eLearning Task Force
2007-2008 Legislative Report

April 29, 2008

Prepared by:

Cathy J. Poplin
Chair Person, eLearning Task Force
Deputy Associate Superintendent for Educational Technology
Arizona Department of Education

Tables of Contents

ELEARNING TASK FORCE BACKGROUND: **3**

TABLE 1: ELEARNING TASK FORCE MEMBERS **4**

MAJOR DUTIES **5**

ACTIVITIES BASED ON THE FOUR MAJOR DUTIES: 6

1. *Examine e-learning programs in other States* *6*
2. *Analyze potential methods to implement e-Learning programs in this State* *7*
3. *Develop innovative e-learning solutions* *8*
4. *Annually report to the legislature regarding e-Learning programs and solutions.* *9*

APPENDIX A: AGENDAS AND MINUTES **12**

APPENDIX B: REQUEST FOR INFORMATION **84**

APPENDIX C: PROJECT INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION **90**

APPENDIX D: REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL RFP ED08-0020 ..... **119**

APPENDIX E: DRAFT SCHOOL APPLICATION FOR MIDDLE SCHOOL MATH PILOT PROJECT **176**

eLearning Task Force Background:

The State of Arizona (Senate Bill 1512) established the eLearning Task Force (ELTF) during the 2006 Legislative Session. The task force is made up of the following appointees:

1. Two representatives of the business community with expertise in technology issues, one of whom shall be appointed by the Governor and one of whom shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

2. Two persons who shall have a background in psychometrics, one of whom shall be appointed by the President of the senate and one of whom shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

3. Two persons who have expertise in curriculum development, one of whom shall be appointed by the Governor and one of whom shall be appointed by the President of the Senate.

4. One teacher who provides instruction in grade six, seven, eight or nine in a public, private or charter school and who is appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

5. One person who represents a public, private or charter school that provides instruction in grade six, seven, eight or nine and who is appointed by the Governor.

6. One person who represents an entity that has at least ten years of experience in teacher training and professional development coursework and that has provided such training and coursework to at least five thousand teachers and who is appointed by the President of the Senate.

7. The Superintendent of Public Instruction or the Superintendent's designee.

8. The Director of the Government Information Technology Agency or the director's designee.

The eLearning task force has met sixteen times since its first meeting in December 2006. All agendas and minutes are posted at www.azed.gov/elearning. Cathy Poplin, Deputy Associate Superintendent for Educational Technology, is Superintendent Horne's appointee and was elected the chair person of the task force.

In the 2007 Legislative Session, the eLearning Task Force membership was expanded to include the following:

1. Two persons who represent higher education and who are experts in education technology and 21st century learning, one who is appointed by the President of the Senate and one who is appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

2. One person who has a background in online or digital format formative assessment, who is appointed by the Governor.

The current members of the ELTF are:

Table 1: eLearning Task Force Members

First Name	Last Name	Appointed By	Role	Organization	Title
Rosalina	Escandon	Governor	Represents a public, private or charter school that provides instruction in grade six, seven, eight or nine	Cartwright School District	Teacher on Special Assignment for Technology Training
Rod	Lenniger	Governor	Representative of the business community with expertise in technology issues	iCrossing, Inc.	Executive Vice President
Lisa	Long	Governor	Expertise in curriculum development	Tucson Unified School District	Curriculum, Instruction and Technology Integration Administrator
TBA	*TBA*	Governor	Online or digital format formative assessment	*TBA*	*TBA*
Sandi	Grandberry	President of the Senate	Expertise in curriculum development	For the Love of Software Company & AZ Legislative	Owner
Debra	Lorenzen	President of the Senate	Represents an entity that has at least ten years of experience in teacher training	ASSET-Eight, Arizona State University	Executive Director
Joseph	O'Reilly	President of the Senate	Background in psychometrics	Mesa School District	Executive Director of Student Achievement Support
TBA	*TBA*	President of the Senate	Higher education and who has experience in education technology and 21st Century Learning	*TBA*	*TBA*

First Name	Last Name	Appointed By	Role	Organization	Title
Vacant	*Vacant*	Speaker of the House of Representatives	Background in psychometrics	*Vacant*	*Vacant*
Theodore	Kraver	Speaker of the House of Representatives	Representative of the business community with expertise in technology issues	eLearning Systems for Arizona Teachers and Students	President
Casey	Loman	Speaker of the House of Representatives	Teacher who provides instruction in grade six, seven, eight or nine in a public, private or charter school	ReSolutions ESP, Inc.	Teacher
Mark	Nichols	Speaker of the House of Representatives	Represents higher education and an expert in education technology and 21st century learning,	Arizona State University	Manager of IDEAL
Cathy	Poplin	Superintendent of Public Instruction	Superintendent of Public Instruction designee	Arizona Department of Education	Deputy Associate for Educational Technology
DJ	Harper	GITA	Director of the Government Information Technology Agency designee	GITA	Communication Manager, GITA

In addition, Hank Stabler, retired IT Director, and Ruth Catalano, retired Ed Tech Director, are ADE consultants that assist Cathy Poplin and serve as staff support to the ELTF. Krystal Nesbitt, ADE Ed Tech Administrative Assistant, takes minutes and prepares meeting materials.

Major Duties

The ELTF is charged with the following four tasks:

1. Examine e-learning programs in other States.
2. Analyze potential methods to implement e-Learning programs in this State
3. Develop innovative e-learning solutions
4. Annually report to the legislature regarding e-Learning programs and solutions.

Activities Based on the four Major Duties:

1. Examine e-learning programs in other States

The ELTF reviewed the following documents:

- K-12 International Online Learning 2006 report
- 1 – 1 Learning: Laptop Programs That Work
- Washington Post: Software's benefits on tests in doubt
- Trujillo Commission on Online Education Final Findings & Recommendations
- eSchool News: Best Practices in School Technology K-20 Success Stories and Case Studies
- NACOL's Keeping Pace with K-12 Online Learning
- K-12 Online Learning: A Survey on U.S. School District Administrators
- SREB Educational Technology Cooperative: Technical Guidelines for Digital Learning Content Development, Evaluation, Selection, Acquisition and Use
- U.S. Department of Education Guide For Advanced Courses Online
- Network Nebraska - A collaborative effort under the auspices of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission (NITC) to share telecommunications resources, network services, and applications among eligible participants.
- GALILEO –Georgia's Virtual Library
- Connecting Students to Advanced Courses Online – US DOE

Hank Stabler, ADE consultant, reported to the Task Force how other states are developing their online learning. The bottom line: eLearning is approached differently around the US. The variables are as follows:

- Twenty-four states have state led programs
- Twenty-six have specific policies in place at the state level
- Ten states have their programs run by the Department of Education
- Other states have their programs run by a university (such as California)
- Some programs run self paced programs
- Some programs are face to face
- Some use virtual classrooms
- Virtual resources – providing websites
- Virtual courses
- Teaching & professional development
    - Use part time teachers
    - Provide online courses for teachers
- Where do the courses come from?
    - Developed locally
    - A few states go out & buy
    - Local universities develop

Cathy Poplin represented the eLearning Taskforce at 2007 National Leadership Development and Strategic Planning Symposium on K-16 Science Education for State Teams in September. The symposium was looking at how to strengthen the Science in STEM and heard how 25

states implementing research-based science programs.

Susan Patrick, CEO of NACOL (North American Council for Online Learning), spoke to the ELTF on the following items:

- Efforts being made to affect pre-service teachers in preparation for e-Learning.
- Essential conditions for providing quality eLearning programs and offerings.
- Best practices for procurement and adoption of digital curriculum that will help maximize accessibility, portability, usability and reusability.
- What advice would you have to help us move the eLearning effort forward in the State?
- Perspective on the continuum of on line learning from Hybrid to pure CAI.

2. Analyze potential methods to implement e-Learning programs in this State

The ELTF reviewed the following documents:

- AZ eLearning Consortium: Response to the Auditor General's performance audit of the Technology Assisted Project-Based Instruction Program (TAPBI)
- The annual reports of Arizona Technology Assisted Project Based Instruction (TAPBI) schools.
- The final report of the 21st Century Skills Summit

As reflected in the ELTF minutes over the past 14 months, the following groups haves presented information regarding eLearning in Arizona:

- Mesa TAPBI program
- Tempe District TAPBI program
- Pinnacle/Sequoia/Arizona Virtual Academy Charter Schools TAPBI program
- Group representing Charter School TAPBI schools
- Group representing District School TAPBI schools
- ADE's CTO on Ed Data Warehouse project
- Legislators - Senator Huppenthal (twice) and Representative Andy Tobin
- Executive Director of the Arizona Tech Council
- GITA regarding broadband capacity in Arizona (twice)

The ELTF has also:

- Supported the Arizona School's Facility Board's 21st Century Schools project by sending out an online survey which generated 206 responses. A team from the ELTF met with John Arnold of the School Facility Board to discuss further collaboration.
- Supported the 21st Century Skills Summit at the University of Arizona on October 25, 2007.
- Co-sponsored the eLearning Summit with GaZEL in February 2008. Experts from Arizona governance, business, eLearning enterprise and education produced inputs for policies and strategies to implement policies for eLearning transformation of Arizona education.
- Advised on the Instructional Technology Systems Pilot Project ($1 million to one K-8 school). One ELTF member reviewed the Phase I and II application process.

3. Develop innovative e-learning solutions

The legislation stipulates the creation of a three-year eLearning pilot program for middle school math to help schools achieve academic and motivational gains based on state and national standards. The scope of the pilot will be limited to three full academic years for up to a maximum of 10 sites and 10,000 or fewer students. The successful vendor must be able to provide a delivery system with program to deliver digital middle school mathematics content aligned to Arizona State Academic Standards. The program will provide the digital content with assessments for math grades 6 through 9 and laptop computers for all students and teachers in the pilot. The digital math content must be capable of scaling up to 50,000 students at over 225 districts and 450 charter schools at school and home. The digital content must also provide for students who are above or below grade level.

For the first several months, the ELTF focused on creating the Middle School Math Pilot RFP and has accomplished the following:

- Reviewed the following articles in preparation for the RFP:
  - What Works Clearing House Evidence Standards for Reviewing Studies
  - What Works Clearing House Middle School Math Curricula
  - What Works Clearing House Curriculum-Based Interventions for Increasing Middle School Math Achievement
- Developed the basic math pilot project requirements' document based on legislation.
- Developed and issued a Request for Information (RFI) to help guide creation of the Project Investment Justification (PIJ) for GITA in February 2007.
- Reviewed and analyzed RFI results.
- Created the PIJ for GITA compliance.
- ITAC presentation and approved on August 22, 2007.
- Received JBLC approval on September 20, 2007.
- Released Middle School Math Pilot **RFP ED08-0020** (found at end of report) on November 1, 2007.

On Friday, Nov 16, 2007, more than 60 people representing 33 vendors met for a Pre-Proposal Conference to ask questions regarding the RFP. On December 14, 2007 seventeen responses were received: 12 proposals and 5 no bids. The twelve proposals represent the following companies:

- Aventa
- Backbone Communications - A +
- Carnegie Learning
- CCS (RM is content provider)
- eCollege/eClassroom - Pearson
- Edu2000 America - Math Pathways
- Esylvan/Educate online Inc.
- JRL Enterprise - I Can Learn
- Link Systems International - NetTutor
- Plato
- Skills Tutor/Training Place

- Education Program for Gifted Youth @ Stanford University

Schools for the pilot will be selected through an application process developed by the eLearning Task Force (ELTF) in conjunction with the Arizona Department of Education (ADE). The selection process will ensure a representative sample of students reflecting, as close as possible, the state's student population profile. The number of participating sites and students will depend on the project's cost per student and the available funds. Laptops provided for the pilot must include wireless cards, meet the Arizona Government Information Technology Agency (GITA) platform standards and match the platform standard (PCs or Mac) of the pilot schools. The award will be based on the system that provides the highest quality digital content and professional development that focuses on effective teacher/student interaction.

A team of four evaluators and three area specific experts are in the process of evaluating the 12 proposals. The evaluation team has reviewed all twelve and has had clarification meetings with four vendors. By April, a recommendation will be given to JLBC for their approval before the Arizona Department of Education will award the contract. The Middle School Math Pilot will expend $2.75 million dollars over the next three years. Approximately $35,000 has been spent on ADE support staff and travel reimbursement thus far. The remaining funds will be spent on data integration hardware needed at the ADE and continued staff support.

The application for selecting the schools to participate in the Middle School Math project will be posted the end of April and schools will be given six weeks to submit their applications. The draft application is at the end of this report.

4. Annually report to the legislature regarding e-Learning programs and solutions.

The time line for the task force is 10 years. Based on the past 16 months review of national, state and local eLearning projects, the ELTF has developed a plan for 2008 with short range goals and strategies for both ELTT and Arizona K-12 education. The outline of a long range scenario for Arizona transformation with goals and strategies will be used as a framework for an eight year plan to be developed during 2008.

2008 – Examine/Analyze/Develop: Classroom Aspects of eLearning Focus

2008 will be an investigative year with primary focus on eLearning in the classroom including the online aspects that serve classroom education. The areas it will explore are:

- Computers in schools and classrooms
- Level of teacher capability to integrated eLearning into the classroom
- Broadband access in the classroom and community
- Data driven decision systems from classroom to state level integrated with e-learning

- Digital curriculum and online access and use
- Policies to support transformation to e-learning
- Cost benefits of investing in eLearning including Total Cost of Ownership
- Map of current initiatives such as Virtual Library/Classroom, STEM (Science Technology, Engineering and Mathematics, and 21st Century Learning.

The ELTF will also:

- Support and oversee the launch of the Middle School Math Pilot Project.
- Support the NACOL (North American Council for Online Learning) national 2008 Virtual School Symposium in Phoenix, October 26-28, 2008.
- Arrange presentations on major Arizona eLearning implementations from charter and traditional schools such as Carpe Diem Academy, Empire High School, Gilbert Classical Academy and a number of others.
- Select several experts who have researched effective and ineffective classroom adoption of eLearning, hear their presentations and study their findings.
- Support the revision of the Arizona Department of Education's Long Range Educational Technology Plan
- Attend the National Computers in Education Conference in San Antonio in late June, 2008. Members that attend will bring back information on innovation with eLearning programs from other states.

