to explain why scheduling is the way it is. Stress the regional view.

We need to know what information to collect and who is providing that information to us.

Gary Hammond stated that a consistency problem is not only an EduTech problem. District personnel also turn over. Need to build in a way to let EduTech know new personnel. Steve Uebbing suggested that as a general operating procedure the Project Coordinator should spend time with new district personnel communicating issues concerning their school.

### **Cognos Update**

Agreement has been completed for 100 licenses. Two people on staff are enrolling in training. Camille will be meeting with Western New York RIC to have them develop the Leap data..

First Phase: all state assessment data through grade 8 for all districts where EduTech provides test scoring, basic student demographic data contained in Leap data

Looking at January for pilot districts to begin accessing information.

#### Questions:

- How quickly can we pilot (January)
- Number of districts: (up to 6 districts 3 GV/ 3 WFL)
- How long until all districts have access? ( Need to see how it goes with pilot, need to address training issues)
- Regarding leap data, how else will other districts not involved in pilot get data (through standard reports we supply)
- If all went well, would we be looking at our data in the fall? (before the fall)
- How do we select pilots? Do we need to look at a policy?

Discussion followed with the following concerns or statements:

- Simply have policy statement that EduTech technical staff will have the ability to select based on technical needs.
- Requirement for the pilot is that the resources be dedicated in the district for the program.

- Helpful if it is clear up front what the expectations are of the pilot district.
- Way for schools to express an interest before selection is made.
- EduTech should have the opportunity to select convenient schools for small testing.
- Send out a request stating there are a limited number of slots for participation and the expectations of the district and the benefits to the district.

There is a consensus that we have informed EduTech what are concerns are and we leave it up to EduTech to select the pilot schools. EduTech will develop an RFP listing district requirements for the pilot schools and send the requirements stating that there are a number of limited slots for participation.

## **Pricing Discussion**

What are the questions/issues you would like to include in pricing discussion for the future?

What is the latest on the cost effectiveness legislation?

- Couple of weeks ago there was a meeting of the subcommittee. First meeting generally discussing items legislation guidelines would need to include.
- Reflected need to move quickly and create template for ease of use and sign off, simple process.
- Superintendent would sign a disclaimer that everything is okay. To purchase BOCES equipment need to sign off that this the least expensive based on documentation provided by BOCES.

What pricing factors should we consider for future years ?

- Other models/other RIC's
- Base plus fee for service ratio
- Baseline year for calculating charges (time lag)
- Level of detail on what pays for what
- External? Cost Analysis
- Phase out residual fees (installations and file server)
- Level of micromanagement/"expert advice"
- Differences in internal capacity
- BOCES - District equipment (support) transfer
- Depreciation?
- Training cost distribution (share individual costs)
- Revenue to expenditure balance with budget categories (subsidies)
- When best to discuss/decide?
- What role does effect on districts have in decision?
- Cost Centers?

Have Camille and Chris present how other RICs price for February meeting.

## **Online Courses**

- How do we grant credits for online courses?
- In-service granted for online courses?
- Perhaps there is information out there in our region from districts that are doing this that could be shared with districts that have not moved in that direction.

Is the purpose of the group to collect information and share?

Online learning is going to change all the rules of education. All of this is changing and it is going to hit school systems. We need to be prepared for when the change comes. There are benefits and issues that we haven't even thought about.

Chris Manasari made a motion that we endorse the idea of a committee to explore the issues and benefits related to online courses. Seconded by Tiffany.

#### Discussion

- Solicit information through district superintendents.
- Representation should include staff development, not necessarily BOCES staff development.
- Is there any connectivity to distance learning? Should the people who have been involved in distance learning be involved?
- The committee broadens out to the new alternative learning forms for staff development and instruction.

Motion amended to include broadening out to the new alternative learning forms for staff development and instruction.

- The first focus will be professional development. If you are looking at student instruction a representative of student instruction specialist needs to be involved.
- Establish a subcommittee of the steering committee to look at technology learning
- Is distance learning going to be obsolete in 2-7 years? How do you define distance learning, between two classrooms or through online courses.
- Issue is what is the current activity. Title III grant includes funds to have 80 students go through a SUNY course online and to then gather information from them.
- The committee's charge is not to solve problems, but to identify issues and activities.

Motion carried 7-0

#### **VI. Research and Development**

Suggest moving to early in next meeting with the following information provided:

- What is on the list now
- Funds allocated and for what
- Tracking the progress of the items
- How do we get other items on the list.

#### **Next meeting:**

December 8, 1999

Rochester Marriott Thruway, Council Room

8:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.

#### **Agenda Items:**

- 2000-2001 Budget with district pricing, R & D, External access (dial in access) status