The ELTF will consider the following set of issues during 2008:

- Development of a common vision for e-learning's role in Arizona education
    - Determine a clear purpose
    - Define eLearning
    - Identify eLearning variations
    - Create engaging 8 year scenario of system of innovative e-leaning solution implementations and their effect on Arizona K-12 education
    - Selecting sequences of target populations to serve
    - Identifying measurements of success
- Creation of a Governance structure for eLearning
    - Centralized vs. Decentralized
- Development of appropriate and supporting policies/laws
    - Counting students – seat time vs. time to mastery
    - Quality and accountability
    - Data collection
    - Equitable access
    - Funding formulas
    - Online Safety
- Identify digital content standards to maximize
    - Accessibility
    - Portability

    - Usability
    - Reusability
- Establish certification requirements for eLearning teachers
    - Pre-service training
        - College of Educations role and responsibility
- In-service training
    - Mentoring and coaching models
- Development of standards for quality in online programs
- Identify options for funding online programs
    - Start-up costs
    - On-going costs
- Survey of available internet connectivity and infrastructure capacities
- Development of strategies to deal with access inequities
- Coordinate with GITA and other State agencies to develop broadband system
- Improvement of Inter-organizational coordination – State agencies, public/private clusters sharing common needs of connectivity and improved educational/training options.
- Determine how to brand our proposed innovation and what innovation diffusion process should be used to assure diffusion to all Arizona school children by 2017.

2009-2017 – Design/Recommend/Place/Enthuse: Innovation driven approaches to implementation of State wide availability of eLearning programs.

Since ELTF is made up of volunteers, recommendations for change will require a commitment for implementation from one or more Arizona agencies and organizations. ELTF will not just report recommendations. It will assure that they not only support ongoing innovative efforts but have recognized champions for implementation. .

Appendix A: Agendas and Minutes

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
1535 W. Jefferson Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Phone: (602) 364-1349

ARIZONA E-LEARNING TASK FORCE

MEETING NOTICE
OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

Date: Wednesday, December 20, 2006
Time: 2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Place: Department of Education, 1535 W. Jefferson Street, Conference Room 417

AGENDA

1. Welcome and Introductions

2. Review of S.B. 1512 and relevant State Laws by Arizona Department of Education staff

3. Election of Chairperson and Assignment of Terms

   Travel reimbursement – Margaret

4. Establish Meeting Schedule

   Suggested times 10 – 12 am or 1 – 3 pm

5. Public Testimony

6. Adjourn

MEMBERS

Chris Cummiskey
Jerry D'Agostino
Rosalina Escandon
Sandi Grandberry
Rod Lenniger
Lisa Long
Debra Lorenzen
Theodore Kraver
Joseph O'Reilly
Cathy Poplin
Casey Loman

Arizona E-Learning Task Force

Minutes of the Meeting
Wednesday December 20, 2006
2:00 Arizona Department of Education,
Conference Room 417

Members Present:

Chris Cummiskey, represented by DJ Harper
Jerry D'Agostino
Rosalina Escandon
Sandi Grandberry
Lisa Long
Debra Lorenszen
Theodore Kraver
Joseph O'Reilly
Cathy Poplin

Members Absent:
Rod Lenniger
Casey Loman

Art Harding called the meeting to order at 2:10 and attendance was noted.

Opening Remarks
Art Harding explained some of the logistics of the meetings such as the "Request to Speak" forms and Sign-in sheets in the back of the room. These lists will be used to generate an email list of interested people. The agenda will be posted in the Lobby of the Department of Education Building, on the E-Learning website and will also be emailed to the e-mail list. Mr. Harding also explained that travel may be reimbursed.

Review of S.B 1512 and relevant State Laws by Arizona Department of Education Staff
Mr. Harding briefly discussed the criteria by which the members of the Task Force were selected. These are:

- Two representatives of the business community with expertise in technology issues
- Two persons who shall have a background in psychometrics
- Two persons who have expertise in curriculum development
- One teacher who provides instruction in grade six, seven, eight or nine in a public, private or charter school
- One person who represents a public, private or charter school that provides instruction in grade six, seven, eight or nine
- One person who represents an entity that has at least ten years of experience in teacher training and professional development coursework and that has provided such training and coursework to at least five thousand teachers
- The Superintendent of Public Instruction or the Superintendent's designee.
- The Director of the Government Information Technology Agency or the Director's designee.

Mr. Harding explained that a chairperson will be elected annually and that each member's term limit would be set today. The expiration of the Task Force will be in 2016. Dr. Kraver asked who will appoint the next appointee when a member's term expires. Mr. Harding stated that the Public Official who appointed the member will appoint the replacement.

Mr. Harding stated that the Task Force's charge is to "Examine E-Learning methods in other states, analyze potential methods to implement e-learning programs in this state, develop innovative e-learning solutions, annually report to the legislature regarding e-learning programs and solutions.

Mr. Harding reminded the members that they are not eligible for compensation for their work on the Task Force however they may be reimbursed for travel.

Mr. Harding described the steps the Task Force must go through in order to develop an E-Learning Pilot Program as described by S.B. 1512. Up to 10 schools will be selected to take part in the pilot program. The task force will prepare and RFP to implement the three-year pilot program. The RFP will include: Scope of work, determine the qualifications required of an entity or group of entities that will be selected for the pilot program, copies of the contracts a successful bidder will be expect to sign, timeline for design and completion of the program and any other relevant information to the pilot program. A preliminary RFP will be submitted to JLBC for review and comment. Based on comments received the Task Force will finalize the RFP and ADE will issue a finalized RFP within 30 days after a hearing conducted by the JLBC. Mr. Harding noted that there was no indication is statute regarding the criteria JLBC will use and suggested asking JLBC to comment on this before submitting. Ten days before the ADE enters into a contract or contracts from the RFP the Superintendent of Public Instruction shall submit the provisions of the contract for review by the JLBC in executive session. The ADE shall award a contract or contracts within 180 days after the issuance of the finalized RFP.

Mr. Harding explained that the three-year pilot program will be delivered by an entity or entities that will provide reliable psychometric analysis of academic gains, evaluate coursework for alignment with the academic standards adopted by the state board of education, perform reliability analysis of electronic systems delivering coursework and assessments, analysis and direction towards system improvements and will deliver monthly reports on the performance of the system and directing any corrective steps required to achieve success.

After contract is awarded, ADE and the task force will establish criteria for schools to apply to take part in the program. Up to 10 schools that provide instruction to at least 2 grades of 6, 7, 8 or 9 may conduct the pilot program. Dr. Kraver clarified that this is intended to gain an understanding of how the student transitions from one grade to another. The selected schools must demonstrate that the teachers are committed to the program and must complete training.

Working with the Task Force, ADE must submit a report on or before 2010.

Dr. O'Reilly noted that the Task Force should move forward with the RFP quickly. Mr. Harding confirmed that it was necessary to move forward quickly given the amount of input required by JLBC and GITA.

Mr. Harding then gave the Task Force a description of Open Meeting Laws as they pertain to the Task Force. He noted that the Task Force has already registered with the Secretary of State's Office and established a web site for posting the agenda and minutes. Mr. Harding noted that it is not necessary to approve the minutes but they must be taken. Mr. Harding also advised that the Task Force err on the side of caution concerning open meeting laws.

Mr. Harding explained that any exchange of facts or opinions amongst a quorum is considered a meeting, this includes e-mail. Discussion of any topic that may end up on an agenda or that is potentially under the Task Force's charge is illegal to send to a quorum. Mr. Harding noted that emails determining a meeting time or location is acceptable. In the instance that a member wishes to distribute information to the entire Task Force it should be sent to the Chair and he/she can put it on the agenda for the next meeting. One –on-one discussion for clarification is acceptable.

Dr. Kraver noted that he sees the task force as requiring a lot more of work in between the meetings. Mr. Harding stated that he understood this but given the manner in which the Task Force was established that was not possible. Mr. Harding also noted that there may be a need for Executive Sessions in order to discuss contracts because they cannot be discussed in front of the public.

Dr. D'Agostino inquired if there could be potential conflicts of interest. Mr. Harding stated that he would look into what the regulations are for conflict of interest.

Mr. Harding noted that the Task Force is only allowed to discuss what is stated on the agenda. Nothing can be added to the agenda without 24 hour notice; however changes could be made up until 24 hours prior to the meeting. Public testimony cannot discuss an issue that is not on the agenda. Task force can respond to criticism of themselves but cannot speak about anything that is not on the agenda.

Election of Chairperson and Assignment of Terms

Each member drew the length of their terms. Mr. Lenniger and Ms. Loman's terms were drawn on their behalf. Ms. Poplin and Mr. Cummiskey's terms do not expire due to the terms of their appointment to the Task Force. The rest of the members drew as follows:

Three-year Term: Mr. Lenniger, Ms. Loman and Dr. Kraver
Two-year Term: Dr. O'Reilly, Ms. Grandberry and Ms. Long
One-year Term: Dr. D'Agostino, Ms. Escandon and Ms. Lorenzen

In the election for Chairperson, Ms. Grandberry nominated Ms. Poplin and Ms. Escandon seconded the motion. Mr. Kraver nominated himself. There was no discussion of the nominations. Dr. O'Reilly motioned that each person submit a written vote and whoever received the majority would be declared Chairperson. Dr. D'Agostino seconded the motion, the whole Task Force approved.

Ms. Poplin won the position of Chair with eight votes in her favor.

Establish Meeting Schedule

Dr. Kraver asked to include a member update on each agenda. Ms. Lorenzen was concerned that this could make the discussion to broad. Dr. Kraver said that it would enhance discussion and introduce new ideas. Mr. Harper suggested a time limit, Ms. Poplin agreed. Dr. Reilly suggested bringing handouts with the additional information; Ms. Poplin said these could possibly be posted to the website. Ms. Grandberry suggested a single sheet summary. Mr. Harding reminded the Task Force that these issues could be presented, yet not discussed. It could be presented and then placed on the

agenda for the next meeting. s. Poplin asked the task force if a motion was necessary for each decision. Mr. Harding stated that asking if there were any objections was sufficient at this time.

Ms. Poplin stated that Department of Education room space is hard to come by and that meetings need to be scheduled as soon as possible. Each member's packet included a meeting date availability sheet and each member was asked to fill it out.

Dr. Kraver asked if the Task Force could meet every two weeks since they were starting later than expected. Ms. Grandberry offered a training room at the Legislature for future meetings. Mr. Harding reminded that there needs to be seating for the public. Ms. Long asked if it was possible to phone in to meetings, Ms. Poplin confirmed that it was.

Ms. Poplin recommended January 17, 2007 as a next meeting date provided there was another location available. Ms. Grandberry and Ms. Lorenzen both offered rooms in their facilities. Ms. Escandon offered a room in her training facility after March 1st. The next meeting was set to be on January 17th at 10:00 AM at the ASSET facility.

Ms. Poplin stated that at the next meeting they will begin to look at a scope of work in order to flush out an RFP for to submit to the JLBC. Ms. Grandberry stated that the turn around time for JLBC can vary so they should work to finish it as quickly as possible.

Dr. O'Reilly suggested February 9, 2007 as another additional meeting date. Mr. Harper stated that GITA is not available for meetings on Fridays. Dr. O'Reilly suggested the ideal numbers of people to ensure are available for each meeting date to be quorum plus one, a total of eight people. A majority of members will be available for February 9th at 10 AM; a meeting is scheduled for that time.

Public Testimony

There was no Public Testimony

Ms. Poplin stated that travel forms could be emailed if members are interested. Stressed the importance of filling out a W-9 and that a Map Quest print out may be used for odometer readings. All paperwork should be sent to Ms. Poplin's Assistant Margaret Ivins.

Assignments: Begin looking into possible RFPs and submit examples to Ms. Poplin to be distributed to the group.

Dr. Kraver moved to adjourn, Dr. O'Reilly seconded the motion. All approved.
Meeting was adjourned at 3:15 P.M.

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
1535 W. Jefferson Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Phone: (602) 364-1349

ARIZONA E-LEARNING TASK FORCE

MEETING NOTICE
OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

Date: Wednesday, January 17, 2007
Time: 3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Place: ASSET ASU Community Services Building - 200 East Curry, Tempe, AZ 85281 Room 112

AGENDA

1. Welcome and Introductions
   a. Update from each Taskforce Member (2 minutes maximum)
2. Create Working Definition of "e-Learning" for Taskforce Efforts
3. Clarify Timeline of the Math Pilot Project
4. Review of Draft Request for Proposal
5. Create Committee to Plan Long Range eLearning Task Force Activities
6. Finalize Meeting Schedule
7. Public Testimony
8. Adjourn

MEMBERS

Chris Cummiskey
Jerry D'Agostino
Rosalina Escandon
Sandi Grandberry
Rod Lenniger
Lisa Long
Debra Lorenzen
Theodore Kraver
Joseph O'Reilly
Cathy Poplin
Casey Loman

People with disabilities may request accommodations such as interpreters, alternative formats, or assistance with physical accessibility. Requests for accommodations must be made with 72 hours prior notice. If you require accommodations, please contact Elizabeth Tuttle at (602) 364-2425.

Arizona E-Learning Task Force

Minutes of the Meeting
Wednesday January 17, 2007
3:00 pm - 5:00 pm
ASSET offices
200 E Curry, Tempe, AZ.

Members Present:

Chris Cummiskey, represented by DJ Harper
Rosalina Escandon
Casey Loman
Debra Lorenzen
Theodore Kraver
Joseph O'Reilly
Theodore Kraver
Cathy Poplin
Rod Lenniger (via phone)

Members Excused:

Jerry D'Agostino
Sandi Grandberry
Lisa Long

Handouts

- Meeting Agenda
- Submission Summary
- 1st draft of RFP
- A Synthesis of New Research on K-12 Online Learning

Welcome and Introductions – Reminder that the meeting is digitally recorded and available for full review.

Cathy Poplin called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm and attendance was noted.
Cathy Poplin welcomed the group and reviewed norms of the taskforce. Sandi Grandberry created a Submission Summary form for use of Task Force meeting.

Create Working Definition of "e-Learning" for Taskforce Efforts

A discussion of the group as a whole on the definition of e-Learning was conducted.
Several Task Force members had written contributions which were shared. The definition accepted is: *The use of electronic technologies or ICT (Information and Communication Technology) in education. E-Learning may occur both in distance and conventional education and may involve electronic media that do not use online delivery*.

Clarify Timeline of the Math Pilot Project

Following the lengthy discussion about the evident discrepancies in the timeline in the legislation and where the Task Force is in the process, a new timeline was suggested (incorporated in Draft 3 of the RFP). It was acknowledged that this would probably change several times before the RFP is released. The timeline will be updated with each draft of the RFP. There was much discussion of the implementation model (what grades to start, where and how laptops transfer) and where and how often

Professional Development will be needed. A major discussion was about the grade levels in the first cohort and how to maximize the dollar exposure for both student learning/exposure. Further discussion took place on timing of implementation (beginning, middle, end of a school year) and how much innovation and additional work the pilot would put on the LEAs involved. A lengthy discussion took place regarding how laptops would be assigned/transferred and what schedule changes a pilot this small (generally not impacting an entire school or grade level) could be expected.

Review of Draft Request for Proposal

There was lengthy discussion on the details of the RFP. The conclusion was to make it general enough to allow vendors to demonstrate innovation and tight enough to be able to differentiate in a scoring/selection process.

Specific sections were reviewed:

- Project Administration
- Technical Requirements
- Digital Content

Task Force members were again asked to review the Draft RFP line by line for further discussion at the next meeting.

Mrs. Poplin set up deadline for revisions by 24th of January. Mrs. Poplin will send out new RFP to the task force group on the 29th.

Create Committee to Plan Long Range eLearning Task Force Activities

Discussion of future tasks or direction of the Task Force resulted in consensus that the primary task for the present is to get the RFP completed, and then the research and other aspects of the legislation will be addressed.

Finalize Meeting Schedule

The meeting schedule was reviewed and will be posted on the website as well as emailed to members. www.azed.gov/E-Learning

Public Testimony

There was no Public Testimony

Adjourn

All approved. Officially adjourned at 5:05 pm

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
1535 W. Jefferson Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Phone: (602) 364-1349

ARIZONA E-LEARNING TASK FORCE

MEETING NOTICE
OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

Date: Tuesday, January 30, 2007
Time: 1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
Place: Arizona Department of Education, Room 417

AGENDA

1. Welcome and Introductions
   a. Update from each Taskforce Member (2 minutes maximum)
2. Review of 2nd Draft Request for Proposal
3. Public Testimony
4. Adjourn

MEMBERS

Chris Cummiskey
Jerry D'Agostino
Rosalina Escandon
Sandi Grandberry
Rod Lenniger
Lisa Long
Debra Lorenzen
Theodore Kraver
Joseph O'Reilly
Cathy Poplin
Casey Loman

People with disabilities may request accommodations such as interpreters, alternative formats, or assistance with physical accessibility. Requests for accommodations must be made with 72 hours prior notice. If you require accommodations, please contact Elizabeth Tuttle at (602) 364-2425.

Arizona E-Learning Task Force

Minutes of the Meeting
Tuesday January 30, 2007
1:00 pm – 3:00 pm
Arizona Department of Education,
Conference Room 417

Members Present:

Chris Cummiskey, represented by DJ Harper
Rosalina Escandon
Casey Loman
Debra Lorenzen
Theodore Kraver
Cathy Poplin
Lisa Long (via phone)

Members Absent:

Jerry D'Agostino
Sandi Grandberry
Rod Lenniger
Joseph O'Reilly

Handouts:

- Future Meeting Date handout
- 2nd Draft of the RFP
- Spreadsheet for e-Learning pilot program (timeline)
- AIMS 2006 Math Results PowerPoint
- AIMS Mathematics Blueprint (beginning spring 2005)

Welcome and Introductions – Reminder that the meeting is digitally recorded and available for full review.

Cathy Poplin called the meeting to order at 1:00 pm and Task Force members were introduced. Updates were given as follows:

- Theodore Kraver- passes out handout. Gives opinion on goals of the E Learning Taskforce group
- Lisa Long- Has been looking at the RFP from a curriculum side
- Cathy Poplin- explains that she was in Florida last week for the Florida Educational Technology Conference
- Other members had no update

Review of 2nd Draft Request for Proposal:

The consultants had created a two page list of assumptions used in developing the RFP. There were some that the Task Force was asked to review and accept or reject. This was done and the results will be incorporated into Draft 3 of the RFP.

A line by line review of the RFP was started. There was a need for extensive discussion to come to a

common understanding of specific terms and concepts among the committee members. These results will be reflected in Draft 3 of the RFP.

Those in attendance moved to small group work to review the following sections of the Draft 2 RFP:

- Professional Development - Ruth Catalano, Debra Lorenzen, Ted Kraver and Casey Loman
- Student Assessment - Rosalina Escandon, Lisa Long and Cathy Poplin
- Technical Requirements - DJ Harper and Hank Stabler

The Task Force agreed to extend the meeting time past the posted time in order to capture the small group work. The results of the small group reports are reflected in Draft 3 including the handout – a Model of implementation from the Technical Requirements group.

Public Testimony

Brian Page (Apple) expressed excitement about the project.

Adjourn

All approved. Officially adjourned at 3:15 pm

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
1535 W. Jefferson Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Phone: (602) 364-1349

ARIZONA E-LEARNING TASK FORCE
MEETING NOTICE
OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

Date: Friday, February 9, 2007
Time: 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Place: Arizona Department of Education, Room 417

AGENDA

1. Welcome and Introductions
   a. Update from each Taskforce Member (2 minutes maximum)

2. Possibility of Creating an RFI (Request for Information) – Hank Stabler

3. Project Investment Justification (PIJ) Process Update - Cathy Poplin

4. Review of 3rd Draft Request for Proposal Issues – Entire Taskforce

   a. 3 yr Implementation Process

   b. Psychometric requirements

   c. Data Collection Reporting Standards/ADE Standards

   d. Project Evaluation – Outside 3rd Party

5. Process to Formalize Changes in Implementation of SB-1512 - *Tentative*

6. Potential Conflict of Interest of eLearning Taskforce Members – *Tentative*

7. Public Testimony

8. Adjourn

MEMBERS

Chris Cummiskey
Jerry D'Agostino
Rosalina Escandon
Sandi Grandberry
Rod Lenniger
Lisa Long
Debra Lorenzen
Theodore Kraver
Joseph O'Reilly
Cathy Poplin
Casey Loman

Arizona E-Learning Task Force

Minutes of the Meeting
Friday February 9, 2007
10:00am – 12 pm
Arizona Department of Education,
Conference Room 417

Members Present:

Rosalina Escandon
Casey Loman
Lisa Long (via telephone)
Debra Lorenzen
Theodore Kraver
Joseph O'Reilly
Cathy Poplin

Members Absent:

Chris Cummiskey
Jerry D'Agostino
Sandi Grandberry
Rod Lenniger

Handouts:

- Assumptions on Budget- DJ Harper
- Assumptions on Budget- Hank Stabler
- Assumptions on Budget- Ruth Catalano
- Assumptions on Budget – Ted Kraver
- What Works Clearing House Evidence Standards for Reviewing Studies
- What Works Clearing House Middle School Math Curricula
- What Works Clearing House Curriculum-Based Interventions for Increasing Middle School Math Achievement
- 3rd Draft of the RFP

Welcome and Introductions – Reminder that the meeting is recorded on tape and available for full review.

Cathy Poplin calls the meeting to order at 10:02 am. Each Task Force member was introduced.

- Cathy Poplin gave handouts from the *What Works Clearinghouse* website pertaining to middle school math. She also provided a copy of "What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards for Reviewing Studies."
- Theodore Kraver- passed out a packet of information which could help the RFP
- Other members had no update

Possibility of Creating an RFI (Request for Information) – Hank Stabler

Following background information on the RFI (Request for Information) process and the advantages and based on recommendations from personnel at ADE, the taskforce decided that an RFI will be created and

disseminated as soon as possible. The work on the RFP will continue.

Project and Investment Justification (PIJ) Process Update - Cathy Poplin

After an explanation of the PIJ process and the requirements to do this, the committee agreed to review the PIJ draft at the Feb 20 meeting. Cathy Poplin will work with ADE staff to begin the process.

Review of 3rd Draft Request for Proposal Issues – Entire Taskforce

The entire eLearning Task Force reviewed the 3rd draft line by line and made numerous suggestions and changes throughout. The Task Force reviewed approximately half way through the Assessment section. A 4th draft is to be presented to the eLearning Task Force electronically the week of Feb 12th and will begin review at the point the last review ended for the February 20th meeting. The ADE consultants were directed to begin the creation of the RFP rubric based on the work done. A specific request was made to begin the 20th agenda with a review of the goals of the RFP as stated and to select one of the models of implementation provided to the eLearning Task Force.

Process to Formalize Changes in Implementation of SB-1512
Potential Conflict of Interest of eLearning Taskforce Members

Cathy Poplin contacted the Attorney General's office regarding formalizing changes in the implementation of SB-1512 and potential conflict of issues that may arise among Task Force members. The Attorney General's office will be in contact with Cathy Poplin with clarifications. These will be shared at future meetings.

Public Testimony

No Public Testimony

Adjourn

Meeting was adjourned at 12:07 pm

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
1535 W. Jefferson Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007
Phone: (602) 364-1349

ARIZONA E-LEARNING TASK FORCE

MEETING NOTICE
OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

Date: Tuesday, February 20, 2007
Time: 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Place: Arizona Department of Education, Room 417

AGENDA

1. Welcome and Introductions
   a. Update from each Taskforce Member (2 minutes maximum)

2. Potential Conflict of Interest – Kim S. Anderson, Assistant Attorney General **(Pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431.03.A.3, the Task Force may vote to go into Executive Session, which will not be open to the public, for legal advice concerning this agenda item.)**

3. Review of 4th Draft Request for Proposal Issues – Entire Taskforce

   a. Review RFP Goals

   b. Select 3 yr Implementation Model

   c. Finalize Psychometric requirements

   d. Update on Project Evaluation – Outside 3rd Party

4. Progress of RFI (Request for Information) – Hank Stabler

5. Progress of Project Investment Justification (PIJ) Process - Cathy Poplin

6. Process to Formalize Changes in Implementation of SB-1512 - Cathy Poplin

7. Public Testimony

8. Adjourn

MEMBERS

Chris Cummiskey
Jerry D'Agostino
Rosalina Escandon
Sandi Grandberry
Rod Lenniger
Lisa Long
Debra Lorenzen
Theodore Kraver
Joseph O'Reilly
Cathy Poplin
Casey Loman

Arizona E-Learning Task Force

Minutes of the Meeting
Tuesday February 20, 2007
10:00am – 12:00pm
Arizona Department of Education
Conference Room 417

Members Present:

Sandi Grandberry	Hank Stabler - ADE
Theodore Kraver	Joseph O'Reilly
Cathy Poplin	DJ Harper – representing Chris Cummiskey
Rosalina Escandon	Casey Loman

Members Not Present:
Jerry D'Agostino
Rod Lenniger
Lisa Long
Debra Lorenzen

Handouts:
- Agenda
- RFP-4th Draft
- RFI Draft
- 1/17/07 Meeting Minutes
- 1/30/07 Meeting Minutes
- 2/9/07 Meeting Minutes
- Timeline Spreadsheet – Ruth and Hank
- Assumptions on Budget
- e70204 Two Models
- Memo regarding Conflict of Interest
- e70219 E Learning Task Force Meeting Input – Theodore Kraver

Welcome and Introduction – Reminder that the meeting is recorded on tape and available for full review.
Cathy Poplin called the meeting to order at 10:05am. Updates were given at the end of the meeting.

Executive Session Begins (Private/Non Public)
Task Force members vote to go into Executive Session with the purpose to obtain legal advice. This session is confidential.

Adjourn
Theodore Kraver motions to adjourn executive session – group approves

Public Session Begins - Review of 4th Draft Request for Proposal (RFP) Issues
1. Task Force began public session by reviewing the Project Goals. Theodore Kraver provided each Task Force member a hand out on his viewpoints regarding the project goals.
    - Discussion occurs regarding the project goals.
    - An E-Learning adoption manual for curriculum directors; this was decided to be a goal for the Task Force not the RFP.

(Casey Loman left the meeting at 11:00am.)

Discussion of page 4

- Line 3: Student motivation, student achievement, and teacher training and teacher perceptions.
- Line 4: Two or three continuous grades; strike "at least."
- Line 15-19: Task Force decided this section is important to keep but put it under the project overview. Make goal to document the whole process and provide documentation.

2. Task Force discussed finalization of the 3 year Implementation Model.

- Hank Stabler begins the discussion by explaining his spreadsheet.
- Task Force goes over "Timeline and Design Considerations for E-Learning Pilot Project."
- Theodore Kraver discusses his spreadsheet
- DJ Harper provides a document that goes with Hank & Theodore's spreadsheets

Sandi Granberry makes a motion to accept the proposed timeline and it will be used as an internal document; Theodore Kraver seconded the motion and the group agreed. (Posted on E-Learning Task Force website www.azed.gov/E-Learning under ***February 20, 2007*** minutes)

3. Finalize Psychometric Requirements
Task Force made changes under this section as follows:

- Page 8 Line 12 – add "s" to assessment
- Add the language "that is capable of providing computer adaptive tests".
- Page 8 Line 14 provide feedback quickly

(DJ Harper leaves the meeting at 11:45am.)

Adjourn
Meeting adjourned at 11:45am. Remaining members decided to just give updates at this time.

Updates

1. Progress of RFI – Hank Stabler
   - The information given from Procurement will take two weeks to finalize, four weeks to hit the street and two weeks to collect data.
   - ADE – Richard Adickes in Procurement is who Hank has been working with.

2. Progress of Project Investment Justification (PIJ) – Cathy Poplin
   - Met with Steve Holzinger of ADE; by March 8th we could have a copy ready for the meeting
   - Try implementing an off the shelf software since we are not creating a software

3. Process to Formalize Changes in Implementation of SB1512 – Cathy Poplin
   - Cathy met with Kim Anderson. Kim suggested we write a progress memo regarding any changes and/or modifications we have made and invite a member of the Senate to attend meetings and receive updates.

Public Testimony
Dale Parcell explained how we could use West Ed for the project evaluation.

Meeting End
Meeting was ended at 12:06pm

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
1535 W. Jefferson Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007
Phone: (602) 364-1349

ARIZONA E-LEARNING TASK FORCE

MEETING NOTICE
OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

Date: Thursday, March 8, 2007
Time: 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Place: Arizona Department of Education, Room 417

1. Welcome and Introductions
   a. Update from each Taskforce Member (2 minutes maximum)
2. Review of 4th Draft Request for Proposal Issues – Entire Taskforce
   a. Finalize Psychometric requirements
   b. Update on Project Evaluation – Outside 3rd Party
3. Progress of RFI (Request for Information) and Possible Vendor List – Hank Stabler
4. Progress of Project Investment Justification (PIJ) - Cathy Poplin
5. Insights from SB1512 Sponsor *(Tentative)* – Sen. John Huppenthal**
6. Public Testimony
7. Adjourn

MEMBERS

Chris Cummiskey
Jerry D'Agostino
Rosalina Escandon
Sandi Grandberry
Rod Lenniger
Lisa Long
Debra Lorenzen
Theodore Kraver
Joseph O'Reilly
Cathy Poplin
Casey Loman

People with disabilities may request accommodations such as interpreters, alternative formats, or assistance with physical accessibility. Requests for accommodations must be made with 72 hours prior notice. If you require accommodations, please contact Elizabeth Tuttle at (602) 364-2425.

**The Arizona Legislature goes into session at 10 am. Sen. Huppenthal may be able to attend at the end of the meeting.

Arizona E-Learning Task Force

Minutes of the Meeting
Thursday March 8, 2007
10:00am – 12:00pm
Arizona Department of Education,
Conference Room 417

Members Present:

Rosalina Escandon
Casey Loman
Debra Lorenzen
DJ Harper
Sandi Granberry
Theodore Kraver
Joseph O'Reilly
Rod Lenniger
Jerry D'Agostino
Cathy Poplin

Members Not Present:

Lisa Long

Handouts:

- Reaching for the Stars Science & Technology Conference – Rosalina Escandon
- 1-To-1 Learning Laptop Programs That Work
- MEC 2007 Conference
- Copy of SB 1503
- 4th draft of RFP

Welcome and Introductions – *Reminder that the meeting is recorded on tape and available for full review.*

Cathy Poplin calls the meeting to order at 10:00am. Each Task Force member introduced themselves.

- Cathy Poplin gave information pertaining to the MEC 2007 Conference and passed out a signup sheet.
- Cathy Poplin also gave each member the book *1-To-1 Learning Laptop Programs That Work*
- Casey Loman attended the Core Knowledge National Conference in Washington, D.C.; where she met Paul Drossmond of Peak School in Flagstaff. Paul's school is the only one to receive a U.S. Department of Education Dissemination Grant. The grant deals with the tracking of student assessments and achievements through computer based learning programs. Casey will share the information she receives from Paul with the E-Learning Task Force.
- Theodore Kraver spoke about the amendment to HB2472 being sponsored by Mark Anderson, which is going through legislative process. The amendment will support a state wide survey to determine broadband access to schools.
- Rosalina Escandon's district is hosting technology conference March 19-21, 2007.
- Other members had no update

Review of 4th Draft Request for Proposal Issues – Entire Taskforce

The entire ELearning Task Force reviewed the 4th draft line by line starting with Student Assessment. The task force made numerous suggestions and changes within Student Assessment. The following sections have been rearranged and should be listed as follows:

A. Digital Product
B. Professional Development
C. Student Assessment
D. Evaluation.

Update on Progress of the Request for Information
The RFI is ready to go and should be on the streets in one week**.** One member asked, how are we publishing the RFI? The RFI will be mailed out to the ADE Vendor list and will be sent to E-Learning Taskforce members to send to any vendors. RFIs are normally not posted to the web.

Progress of Project Investment Justification (PIJ) – Hank Stabler
The recommendation from GITA is to wait until the RFI data is back before we complete the PIJ. The Task Force also discussed the ownership of the data. Majority decided that the data will belong to ADE. Rod Lenniger suggested that if a Task Force member has not seen a PIJ or is not familiar with what a PIJ is to look over a copy of one. Cathy Poplin said she will send out copies.

Insights from SB1512 Sponsor – Sen. John Huppenthal (unable to attend)
In Sen. Huppenthal's absence, Cathy Poplin and Hank Stabler presented his vision for real-time feedback to the student and the class (cumulative) in the form of a "scoreboard". The "scoreboard" will be used to increase motivation for the students and will show feedback in real time for in class use; with focus on group and individual incentives. The taskforce suggested crafting language into the RFI about increasing student motivation but not limited to the scoreboard in order to gain more ideas from the vendor regarding motivation within their systems approach. By consensus, the taskforce decided to put motivation under Digital Product and Student Assessment for the existing RFP.

Public Testimony
Three visitors were present:
Beth Sour – School Board Association
Michael Koop – Cisco Learning Institute
Sherman Moeller – Formally with Cisco Learning Institute; Father of school age children.

Adjourn

Meeting was adjourned at 12:20pm

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
1535 W. Jefferson Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Phone: (602) 364-1349

ARIZONA E-LEARNING TASK FORCE

MEETING NOTICE
OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

Date: Thursday, April 5, 2007
Time: 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Place: Arizona Department of Education, Room 417

AGENDA

1. Welcome and Introductions
   a. Update from each Taskforce Member (2 minutes maximum)
2. Insights from SB1512 Sponsor – Sen. John Huppenthal
3. Update on RFI (Request for Information) – Cathy Poplin
4. E-Learning in Other States – Hank Stabler
5. Review of 5th Draft Request for Proposal Issues – Entire Taskforce
   a. Finalize Psychometric requirements
   b. Update on Project Evaluation – Outside 3rd Party
6. Public Testimony
7. Adjourn

MEMBERS

Chris Cummiskey
Jerry D'Agostino
Rosalina Escandon
Sandi Grandberry
Rod Lenniger
Lisa Long
Debra Lorenzen
Theodore Kraver
Joseph O'Reilly
Cathy Poplin
Casey Loman

Arizona E-Learning Task Force

Minutes of the Meeting
Thursday April 5, 2007
10:00am – 12:00pm
Arizona Department of Education
Conference Room 417

Members Present:

Rosalina Escandon
Rod Lenniger
Joseph O'Reilly
Cathy Poplin
Debra Lorenzen
Theodore Kraver
DJ Harper

Members Not Present:

Chris Cummiskey
Jerry D'Agostino
Lisa Long
Sandi Grandberry

Handouts:

- Washington Post: Software's benefits on tests in doubt –
- Eb70405USDOE20042005 Ed Software Test
- Trujillo Commission on Online Education *Final Findings & Recommendations*
- eSchool News: Best Practices in School Technology *K-20 Success Stories and Case Studies* Keeping Pace with K-12 Online Learning
- K-12 Online Learning A Survey on U.S. School District Administrators
- SREB Educational Technology Cooperative: Technical Guidelines for Digital Learning Content Development, Evaluation, Selection, Acquisition and Use
- Email from SETDA: Software's Benefits On Tests In Doubt
- Responses to E-Learning Pilot Project RFI
- Project Investment Justification (PIJ)
- 4th Draft of the RFP

Welcome and Introduction – Reminder that the meeting is recorded on tape and available for full review.

Cathy Poplin called the meeting to order at 10:05am. Cathy asked Task Force members for updates.

- Theodore Kraver
  - E-Learning Study on software curriculum products for 2004-2005; article was from the Washington Post. The study did not show that technology made a difference in student achievement and painted educational technology in a very negative way.
  - Legislative Bill update (HB 2742) - The House heard the E-Learning bill for $10 million by Rep. Mark Anderson; everything is in the budget, when the budget is passed the bill will automatically be passed. Ted was not sure if we will get all $10 million.
  - Cathy Poplin asked if there was anything we can do to help get the HB2742 passed?
  - Ted suggested 2-3 people from a particular district contact their legislative representative via email or call.

- Rod Lenniger brought the final findings & recommendations from the Trujillo Commission on Online Education. And a similar article from eSchool News Best Practices.
- Debra Lorenzen informed the Task Force that ADE will be part of a 10 state formative assessment program. ADE will identify two high schools within the state to participate. ASSET was brought in to help create an online environment for these two high school study teams to work with. The content is provided by the grant; the content was created by formative assessment guru Rick Stiggens. Debra will keep the Task Force updated as this program develops.
- Rosalina Escandon briefed the Task Force about her district's tech conference. Had a wonderful turn out, mostly hands on, which the teachers liked more than just lectures. Looking into having the conference again next year, maybe doing it in October, instead of March.
- Cathy Poplin began her update and handed out an email from SETDA (State Education Technology Director's Association) refuting a national study on math software that was just released by the US DOE. SETDA is also working with other organizations to propose a new Ed Tech program within the reauthorization of No Child Left Behind.
- Cathy went to the COSN conference last week. The main focal point of the conference was 1-to-1 learning. An organization called The Anytime Anywhere Learning Foundation (AALF) was there. Their presentation was on *Leading 1-to-1 Summit: The Essential Blueprint for Superintendents and Principals;* which ties into our 1-to-1 learning. AALF is having more workshops if anyone is interested, Cathy has more information.

Responses to E-Learning Pilot Project RFI
Task Force has received twenty-five responses from various vendors. If there are any other vendors that are interested or may be more qualified please have them respond to the RFI.
Cathy asked the Task Force how they would like to receive the summary of the RFI - either a detailed summary or an executive summary. Ted requested a detailed summary and the other members requested an executive summary.

Project Investment Justification (PIJ)
Cathy gave each member a PIJ packet to help answer questions regarding the PIJ. When it comes to writing the PIJ, this is what will have to fill out. Rod Lenniger suggested that when it comes to writing the PIJ, we contact other agencies for advice.

E-Learning in Other States – Hank Stabler
Hank Stabler took this time to share with the Task Force how other states are developing their online learning. Hank gave a summary of the handouts he gave to each member; each state is approaching E-Learning differently. The variables are as follows:

- Twenty-four states have state led programs
- Twenty-six have specific policies in place at the state level
- Ten states have their programs run by the Department of Education
- Other states have their programs run by a university (such as California)
- Some programs run self paced
- Some programs are face to face
- Don't differentiate between online teachers
- The use of virtual classrooms
- Virtual resources – passing out websites
- Virtual courses
- Teaching & professional development
    - Use part time teachers
    - Providing online courses for teachers
- Where do the courses come from?

- Developed locally
- A few states go out & buy
- Local universities develop

Senator John Huppenthal Vision for SB1512

Senator John Huppenthal was able to share his passion and insights into the SB1512 legislation. He began by sharing his vision for SB1512 as an author of the bill. Over the years, he noticed that the high performance companies around the country measured their total performance of the company and provided feedback to the company in a positive light. The low performance companies measured their performance on an individual level and provided that feed back to the company in a positive light. He based SB1512 on this principal.

The legislation states that in classroom technology will be used to measure the performance of said classroom on ***a real time basis*** and in an environment where the computer will provide the student testing (in a progressive manner) and then evaluate the student's performance. Senator Huppenthal indicated that this meant to total each student's performance and calculate the total performance of the whole classroom.

Senator Huppenthal asked Task Force if they had any questions:

- *Q. What if the vendors we ask don't have a product like the one we are looking for?*
  A. There is enough money in the budget to create the product we need.
- *Q. With a focus on individual learning, how do you handle students at different levels of learning?*
  A. This environment will allow for one student to be on a different level then another student. Ex. One child on 2nd grade level & another on 3rd grade level. In the high performance companies, collaboration is a must. We must reinforce the "total performance" of the classroom.
- *Q. How do we implement motivation?*
  A. Fundamentals of human motivation (2nd & 3rd points are the most important)
    1. **Survive** – Learn
       The idea that we need to "learn" in order to survive is not prevalent in today's society.
    2. **Join** – Join a team, students will work in a team setting
    3. **Gain Status** - To show the students their "status" we must rank the students. Example: 1st, 2nd, 3rd…etc. The only way to move up in ranking is to be positive with their peers. Reward the team not the individual (intrinsic values verses extrinsic values) Example given: Everyone works as a team to catch the elephant; everyone gets the reward for catching the elephant, just a little higher reward to those with a higher performance.

(Senator John Huppenthal left the meeting to return to Arizona Legislature which was in session.) Task Force members decided that the vision needs to be stated clearly in the RFP so vendors will understand what is needed for "motivational gain".

Public Testimony

Three visitors were present:

Kathy Elerick – Learning Station Vendor
John Kelly – Triadvocates
Doris Sawner – Educational Options -

Adjourn

Meeting was adjourned at 12:15pm

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
1535 W. Jefferson Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Phone: (602) 364-1349

ARIZONA E-LEARNING TASK FORCE

MEETING NOTICE
OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

Date: Tuesday, May 8, 2007
Time: 1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
Place: Arizona Department of Education, Room 417

AGENDA

1. Welcome and Introductions
   a. Update from each Taskforce Member (2 minutes maximum)
2. Report of RFI Findings
3. Recommendations for PIJ and RFP based on RFI Findings
4. E-Learning Task Force Summer Meeting Dates
5. Public Testimony
6. Adjourn

MEMBERS

Chris Cummiskey
Jerry D'Agostino
Rosalina Escandon
Sandi Grandberry
Rod Lenniger
Lisa Long
Debra Lorenzen
Theodore Kraver
Joseph O'Reilly
Cathy Poplin
Casey Loman

People with disabilities may request accommodations such as interpreters, alternative formats, or assistance with physical accessibility. Requests for accommodations must be made with 72 hours prior notice. If you require accommodations, please contact Elizabeth Tuttle at (602) 364-2425.

Arizona E-Learning Task Force

Minutes of the Meeting
Tuesday May 8, 2007
1:00pm – 3:00pm
Arizona Department of Education
Conference Room 419

Members Present:
Casey Loman
Theodore Kraver
DJ Harper – Representing Chris Cummiskey
Debra Lorenzen
Sandi Grandberry
Joseph O'Reilly
Cathy Poplin
Rosalina Escandon – via phone

Members Not Present:
Jerry D'Agostino
Lisa Long
Rod Lenniger

Handouts:
- May 7, 2007 agenda
- Minutes from the February 20, 2007 meeting
- Minutes from the April 5, 2007 meeting
- Enhancing Education Through Technology Grant Reviewer application
- Email from Javan Mesnard and copy of Proposed Amendment-Senate Amendments to S.B. 1094 (changes to SB1512)
- Report of RFI findings – Theodore Kraver
- Review and assessment of 25 responses from vendors to the RFI
- 2/21/07 draft of the PIJ
- E-Learning Task Force future meeting dates ballot

Welcome and Introductions – Reminder that the meeting is recorded on tape and available for full review.
Cathy Poplin called the meeting to order at 1:09pm. Cathy asked Task Force members for updates.
- Theodore Kraver opened with an update on House Bill 2742. Rep. Anderson said it is in the budget with an estimated amount of 3.1 to 4 million dollars (house budget). The Governor and Senate are currently working on the Senate budget. Ted will keep the Task Force up to date on the budgets progress.
- DJ Harper wanted to make a few corrections to the Feb. 20th minutes. It was stated in the minutes that when he left early at 11:45am the Task Force did not have a quorum. The Task Force in fact did have a quorum; six members are needed for a quorum. When he left the Task Force still had six members present. Also, DJ wanted to make a note on the April 5th minutes. The minutes did not state he was representing Chris Cummiskey.
- Debra Lorenzen gave an update on the new 45-hour SEI course ASSET is offering. Open registration begins in July. The course will fill up fast.
- Cathy Poplin asked members if they were interested in helping review the Enhancing Education Through Technology (EETT) Grants that are due May 18th. Compensation is $350 for evaluation

services for each reviewer. Those that are interested were asked to complete an application and return to Cathy. Members will be notified by May 15th if they were selected.

- Cathy also shared with the Task Force that she received an email from Javan Mesnard, Senate staffer who helped write SB1512. Javan made a few modifications to the timeline given in SB1512 which will allow more time for the RFP and the beginning of the math pilot project. Javan does not think this will impact the budget and does not see a problem with getting it approved.

Report of RFI Findings
Theodore Kraver had volunteered to review the RFI documents and presented his findings to the Task Force. Twenty-four organizations responded out of 1000+ invitations. Ted only reviewed the responses to twenty-one questions. Responses ranged from a few pages to an inch of documents and CD's and the answers ranged from very, very good to not answering the question at all. Ted suggested the Task Force be more specific with the 6th – 9th grade middle school math requirements in the RFP. He felt the responses to this section in the RFI were too general.

Ted also recommended that the Task Force determine what redesign was needed in the layout of the RFP and do substantial work to relate RFI responses to current RFP draft. He cautioned to not make the RFP so specific that it excluded possible vendor responses. Task Force members asked for a spreadsheet of the vendors' responses to make for an easier read of said responses to the RFI before the next Task Force meeting.

Joseph O'Reilly arrives at 2:15pm

Recommendations for PIJ and RFP
Cathy Poplin gave a draft of the eLearning Pilot Program PIJ (Project Investment Justification), written by Steve Holzinger, ADE's IT department, to each task force member. She reported that Steve was able to fill much of the PIJ by just reading the legislation. He had highlighted several areas of importance that needed to be answered before the PIJ could be submitted. Cathy reminded the group that before the RFP can be completed the PIJ must be completed and approved by GITA. Completion of the PIJ will be next big project for the Task Force.

After much discussion about what to expect once the RFP was written and made public, it was decided that Richard Adickes from procurement will be invited to next meeting to answer questions regarding the vendor selection process.

E-Learning Task Force Summer Meeting Dates
Task Force members were asked to select future meeting dates for the months of July, August, and September. Members were asked to select the dates that they can attend. The dates will be tallied and the dates with the most votes will be selected.

Public Testimony
Jeff Hubbell from HP was an observer.

Adjourn
Meeting was adjourned at 11:50am.

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
1535 W. Jefferson Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Phone: (602) 364-1349

ARIZONA E-LEARNING TASK FORCE

MEETING NOTICE
OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

Date: Thursday, June 7, 2007
Time: 10:00 p.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Place: Arizona Department of Education, Room 417

AGENDA

1. Welcome, Introductions & Approval of Minutes
    a. Update from each Taskforce Member (2 minutes maximum)
2. Review and approve final draft of eLearning Pilot Project PIJ – Hank Stabler
3. Review RFP process and the eLearning Taskforce's Role – Richard Adickes
4. Discuss participation in Gazel's Arizona eLearning Summit – Ted Kraver
5. eLearning Task Force Collaboration within IDEAL – Mark Nichols, ASU
6. Meeting Dates for Summer – Cathy Poplin
7. Public Testimony
8. Adjourn

MEMBERS

Chris Cummiskey
Jerry D'Agostino
Rosalina Escandon
Sandi Grandberry
Rod Lenniger
Lisa Long
Debra Lorenzen
Theodore Kraver
Joseph O'Reilly
Cathy Poplin
Casey Loman

People with disabilities may request accommodations such as interpreters, alternative formats, or assistance with physical accessibility. Requests for accommodations must be made with 72 hours prior notice. If you require accommodations, please contact Elizabeth Tuttle at (602) 364-2425.

Arizona eLearning Task Force

Minutes of the Meeting
Thursday, June 7, 2007
10:00am – 12:00pm
Arizona Department of Education
Conference Room 419

Members Present:
Casey Loman
Rosalina Escandon
Rod Lenniger
Debra Lorenzen
Theodore Kraver
Joseph O'Reilly
Cathy Poplin
DJ Harper – Representing Chris Cummiskey

Members Not Present:
Jerry D'Agostino
Sandi Grandberry (on vacation)
Lisa Long

Handouts:
- June 7, 2007 Agenda
- Minutes from the May 7, 2007 meeting
- Latest draft of eLearning PIJ
- GAZEL eLearning Summit – Theodore Kraver
- Future eLearning Task Force Meeting Dates for Summer

Senator John Huppenthal Speaks to Task Force
Before the official e-Learning Task Force (ELTF) meeting began, Sen. Huppenthal stopped by to speak to the ELTF regarding the "scoreboard" software. Sen. Huppenthal reported that he has contacted several companies regarding a real time "scoreboard" for classroom use; and believes the software does not exist. He also went to the attorneys for the Senate and they advised Sen. Huppenthal that the ELTF could focus solely on getting the new software created in lieu of the current focus of a middle school math pilot.

Theodore Kraver stated that from the RFI responses that have been received to date nearly half already have assessments as a part of the software. Sen. Huppenthal advised that the assessments might be there but the item bank has to be fairly large. Joseph O'Reilly added that there are companies with large item banks but not certain if there is one with the quality of information we want and need for the "scoreboard" software.

10:10am - Sen. Huppenthal leaves to return to the state legislature.

Welcome and Introductions – Reminder that the meeting is recorded on tape and available for full review.
Cathy Poplin called the meeting to official order at 10:12am. Cathy informed the ELTF that Jerry D'Agostino will be leaving Arizona for a new teaching position in Ohio. Cathy will look into Jerry's term with the ELTF, as to whether he needs to turn in a letter of resignation or let his term run out and then bring in someone else.

Cathy Poplin asked the ELTF members to review the minutes of the May 7th meeting. ELTF members noted no changes. Theodore Kraver moved to accept the minutes, Joseph O'Reilly seconds. Minutes are approved.

Cathy introduced Nan Williams to the ELTF as the new Director of Education Technology with the Arizona Department of Education.

Theodore updates the ELTF on House Bill 2742 Instructional Technology Systems Grants Fund. The bill is still in House and Senate budget negotiations. The bill includes $4 million that will go toward eLearning transformation; school by school. The language of the bill has not changed.

Debra Lorenzen reminded the ELTF about teachers taking on-line professional development courses offered through ASSET and IDEAL. For more information on when the next round of classes begins, ELTF can check on the IDEAL/ASSET website.

Task Force Discussion
Much discussion occurred as a follow up to Senator Huppenthal's visit.
Comments included but not limited to:

- Isn't what the Senator said going to change everything?
- The original bill language was re-read: A three-year pilot program is to be established. A central digital curriculum system to deliver mathematics course work that will be aligned with academic standards. Assessment results will be produced at the individual student level to monitor student's growth. Teachers will access information in real time, and both school and district administrators will be able to access data at the student, class, school, grade, and district level.
- Students and teachers want to see data in real time at the item level; not just in real time after taking a test.
- It is difficult to create a system to "motivate" people. You can only create an environment that will allow them to motivate themselves; you can't motivate someone else.
- If a company is asked to develop software to do something specific, they have to be given very specific requirements. The requirements can't be changing in real time and they can't have all these variables. It would be impossible to build. To create the Senator's vision, $3 million may or may not be enough.
- Will the vendor who is paid to create a ground breaking unique software for Arizona be able to take and sell to other states? Who owns the intellectual property? Will the software that was built for us be licensed to others? It changes the whole character of project.
- Recommend finding an appropriate eLearning system and have it tailored to what we are trying to do here in Arizona. Run a pilot and find out if it can be implemented across the state; and at what grade levels, whether it is good or bad.
- It was suggested that the eLearning Task Force continue the course that was started; don't design new software but have linkage points in that software that we can build on.
- Continue with the concept of getting something up and running and next year add to it.
- Will the other legislatures feel that we wasted money if we build new software and not proceed as a pilot project?
- The ELTF has put much time and effort into the work thus far. A RFI was written and lots of information has been gathered. The PIJ is nearly complete.
- The ELTF needs to continue down the path it is currently on; recognizing that there are gaps between the pilot and the finalized project.

- The ADE working group has looked at motivation as written in the legislation and Senator Huppenthal's vision and recommends including it in the RFP as a "nice to have but not required" item.

Cathy Poplin suggested that the ELTF define how we will continue with our interpretation of the bill. Rod Lenniger made a motion to continue developing the PIJ and then the RFP for a middle school math pilot project as indicated in the legislation. Theodore Kraver seconds the motion; all in favor, no one opposes.

Task Force Review of PIJ
Rod noticed a few corrections that could be made.

- Page 3, paragraph one - change the word "laptop" to "portable technology."
- Page 4, section C - "14 schools offer online courses in a pilot program", give more information regarding the "14 TABPI schools"; and the second sentence "Online educations programs are offered by 24 states," change to "by comparison" online education offered in several other states.
- Page 5 – estimating the resource cost – who bares the cost? ADE?
- Page 6, section E – add another bullet stating the ELTF needs to make recommendations for future adoptions.
- Page 7, section H – Sept. 2007 "Initial project plan created" – wouldn't this come back from the vendor as a response to the RFP? And who is the 3rd party evaluator? Cathy Poplin informed Rod that WestEd may be a viable 3rd party to evaluate the overall program.
    - Change the word "LEA" to schools
    - Between Oct 2008 and Nov 2011 – add evaluations and status reports
- Page 11 – Operating cost – we truly don't know the operating cost
    - DJ Harper – commented that not all these operating costs are operating costs
    - Rod suggested we will need to add maintenance cost

Rod pointed out the areas that need to be fine tuned; the sections that the committee needs to pays close attention are:

1. "As Is"
2. "To Be"

Joseph asked about page 6 – Roles and Responsibilities. The last bullet needed to include those that are affected by the program. ELTF decided to remove "eLearning task force" from first part of the last bullet.

The PIJ will be sent out before the next meeting and can be voted on electronically.

RFP process and the eLearning Task Force's Role – Richard Adickes, ADE Procurement Office
Richard Adickes was asked to advise ELTF on the RFP process and what can be expected. Richard started with the development phase of the RFP. He stated that the "scope of work" must be extremely complete in order to communicate what is wanted. He advised not to put options in the RFP but to add them as addendums. If you take a look at the intellectual property rights for ADE you will find that anything created with our money belongs to us. Richard also pointed out that there are several areas of importance.

1. Pricing – you need to know what needs to be priced.
2. Reports – needs to be included in scope of work. What type of information do you need and want in these report(s)/

3. Special Terms and Conditions:
    a. Will vendors provide training? What kind of training is needed?
    b. Length of training? How long it will take? Term of contract and any extensions

(There are a set of uniformed terms and conditions for the state of Arizona that have to be included; such as the intellectual property clause mentioned above.)

4. Special Instructions – these are the areas that we will evaluate your responses on. Your responses must be evaluated by these special instructions. Needs to be specific.
5. Solicitation must be on the street a minimum of 14 days after it has been advertised. Since this is a combination of service and commodity it will have to be advertised in the newspaper and sent to all who applied. In this case, Richard recommends that we allow a month to complete the response due to the complexity of the project.

Rod asked if it is OK to look at other states eLearning RFPs. Richard advised yes and that it might be a good idea. Cathy agreed to post a request on the State Educational Technology Directors Association (SETDA) site. She will report the findings at the August meeting.

Once the responses are received and the evaluation committee has made their first round of cuts, ELTF can then ask for clarification on any area(s) that are unclear. We can also ask them to come in and give us a presentation on their program. This can be an ongoing process until the committee has made their final decision.

If no vendor has what we are looking for, we can cancel the solicitation. This can be done at any time.

Rod asked if we will need a bidders' conference. Richard advised we allow two weeks after the RFP is published and then hold a bidders' conference. This is where the vendors can ask questions of the agency regarding the RFP. At the conference we can only discuss what is in the document. Rod also pointed out that if the process isn't closely followed it could go to appeal. Thus, if a question is asked and answered for a particular vendor and not another, this could lead to an appeal.

Cathy informed the group that once the RFP becomes public all questions will be answered by Richard. It will be his responsibility to provide all questions and answers to all bidders.

Taskforce members asked if we could talk to vendors about the RFP coming out. Richard advised yes up until the time the RFP is made public. A question was asked if we can talk about the details in the RFP. Richard suggested that we limit the details. However, it was noted that in the minutes posted on the eLearning Taskforce website there are details about the RFP. Joseph asked since our meetings are public, should be go into executive session when we begin to discuss the RFP? Richard advised that during the development/drafting phase of the RFP, the Taskforce should go into executive session to keep all information regarding the RFP confidential. Since the RFP has already been discussed at several meetings, Cathy said she will ask our attorney, Kim Anderson for an opinion.

When the RFP responses come in, the RFP then goes to an evaluation committee. Once the evaluation phase begins, ELTF members can not discuss the RFP to anyone, not even other ELTF members. It can only be discussed by the evaluation committee. Evaluation committee members will have to sign a confidentiality agreement. The ELTF members thanked Richard for his time and the information he provided.

GAZEL's Arizona eLearning Summit – Theodore Kraver
Theodore informed the ELTF that GAZEL has invited the eLearning Task Force and ADE to participate in their summit on September 27th. The summit will not focus on education and networking but on policy issues, current policy and workshops to develop new policy for eLearning adoption in Arizona. ELTF members suggested they send a representative to the summit.

eLearning Task Force Collaboration within IDEAL – Mark Nichols, ASU
Mark Nichols gave an interactive whiteboard presentation on how ELTF members can log onto IDEAL and use the collaborative environment. They can also chat online with each other. Cathy will ask Kim Anderson if the ELTF can chat/discuss online regarding the project. Cathy and Mark will look into ELTF members receiving their IDEAL user ID and password and instructions on how to use IDEAL website.

Future eLearning Meeting Dates
There are going to be several ELTF members unable to attend during the month of July; and we won't have enough people for a quorum. The ELTF members decided not to have a meeting for the month of July. Next meeting dates are:

- August 10, 2007 10am – 12pm
- September 14, 2007 10am - 12pm

Public Testimony
ELTF received a request to speak from a member of the audience. Mary Platner, special education teacher with Scottsdale Unified, introduced a grant proposal for a state license for accessible learning support software. Mary currently works with software that provides an aggregate score for the class or an individual student, as well as an item analysis per class or student. Mary also is with NIMAS (National Instructional Materials Accessibility Standard)

Other guests:
Jonathan Lindsey – Fennemore Craig/Boeing

Adjourn
Meeting was adjourned at 12:10pm

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
1535 W. Jefferson Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Phone: (602) 364-1349

ARIZONA E-LEARNING TASK FORCE

MEETING NOTICE
OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

Date: Friday, August 10, 2007
Time: 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Place: Arizona Department of Education, Room 417

AGENDA

1. Welcome, Introductions & Approval of Minutes
   a. Update from each Taskforce Member (2 minutes maximum)
2. Review additions/changes to eLearning Taskforce from 2007 Legislative Session – Cathy Poplin
3. Update on eLearning Pilot Project PIJ – Hank Stabler
4. Report on clarification received from Attorney General's Office – Cathy Poplin
5. Discuss next steps in the RFP design for the Middle School Math Pilot Project – Entire Taskforce
6. Review of new Instructional Technology Pilot from 2007 Legislative Session – Cathy Poplin
7. Review 21st Century Schools recommendations (School Facility Board) – Hank Stabler & Cathy Poplin
8. Future Meeting Dates
9. Public Testimony
10. Adjourn

Arizona eLearing Taskforce

Minutes of the Meeting
Friday, August 10, 2007
10:00am – 12:00pm
Arizona Department of Education
Conference Room 417

Members Present:
DJ Harper – Representing Chris Cummiskey
Lisa Long – via Conference Phone
Theodore Kraver
Sandi Grandberry
Rod Lenniger
Casey Loman
Cathy Poplin, Chair

Members Not Present:
Jerry D'Agostino
Debra Lorenzen
Rosalina Escandon
Joseph O'Reilly

Handouts:
- Agenda for August 10, 2007
- June 7, 2007 Meeting Minutes
- Arizona State Senate Fact Sheet for H.B. 2790
- Compilation of RFI Responses for Middle School Math Pilot (In 4 parts)
- What Works Clearinghouse – Middle School Math
- Newest AZ Ed Tech Legislation
- 21st Century Schools Recommendations DRAFT
- Arizona State Legislature/GITA Policies, Standards, and Procedures
- Future Arizona eLearning Taskforce Dates
- Planning Model of one to one implementation of eLearning, a ten year projection – Theodore Kraver

Welcome and Introductions – Remember that the meeting is recorded on tape and available for full review.
Cathy Poplin called the meeting to official order at 10:10am. Quorum was determined. Cathy asked the ELTF members present to introduce themselves so Lisa Long, on telephone, would know who was present.

Cathy asked the ELTF members to review the meeting minutes from June7th. ELTF members noted no changes. Theodore Kraver made a motion to accept the minutes, Rod Lenniger seconded the motion. Minutes were unanimously approved.

Sandi Grandberry updated the ELTF on computer classes being offered at Arizona State Legislature.

Theodore Kraver updated the ELTF on eSATS. Theodore provided everyone a handout on internet and connectivity costs. This is eSATS' ten year projection planning model for one to one implementation of eLearning. Theodore will clean up the planning model and release to Cathy Poplin to send electronically to all the ELTF members.

Cathy Poplin updated the ELTF on the NECC 2007 Conference that was held in June in Atlanta, GA. The conference focused on 21st century learning. Cathy left the conference with the sense that our children need to be able to collaborate globally, and have the opportunity to be creative and use their problem solving skills. Cathy also informed the ELTF that the 1:1 boot camp held July 10 & 11 by ADE was successful.

Review additions/changes to eLearning Taskforce from the 2007 Legislative Session
Cathy referred the ELTF the *Arizona State Senate* handout. The handout includes background information on H.B. 2790 with the changes made to the eLearning Taskforce composition. The legislature added three new members:

a) two persons who represent higher education and who are experts in education technology and 21st century learning
b) one person who has a background in online or digital format formative assessment

Cathy asked the ELTF members for any recommendation for new members. Cathy was not sure if the legislature had specific people they would like to appoint; but she would like to have recommendations from the ELTF to offer. Theodore Kraver suggested Jim Middleton, professor at ASU. Jim headed the Governors' Education Taskforce and Digital curriculum. Hank Stabler recommended Roger Yohe who heads 21st Century Learning at Estrella Mountain College. Ruth Catalano recommended Helen Padgett, Peggy George & Chris Johnson. Cathy suggested we get a representative from Northern Arizona. Gypsy M. Denzine from Northern Arizona University was recommended.

Cathy informed the ELTF that Javen Messner, Senate Staff, was aware of the changes made to the timelines for the Middle School Math Pilot and Javan wrote legislation that reflected the changes. The Senate accepted all the changes the ELTF recommended. The timeline posted on the eLearning Taskforce website is correct.

Update on eLearning Pilot Project PIJ – Hank Stabler
A current copy of the PIJ was emailed to all the ELTF members. A few ELTF members sent Hank questions. Hank worked with Steve Holzinger, ADE IT, to answer the questions and Frank Summers helped move the PIJ through the final process. A few changes had to be made to the budget section of the PIJ; Frank and Steve assisted with them. Next ITAC meeting is August 22, 2007 at the Department of Administration, Suite 300 at 1pm. Cathy informed the ELTF that she will be out of town on August 22nd and asked any ELTF members interested to help represent the ELTF along with Hank Stabler. DJ Harper recommended having less than six members present so as not to have a quorum at a public meeting.

Report on clarification received from the Attorney General's Office – Cathy Poplin
Cathy gave an update on the discussion of the RFP during ELTF meetings. Kim Anderson advised that the ELTF has not violated any laws regarding procurement and the open meeting rule. The only thing the ELTF cannot discuss in an open meeting will be the specific offers from vendors; the discussion of the offers will need to take place in executive session. Kim stated that two or more ELTF members together constituents an open meeting and that the open meeting laws apply. However, the discussion of the individual proposals will have to be made in an executive session. Kim will advise Cathy on how to write the agenda and how to proceed at that time.

Discuss next steps in the RFP design for the Middle School Math Pilot Project
Hank Stabler invited the ELTF to review the last version of the RFP and to highlight any issues or areas the ELTF may need to review. Ruth Catalano said reviewing other RFPs can help expedite the process. Hank obtained an RFP from Henrico County and one for Georgia's online curriculum for middle school math. These RFPs can guide what the ELTF is doing. Rod Lenniger agreed that looking at these two RFPs will help develop and fine tune the ELTF RFP. Cathy will post both of these items to the IDEAL collaborative website.

Cathy informed the ELTF that before the RFP can be finalized it will need to be approved by the JLBC, Joint Legislative Budget Committee. The JLBC has a member that serves on ITAC.

Cathy Poplin will contact Richard Adickes in regards to the ELTF RFP timeline. Richard Adickes advised in the last ELTF meeting to allow a minimum of 14 days for the RFP to be advertised and then proceed toward holding a bidders' conference.

Cathy mentioned that WestEd's Southwest Comprehensive Center may be contracted as the third party for program evaluation.

Review of the new Instructional Technology Pilot from 2007 Legislative Session
Cathy brought to the attention of the ELTF the newest AZ Ed Tech Legislation. The Arizona State Board of Education, in collaboration with the Arizona Department of Education, shall establish an instructional technology systems pilot program. The budget for this pilot program is $1,000,000. The Department of Education shall select one school that provides instruction in any combination of kindergarten programs and grades one through eight. Cathy asked for input &/or recommendations for the implementation of this from the ELTF.

Cathy also gave a brief overview of the most current *What Works Clearinghouse* handout. The handout summarizes the second wave of intervention reports produced in 2006-07 on Middle School Math. There are only two programs that really showed improvement: Saxon Middle School Math and I Can Learn. Lisa Long commented that these are the only two that have gone through the "gold standard." Hank noted that written into our RFP is the requirement for vendors to provide evidence that their program has been proven effective and is based on sound research.

Review 21st Century Schools Recommendations (School Facility Board)
Cathy shared with the ELTF the 21st Century Schools recommendations draft. 21st Century Schools is asking for feedback from a broad section of their stakeholders. The recommendations will be sent to the governor's office by October 1, 2007. The recommendations will apply to new schools being built. Once the recommendations have been finalized, retrofitting existing schools will need to be studied closely. The 21st Century Schools recommendation draft will become a lengthy report. Cathy asked the ELTF for input and if they would participate in the ADE survey being developed.

Arizona State Legislature
The ELTF discussed the GITA Standards (SB1512/ARS 15-1044). Districts want to know if they will be penalized if they do not adopt the GITA Standards. DJ Harper advised the ELTF how he answers districts' questions regarding the GITA Standards. DJ informs districts that he is not a lawyer, he is not a representative of the state legislature and can not speak to the intent of the law. The law does not require them to adopt the standards it only requires that they review and vote whether or not to adopt the GITA Standards. Some of the GITA Standards conflict with standards that they are required to adopt

from ADE and E-Rate. Some districts are not adopting the standards but are asking their governing boards to review the GITA Standards and make sure they have an equivalent standard in place.

Rod Lenniger suggested that maybe ADE should adopt the GITA Standards on a state level; and continue to let the LEAs review the standards and follow the ADE and E-rate standards. Cathy suggested ADE put out a clarifying document on the ADE website. DJ will review the clarifying document before it is posted.

Future ELTF Meeting Dates
Cathy reviewed the list of future meeting date choices. Each taskforce member was asked to choose their preference and return them to Krystal Nesbitt. Next meeting will be September 14, 2007 at 10am to 12pm

Public Testimony
ELTF received a request to speak from a member of the audience. Jeff Barnes with Trillion introduced himself. Also present was Penny Kotterman.

Adjourn
Meeting was adjourned at 11:50am

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
1535 W. Jefferson Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Phone: (602) 364-1349

ARIZONA E-LEARNING TASK FORCE

MEETING NOTICE
OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

Date: Friday, September 14, 2007
Time: 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Place: Arizona Department of Education, Room 417

AGENDA

1. Welcome, Introductions & Approval of Minutes
   a. Update from each Taskforce Member (2 minutes maximum)
2. Update on eLearning Pilot Project RFP to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee – Cathy Poplin
3. Review of RFP Sent to JCLB and Make Suggested Revisions – Entire Taskforce
4. Design of District/School Application for Middle School Math Pilot - Entire Taskforce
5. Results of School Facility Board Survey and Draft Report – Hank Stabler & Cathy Poplin
6. Arizona Broadband Update – Galen Updike, GITA (At 11:00 am or after)
7. Extension of eLearning Taskforce Terms – Cathy Poplin
8. Future Meeting Dates
9. Public Testimony
10. Adjourn

MEMBERS

Chris Cummiskey
Rosalina Escandon
Joseph O'Reilly
Casey Loman
Mark Nichols
Lisa Long
Theodore Kraver
Rod Lenniger
Debra Lorenzen
Sandi Grandberry
Cathy Poplin, Chair

People with disabilities may request accommodations such as interpreters, alternative formats, or assistance with physical accessibility. Requests for accommodations must be made with 72 hours prior notice. If you require accommodations, please contact Elizabeth Tuttle at (602) 364-2425.

Arizona eLearning Taskforce

Minutes of the Meeting
Friday, September 14, 2007
10:00am – 12:00pm
Arizona Department of Education
Conference Room 417

Members Present:
Rosalina Escandon
Theodore Kraver
Sandi Grandberry – via conference phone
Cathy Poplin, Chair

Members Not Present:
Chris Cummiskey
Lisa Long
Casey Loman
Debra Lorenzen
Joseph O'Reilly
Rod Lenniger

Handouts:
- Letter from GITA regarding PIJ recommendation to ITAC
- Draft Application to Participate – eLearning Pilot SB1512 Middle School Math Project
- Building Arizona's 21st Century Schools
- Review of SFB 21st Century Schools Recommendations
- eLearning Taskforce Members and Terms
- eLearning Taskforce Meeting dates for 2007-2008
- BASE LATA & ILEC's with Middle Mile Fiber – Galen Updike, GITA
- ATTAIN Committee and NCLB – Theodore Kraver
- ISTE Webinars – Cathy Poplin

Welcome and Introductions – Remember that the meeting is recorded on tape and available for full review.
Cathy Poplin called the meeting to official order at 10:06am. Not enough members present to have a quorum. Cathy asked the ELTF members present to introduce themselves and give a brief update.

Hank Stabler began the introductions. Hank is a consultant for ADE. Hank shared information on the ISTE webinars being held on Tuesday, September 25, 2007 about Online Learning. Cathy will send an email out with the times and registration information.

Rosie Escandon, Cartwright School District, informed the ELTF that Cartwright's technology fair will be scaled down to two days instead of three as done in the past. The fair was originally scheduled for next month, but due to scheduling conflicts, the date has been changed and may be held in March of 2008. Rosie will inform the ELTF with the dates as they become available.

Theodore Kraver is with eLearning Systems for Arizona Teachers and Students (eSATS).
Ted passed out a handout regarding the ATTAIN (Achievement Through Technology and Innovation) bill. This bill has been included as a section (Part F) in the proposed renewal of the NCLB Act.

Cathy Poplin, Chairperson and Deputy Associate Superintendent for Educational Technology with the Arizona Department of Education, gave an update on the draft RFP that will go to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee (JLBC). The PIJ was approved by GITA. However, there will be a lot of reporting that has to take place monthly.

At 10:19 am Sandi Grandberry joins the ELTF meeting via conference phone.

Theodore asked Cathy if the procurement department reviews the proposals the ELTF will be receiving from vendors. Are the proposals the ELTF receives those that meet our criteria? Or will we have to make more cuts? Cathy will report the answers to these questions at the next meeting.

Cathy asked if any ELTF members had corrections to the draft RFP that was sent to the JLBC. The ELTF discussed the scope of work for any corrections and or changes. The RFP goes to the JLBC on September 20, 2007.

Arizona Broadband Update – Galen Updike, GITA

Galen Updike, the Telecommunication Development Manager with GITA, gave each person a map of Arizona's fiber optic network and focused on the "Middle Mile." Galen advised the ELTF on where Arizona is with broadband connectivity with emphasis to schools having access high speed for multi-media use.

Galen has been working on getting a map to represent Arizona's middle mile fiber. The Middle Mile is the pathway/lines that take the signal from the edge of the community and takes it back to the tier one sites (which are located in Phoenix & Tucson). From a tier one site, it goes to the World Wide Web. It is an intrastate fiber network. The Last Mile connects local citizens to their local network provider; i.e. Cox and or Qwest. Arizona's middle mile is very confusing and outdated. The areas most affected by this are the rural areas.

The average price for a school to obtain high speed connectivity in urban areas is around $400 a month. The average price for a school in a rural area is considerably more, around $3,000 a month for the distance charges that are tied in with the standard rate. Distance charges are charged for connecting the school to the tier one line.

Galen's concern is that Arizona may run into violating the Constitution's 14th amendment--equal protection under the law. As we demand more of students and expect them to do homework using the internet and given the current level of disparity of broadband/internet connectivity to the rural areas, we have automatically unjustly treated those individuals.

Galen's would like to create a map of layers for the state which shows the fiber optic lines. GITA will conduct a survey which includes a physical visit to schools to locate their fiber optic lines. GITA would like to have a map with all of the elementary school districts' fiber optic lines marked. On top of that map another map of all the union high school districts' fiber optic lines. Galen asked that ADE help with the creation of this map. ADE could provide GITA with demographic information. Most of the concern for the survey is in economic development.

Cathy asked Galen if Arizona could possibly create a statewide education network. Due to the Gift Clause in state law, public dollars are prohibited from being used for a private purpose. When the

government is taken out of the equation, the cost becomes too much for the citizens and the gap becomes wider. Citizens should only pay for right of way once.

eLearning Taskforce Future Meeting Dates
A handout with the future eLearning Taskforce meeting dates was given to each person present. Cathy asked everyone to mark the meetings on their calendars. In case an emergency meeting has to be called, Cathy will inform everyone.

Date	Time	Location
10/18/07	10-12 pm	ADE – Rm 417
11/8/07	10-12 pm	ADE – Rm 417
12/18/07	10-12 pm	ADE – Rm 417
1/7/08	10-12 pm	ADE – Rm 417
2/8/07	10-12 pm	ADE – Rm 417
3/7/08	10-12 pm	ADE – Rm 417
4/4/08	10-12 pm	ADE – Rm 417
5/1/08	10-12 pm	ADE – Rm 417

eLearning Taskforce Members Term
Cathy gave a handout with the ELTF members' terms. Whoever was drawn for one year term last year moves to a three year term this year; two year term moves to one year term; and a three year term moves to two year term. Members are appointed for the life of the bill. There are four positions that still need to be filled. Cathy is working with the various government agencies to have these positions filled. Members were encouraged to review the handout.

Results of SFB Survey and Draft Report – Hank Stabler
Hank gave a summary of the SFB survey and draft report results. The focus of the survey is to encourage support for eLearning. Each new building shall have six drops in every classroom and a Local Area Network (LAN) that should be part of a district Wide Area Network (WAN). For grades K-3 a ratio of 1:3 and for grades 4-12 a ratio of 1:1 for personal computing devices.
The recommendations will ensure new buildings have the electrical capacity to handle all of the technical needs for students. The new buildings will also have electronic visual displays in each classroom, wireless infrastructure including new cabling standards and physical characteristics to enhance technology use.

Design of District/School Application for Middle School Math Pilot
The ELTF began to look at the application process for the pilot schools. The application is strictly for the selection of the schools that will participate in the pilot project. It has nothing to do with the selection of the vendor. A draft application was given to each member. The ELTF members discussed what type of questions to ask the schools, the format of the application and how to distribute it. Cathy asked the ELTF if the application should be distributed statewide to both rural and urban areas or should we keep it limited? Galen suggested the ELTF keep in mind that the rural areas may not have broadband access and that it will be impossible (at the current moment) to have statewide participation. Cathy suggested that one of the questions on the application ask for the schools demographics. Other grammatical errors were

discussed.
Further discussion will continue at the next ELTF meeting.

Public Testimony
Sean Warren with SAS was present. Sean suggested the ELTF have someone with strong experimental design to help with the application process. The school has to be able to relate to the end goals of the eLearning pilot project.

Adjourn
Cathy informed the ELTF that the next meeting will be on October 18, 2007. Rosie informed everyone that she will not be able to attend the next meeting. Cathy adjourned the meeting at 12:00pm.

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

1535 W. Jefferson Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Phone: (602) 364-1349

ARIZONA E-LEARNING TASK FORCE

MEETING NOTICE

OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

Date: Thursday, October 18, 2007
Time: 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Place: Arizona Department of Education, Room 417

AGENDA

1. Welcome and Introduction of New Taskforce Member(s)
   a. Update from each Taskforce Member (4 minutes maximum)
2. Approval of Minutes from August 10, 2007 & September 14, 2007
3. Mesa Distance Learning Program TABPI School – Terry Hutchins, Mesa Distance Learning
4. Update on eLearning Middle School Math Pilot Project Request for Proposal - Cathy Poplin
5. District/School Application for Middle School Math Pilot – Ruth Catalano & Hank Stabler
6. Update on $1million Instructional Technology System Pilot – Cathy Poplin
7. Beyond Middle School Math Pilot? What is next for ELTF? – Cathy Poplin
8. Extension of eLearning Taskforce Terms – Cathy Poplin
9. Future Meeting Dates
10. Public Testimony
11. Adjourn

MEMBERS

Chris Cummiskey
Rosalina Escandon
Joseph O'Reilly
Casey Loman
Mark Nichols
Lisa Long
Theodore Kraver
Rod Lenniger
Debra Lorenzen
Sandi Grandberry
Cathy Poplin, Chair

People with disabilities may request accommodations such as interpreters, alternative formats, or assistance with physical accessibility. Requests for accommodations must be made with 72 hours prior notice. If you require accommodations, please contact Elizabeth Tuttle at (602) 364-2425.

Arizona eLearning Taskforce

Minutes of the Meeting
Thursday, October 18, 2007
10:00am – 12:00pm
Arizona Department of Education
Conference Room 417

Members Present:
DJ Harper – Representing Chris Cummiskey
Theodore Kraver
Sandi Grandberry
Rod Lenniger
Debra Lorenzen
Mark Nichols
Cathy Poplin, Chair

Members Not Present:
Lisa Long
Joseph O'Reilly
Casey Loman
Rosalina Escandon

Handouts:
- Agenda for October 18, 2007
- August 10, 2007 Meeting Minutes
- September 14, 2007 Meeting Minutes
- The Evolution of the Mesa Distance Learning Program – Terry Hutchings & Jennifer Echols, with Mesa Distance Learning
- DRAFT Application to Participate – eLearning Pilot SB1512 Middle School Math Project – Cathy Poplin
- eLearning Taskforce Meeting Dates for 2007-2008
- eLearning Taskforce Members and Terms
- 2007 National Leadership Development and Strategic Planning Symposium on K-16 Science Education for State Teams – Cathy Poplin
- 2008 Summary of Seed Funding to Launch Critical Elements of eSATS – Theodore Kraver
- eSATS Redesign Report October 2007 "A Work in Progress" – Theodore Kraver

Welcome and Introductions – (The meeting is recorded on tape and available for full review.)
Cathy Poplin called the meeting to official order at 10:05am. A quorum was determined. Cathy introduced Mark Nichols, the newly appointed ELTF member. Mark is representing the Speaker of the House. Mark is an expert on K-12 and 21st Century Learning. Cathy asked the ELTF members to introduce themselves and give a brief update.

Mark began the introductions by briefly giving his background and area of his expertise. Mark was a classroom teacher in several different states, the technology director for a small reservation school district, taught at ASU West and worked with Apple, Inc. Mark has been in Arizona for the past 12 years.

Rod Lenniger introduced himself and gave a report from the Western Cooperative for Educational Telecommunications (WCET) to Cathy Poplin to review. The coop is funded by the William and Flora Hewlett and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundations. The coop's mission is to promote and advance the effective use of technology in higher education. Their website provides useful software for eLearning, http://www.wcet.info/home.asp . All of Arizona's state universities and University of Phoenix are members.

This may be an organization the ADE and ELTF may be interested in joining.

Theodore Kraver updated the ELTF on the eSATS Redesign Report for October 2007. Ted also gave each member present a summary of the 2008 funding and legislation of eSATS system design. As new funding for statewide eLearning adoption becomes available wise and supported decisions can be made. Oversight of this bill will be assigned to Arizona's eLearning Task Force. The eSATS website is up and running. There is a seven minute video on eLearning plan and process at the website, www.arizonaelearning.com.

Cathy Poplin gave an update from the 2007 National Leadership Development and Strategic Planning Symposium on K-16 Science Education. Cathy gave each member a copy of the agenda from the Symposium and invited questions of interest based on the agenda. She informed the ELTF that Andy Tobin from the House is very interested in providing online courses for students and suggested that he contact Mesa's Distance Learning program.

Sandi Grandberry gave a brief introduction and a brief update on distance learning in Africa. The small community uses radio broadcast to teach their distance learning on a variety of subjects. Other members present gave a brief introduction with no updates.

Approval of Minutes from August 10, 2007 & September 14, 2007
Cathy asked the ELTF members to review the meeting minutes from August 10, 2007 and September 14, 2007. ELTF members noted no changes. Sandi Grandberry made a motion to accept the minutes, Debra Lorenzen seconded the motion. Minutes were unanimously approved and will be posted.

Mesa Distance Learning Program TAPBI School – Terry Hutchins and Jennifer Echols
Cathy introduced Terry Hutchins from the Mesa Distance Learning Program/TAPBI (Technology Assisted Project Based Instruction) Schools. There are currently fourteen schools that make up the TAPBI schools; the TAPBI program is funded by the state per the TAPBI legislation. Students can attend school from home or from a computer lab; the student must complete 720 hours of instruction a year. Terry introduced himself and Jennifer Echols. Terry gave the ELTF members a copy of "The Evolution of the Mesa Distance Learning Program" handout.

When Mesa Distance Learning Program began in 1999, they used a commercial courseware. Student management and the grade book were handled by a commercial company. Data access was limited. The program was mainly used by home school students and an alternative to attending a "brick & mortar" (B&M) school. Dialog between student and teacher was done via email. Mesa Distance Learning did not and still does not advertise; all students are referred to the program by word of mouth. Their students include those with disabilities that keep them from attending a regular school on a regular basis and/or students with certain types of school phobias.

Since the beginning of the program Mesa Distance Learning has learned much about online learning and has made many changes, which include more teacher involvement, and the courseware, student management, grade book and dialog (message box) is now done in-house by Mesa. Data access is now given to the teacher, parent, administrator, counselor and lab teacher. The teacher feedback feature was added in 2007. The program is used by home schooled students, as an alternative to B&M, dual enrollment students, other urban and rural schools. The reason Mesa moved from commercial software to in-house use was for more control of the software design and to make sure the curriculum is aligned with Arizona standards.

Online teachers receive training via in-house instruction. The length of training depends on the teacher. The student/teacher ratio depends on the subject and how much the teacher can handle. Teachers submit timesheets for pay - 90 hours a semester. Mesa currently has six full time employees (secretary, media

specialist, a science specialist, math specialist, social studies specialist and an English specialist who also handles probationary students) and 30 part time teachers. All online teachers are hired on a trial basis to see how they work and fit into the program.

Terry briefly went over the different types of curriculum they provide to their students. Quarterly assessments are given at the K-6 level. A final exam is given at the end of the semester for seventh grade and above. If the student fails the final exam, they fail the course. Technical support is available for all students and teachers. The ELTF asked Terry and Jennifer how they address the issue of motivation for their students. Mesa sends out newsletters asking "are you right for distance learning", when a student falls behind the parent is notified. One of the major motivating factors for a student is strong parental involvement and the students feel a personal connection to a teacher. Distance learning is not recommended for credit recovery. If a student is having trouble attending a regular school, distance learning may not be a good solution for that student.

The ELTF members discussed the differences between district TAPBI Schools and the charter TAPBI schools. Cathy asked the ELTF if they would now like to hear from one of the Virtual Academies. The ELTF agreed, Cathy said she would arrange it.

District/School Application for Middle School Math Pilot – Ruth Catalano & Hank Stabler
Cathy asked the ELTF members to review the draft application to participate in the Middle School Math Pilot. The draft still needs a little work. Cathy suggested that the ELTF review the application as homework and send any suggestions to Ruth Catalano before the next ELTF meeting. The ELTF members all agreed.

Update on $1 million Instructional Technology System Pilot – Cathy Poplin
Cathy informed the ELTF that on Monday, October 22, 2007, she will be presenting the application for the $1 million School to the State Board of Education. Cathy passed a copy of the application around to the ELTF members to review and provide any feedback.

One K-8 school will be selected to participate in this pilot project. The application is a two step process. The first step is submitting a letter of intent and answering a few basic questions. If invited to continue, the second step requires the submission of a large proposal. If a district has five schools they want to participate, each will need to submit five separate proposals. One of the basic premises of the application is that the schools interested must demonstrate they have already started the transition toward One to One computing; not just thinking about it. They also need to be at least performing or above on AZ LEARNS. The second step requires letters of commitment from all of the school support staff and teachers. The schools that apply must have their Governing Board approval and a plan of what will happen in year one, two & three.

Update on eLearning Middle School Math Pilot Project Request for Proposal – Cathy Poplin
Cathy informed the ELTF that the RFP will be ready to go out by Monday, October 22, 2007. The RFP will be distributed to the vendor list used by the Arizona Department of Education has and to those who responded to the RFI. Cathy asked the ELTF members to send the email addresses for vendors that they think may be interested in the RFP. Cathy said she will let the ELTF know when the RFP is made public.

Extension of eLearning Taskforce Terms – Cathy Poplin
Cathy explained to the terms ELTF members and provided a handout of terms. If a member started serving a one year term, they will then rotate to a three year term, and then two. If a member started with a two year term, they will rotate to one year and then three. If a member started serving a three year term, they will then rotate to a one year term and then two. Appointment to the ELTF is permanent, unless they resign. Mark Nichols will be starting out as a one year term. There are still three positions that need to be filled: one appointed by the Governor's office, one by the president of the Senate and one more from the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Beyond Middle School Math Pilot? What is next for ELTF? – Cathy Poplin
The ELTF will continue to monitor the Math Pilot Project, but once it is underway, Cathy asked what direction the ELTF would like to go? Debra Lorenzen suggested the ELTF continue to gather information about what works and what doesn't work in relation to eLearning and to make recommendations to the legislature. It was suggested to continue inviting people to provide presentations on their projects. Cathy informed the members that the taskforce has travel funds. Theodore Kraver mentioned going to the NECC conference next year. DJ Harper recommended that the ELTF develop a long term strategic plan for the state; a mission and vision statement for eLearning and the ELTF. Cathy said she will provide more information regarding developing a mission and vision statement.

Future Meeting Dates – Cathy Poplin
Cathy provided a list of future meeting dates for the ELTF. Cathy asked all members to make note of the dates. Cathy informed the ELTF that she will be out of town on November 8th, the next meeting date. Ruth Catalano will chair the meeting.

Public Testimony
No visitors were present

Adjourn
Meeting was adjourned at 12:05pm

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

1535 W. Jefferson Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Phone: (602) 364-1349

ARIZONA E-LEARNING TASK FORCE

MEETING NOTICE

OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

Date: Tuesday, December 18, 2007
Time: 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Place: Arizona Department of Education, Room 417

AGENDA

1. Welcome and Introduction of Taskforce Member(s) & Guests
   a. Update from each Taskforce Member (3 minutes maximum)
2. Approval of Minutes from October 18, 2007
3. Middle School Math RFP Update and RRP Evaluation – Richard Adickes
4. District/School Application for Middle School Math Pilot – Ruth Catalano & Hank Stabler
5. ADE's Data Integration Model for the Middle School Math Pilot Project – Donald Houde
6. Online Learning– Rep. Andy Tobin
7. TAPBI Consortium Report presented to State Board on 12/10/07 – Herb Dwyer
8. Next Meeting – January 7, 2008
9. Public Testimony
10. Adjourn

MEMBERS

Chris Cummiskey
Rosalina Escandon
Joseph O'Reilly
Casey Loman
Mark Nichols
Lisa Long
Theodore Kraver
Rod Lenniger
Debra Lorenzen
Sandi Grandberry
Cathy Poplin, Chair

People with disabilities may request accommodations such as interpreters, alternative formats, or assistance with physical accessibility. Requests for accommodations must be made with 72 hours prior notice. If you require accommodations, please contact Elizabeth Tuttle at (602) 364-2425.

Arizona eLearning Taskforce
Minutes of the Meeting
Friday, December 18, 2007
10:00am – 12:00pm
Arizona Department of Education
Conference Room 417

Members Present:
Rosalina Escandon
Sandi Grandberry
DJ Harper - Representing Chris Cummiskey
Theodore Kraver
Lisa Long
Debra Lorenzen
Mark Nichols
Joseph O'Reilly
Cathy Poplin, Chair

Members Not Present:
Casey Loman
Rod Lenniger

Handouts:
- Agenda for December 18, 2007
- October 18, 2007 Meeting Minutes
- Solicitation Response for RFP ED08-0020

Welcome and Introductions – *The meeting is recorded on tape and available for full review*
Cathy Poplin called the meeting to official order at 10:00am. Cathy was pleased that there was almost at 100% attendance today; with the exception of Casey Loman, who is out on medical leave. She stated that Rod Lenniger had some business to attend to; however, he will join the group at approximately 10:30am via the telephone.

Cathy asked the group if anyone remembered what happened nearly a year ago. The answer was: The eLearning Taskforce had their first meeting. She stated the group will make their introductions, introduce any guests, and to give an update of anything you are currently working on or something good for the entire group. Cathy introduced Teresa Wolfe who is her administrative assistant. Teresa will be taking the minutes today because Krystal is out sick.

The group introduced themselves. The following people made specific comments:

Debra Lorenzen shared that PBS has developed a new online tool for educators for districts called Peer Connection; and it's an online coaching tool. It supports any model of coaching and they're excited to share it with districts around the state. It allows a district to add their own content to it. It doesn't teach coaching. It just supports whatever model is out there.

Lisa Long stated the most exciting thing that has happened to them lately was turning a negative into a positive. She stated that her district recently had their corrective action visit from the Department of Education. As they talked about the deployment of curriculum and the articulation of the state standards she talked about how they have merged the technology budgets with the curriculum textbook budget so that it is one of the same. She elaborated further how it was seamless to teachers as the end user in terms of the professional development. The Arizona Department of Education seemed pleased.

Joe O'Reilly stated what's new is this year they are putting in a new formative assessment, district assessment and data warehouse systems. He's doing the training and bringing all people involved together and it's taking more time than he than he thought. He still has a full agenda, things he still has to fix, and get ready for the next implementation.

Ted Kraver introduced himself and elaborated on what he has been involved in. Ted is part of eSats which is a non-profit organization for advocacy of eLearning and K-12 education; which spun out of the organization Gazel. He passed out a flyer where Gazel is going to hold a summit. He stated this is the first major summit they have done in a number of years. He continued to describe and elaborate the reasons for this high level summit. They are trying to bring in legislators, business communities as well as all the major communities in Arizona. He invited all to attend and be a part of this summit. Secondly, the legislation that eSats is trying to put together with Mark Anderson ran into a problem. The legislation has been re-written and basically it is asking this eLearning Taskforce to address about 8 different critical issues that have been discussed here several times. Legislature will wait to see what we come up with a more structured policy basis. It is not in legislation yet but it's going forward. Final item he mentioned was his visit to a military and simulation training.

Rosalina Escandon mentioned her annual technology conference has been approved. Conference will be held on March 7th through March 8th. She was very excited with the person she confirmed for the conference and the work he does in the field of multimedia.

Mark Nichols mentioned the opportunity to present at the Mega Conference on IDEAL, and give a preview of the new interface that will be rolled out in January. He will be happy to get some feedback and looking forward to hearing from the people that utilize this site.

Cathy Poplin's update was on IDEAL. She explained aspects of version 2.0 and anticipates it should be up and running after January 15th. Cathy introduced one of her newest staff members, Brett Hinton. Cathy introduced the guests that will be part of the agenda today: Richard Adickes, Representative Andy Tobin, Donald Houde, and Herb Dwyer; and 3 guests Richard Brincefield, Larissa Krew and Bob Rosenberg.

Approval of Minutes from October 18, 2007

Cathy asked the ELTF members to review the meeting minutes from October 18, 2007. ELTF members noted no changes. Ted Kraver made a motion to accept the minutes, Rosalina Escandon seconded the motion. Minutes were unanimously approved and will be posted.

Middle School Math RFP Update and RRP Evaluation

Richard Adickes spoke and highlighted the following:

- Solicitation response was 17 responses with a breakdown of 12 proposals and 5 no bids
- Very thick information on most all responses
- It has now moved out of the arena of the taskforce and into the arena of the evaluation committee. This committee is not a sub-committee of the taskforce
- The open meeting law does not apply to this evaluation committee
- Everything will be confidential from this point forward
- If members of this taskforce are selected to be on this evaluation committee, they will be asked to sign confidentially statements and the whole process is to remain confidential until award is made
- Will be using expertise of various areas to assist in the evaluation

- Will be using the scope of work that was developed by this taskforce
- Names listed are all primes and supported by other vendors
- Evaluation will begin after the Christmas holiday
- Goal is to make a recommendation about the award prior to the end of January to the JLBC

Cathy Poplin thanked Richard Adickes for all his help and support.

Cathy Poplin stated she would like to solicit one or two more people for the evaluation team if anyone was interested. If interested, she needs a commitment to a 2-hour training session in January as early as they can, and a full day consensus scoring toward the end of January. If this is something you would like to do, she encouraged dropping a note or sending her an email. It was clarified that the commitment was the 'meeting commitment' then you would have three weeks to evaluate on your own. Then everyone returns for the consensus. Cathy Poplin ended by stating "we will now move on to the silent phase of this process".

District/School Applications for Middle School Math Pilot
Cathy Poplin opened this part of the meeting on the applications and the schools that will apply to be a part of this. Cathy stated everyone should have a draft; which was homework. It was acknowledged that they had received responses. However, this was the time to bring forward any additional ones, and/or any comments to see if we were on the right track. A point was made that if anyone felt his or her school was going to participate in the application you may want not to include yourselves in this discussion. Cathy Poplin explained that this is where a person needs to sign a disclosure form that was handed out to avoid any conflict.

Ruth Catalano encouraged anyone to advise her of any grammatical errors in the application. Discussion involved the motivational piece, the data input, the charts, demographics, school report card, the 5th grade input, raw scores, professional development planning, and the pre-test. A conversation ensued on when to post this. It was a consensus that it not to be posted until a vendor is selected.

Ruth Catalano asked Ted Kraver if he could research something for her. It was requested that on the very first page, and very first sentence, that the legislative session be put in that passed the bill. Cathy Poplin encouraged everyone to continually give them feedback. They were advised to send them to Ruth Catalano and to copy Cathy Poplin.

ADE's Data Integration Model for the Middle School Math Pilot Project
Don Houde gave an IT perspective overview on how they are going to handle data integration. He elaborated on the sustainability and the protection of the data. He reiterated that he was not here to encumber the process, or to control it, but to build a sustainability model. A question was mentioned regarding standards. A discussion by the group brought many noted facts of what they knew was happening outside of the agency. Don Houde mentioned the reasons of why not all standards are put on the public domain. One specific mention was hackers and examples of what they try to do.

Another question was raised specific to a data integration server that IT is going to purchase and how do they envision it working with the vendor selected. Don Houde stated it depended on how the vendor collects his information and he explained the process. A discussion evolved on standards and its clarity. It was duly noted that the RFP states data standards must be compliant with SIF.

In closing, Cathy Poplin asked Don House who would be a representative on the committee. Don Houde

stated that it would be him, and due to the level of commitment it would be only on the advisory committee.

Online Learning – Representative Andy Tobin
Cathy Poplin introduced Rep Andy Tobin and mentioned he had a vision for education which he will share. He began by thanking everyone for what they are doing. Today he was going to speak as a parent, more than as legislator, because he has five children of his own. He gave a short story on "how are the children" of Arizona which is his focus. He doesn't feel our children are doing well and he doesn't feel our system is where it needs to be. He followed with a brief synopsis of his background and his views on how education is funded. He said that a bill was passed that no longer penalizes districts for graduating a student early. They will now continue to fund the districts, with a stipulation that a portion of the funds be set aside for the student to continue their post secondary education. In his view, it is time to create the resources to start graduating students early. His vision is to walk through a classroom on your laptop which directs you to virtual learning. He mentioned that he knows Mesa already has curriculum online and the potential of other districts connecting with their system to help their own students would be ideal. It was noted that Mesa is already doing that with other districts. It would be so advantageous to the rural areas in the state to go online and know that teachers are accessible to teach; and, to tap into systems that are already working. His new goal is find sponsors so that the state can move forward with online teaching. A discussion evolved of having a student have at least one online class to graduate to prepare them for the future of technology learning. He encouraged and welcomed any suggestions, help and direction to move forward with his goal; and he again thanked the group.

TAPBI Consortium Report presented to State Board on 12/10/07
Cathy Poplin introduced Herb Dwyer and Mike Ruppel from Tempe Union High School District. Herb Dwyer began by stating that he represented the Arizona E-Learning Consortium (the seven district TAPBI schools) whereby they are working on developing standards for online courses. The presentation to the State Board last week was in fact a response to a much publicized Auditor General's report He gave an overview of what TAPBI is, how they came about, and who is involved. He mentioned that Tempe Union High is one of the seven public districts involved. He was representing the district TAPBI schools only. The needs of the public schools and the needs of the charter schools are different. Some of what comes out of the Auditor General's report reflects these differences. The purpose of the report last week was to define where we fit into this whole process and examples were given. The seven districts under TAPBI are Deer Valley USD, Lake Havasu USD, Marana USD, Mesa USD, Peoria USD, Tempe UHSD and Tucson USD. He noted for information these seven districts collectively represent 23% of students in the state; we're talking some big school districts. The consortium meets monthly except during the summer months. They feel by sharing knowledge, ideas and concerns they would become more effective ourselves individually. Their mission is three-fold and Mr. Dwyer defined each:

- Provide advocacy and support for high-quality rigorous online instruction
- Promote strong standards for evaluating online programs
- Lobbying for equitable legislation supportive of online education

Focus of report was on the financial issues. Mr. Dwyer continually gave examples, reiterations on the benefits of academic performance; which is one of their main concerns. The focus of their work is the quality educational opportunities for the student. In his summarization, he stated their goals are to provide online courses that are as good as our face-to-face courses, at the very minimum. Additionally, given the added abilities of technology enhancing this learning, they feel it could potentially be even better. Mr. Dwyer finalized, elaborated and explained all of the nine recommendations that were noted at the end of the Auditor General's report.

Cathy Poplin brought up the question as to what the taskforce can do to support them. Mike Ruppel and Ted Kraver gave their views and the future picture. One statement given was that the groups mentioned here today are not in competition with each other but complimentary of each other. However, it is a small population and we need to open up our thinking. Group then opened with comments, varying views, suggestions, research comments, and economic access on technology.

Next Meeting Date
Cathy Poplin stated the next meeting is January 7, 2008. She asked if anyone had agenda items to please send them to her.

Public Testimony
No one acknowledged acceptance to speak.

Adjourn
Meeting was adjourned 12:10pm

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
1535 W. Jefferson Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007
Phone: (602) 364-1349

ARIZONA E-LEARNING TASK FORCE

MEETING NOTICE
OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

Date: Monday, January 7, 2008
Time: 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Place: Arizona Department of Education, Room 417

AGENDA

1. Welcome and Introduction of Taskforce Member(s) & Guests
   a. Update from each Taskforce Member (5 minutes maximum)
2. Approval of Minutes from December 18, 2007
3. Pinnacle Education Charter TAPBI Overview – Michael R. Matwick, Pinnacle Education
4. Arizona Technology Council Overview – Ron Schott, Executive Emeritus
5. District/School Application for Middle School Math Pilot Timeline– Ruth Catalano & Hank Stabler
6. iTunes K -12 Meeting Report – Cathy Poplin
7. Next Meeting – February 8, 2008
8. Public Testimony
9. Adjourn

MEMBERS

Chris Cummiskey
Rosalina Escandon
Joseph O'Reilly
Casey Loman
Mark Nichols
Lisa Long
Theodore Kraver
Rod Lenniger
Debra Lorenzen
Sandi Grandberry
Cathy Poplin, Chair

People with disabilities may request accommodations such as interpreters, alternative formats, or assistance with physical accessibility. Requests for accommodations must be made with 72 hours prior notice. If you require accommodations, please contact Elizabeth Tuttle at (602) 364-2425

Arizona eLearning Task Force
Minutes of the Meeting
Monday, January 7, 2008
10:00am – 12:00pm
Arizona Department of Education
Conference Room 417

Members Present:

Debra Lorenzen
Theodore Kraver
Rod Lenniger
Mark Nichols
Casey Loman
Joseph O'Reilly via conference phone
DJ Harper – Representing Chris Cummiskey
Cathy Poplin, Chair

Members Not Present:

Lisa Long
Rosalina Escandon
Sandy Grandberry

Handouts:

- Agenda for January 7, 2008
- December 18, 2007 Meeting Minutes
- AZ eLearning Consortium: Response to the Auditor General's performance audit of the Technology Assisted Project-Based Instruction Program (TAPBI)
- USDOE News Release: U.S. Department of Education Launches New Guide For Advanced Courses Online
- Table of Selected Variables of Highlighted Online Course Providers
- The Arizona Technology Council – print out of power point presentation
- Copy of the Arizona Department of Education Instructional Technology System Pilot Program Grant Application Directions
- Network Nebraska
- GALILEO
- Sustainability and eLearning in Arizona

Welcome and Introductions – *The meeting is recorded on tape and available for full review*
Cathy Poplin called the meeting to order at 10:06 am. Cathy wished everyone a Happy New Year and welcomed those in attendance. Cathy informed everyone that Lisa Long will be joining the meeting via conference phone once her district's budget meeting has concluded. Debra Lorenzen is running late, but will be joining the meeting shortly. Sandy Grandberry will not be in attendance due to the opening of the 2008 Legislature session. Cathy asked Theodore Kraver to begin with the introductions and include any updates he may have to share with the Task Force.

Theodore Kraver began by introducing himself and giving a brief update on a Legislature Bill that does not have any funds attached to it. However, the bill will request the eLearning Task Force to broaden and deepen its scope on what it studies over the next few years. Once this Bill becomes statute it will allow the eLearning Task Force to request grant funds and to help pass one eLearning bill a year. Ted will provide Cathy Poplin with a copy of this Legislature Bill to pass along to the eLearning Task Force.

Rod Lenniger had the opportunity to speak with some business executives from the technology

community over the holiday season. Rod noticed a lot of business executives did not know about the Arizona eLearning Task Force. Rod suggested the eLearning Task Force do some general Press Releases in regards to the eLearning Task Force to the Arizona Technology Council and GPEC (Greater Phoenix Economic Council) to spread the word about what the eLearning Task Force is doing.

DJ Harper informed Cathy that GITA is working with the Department of Education and the State Library Division in regards to the E-Rate program. The goal is to help Arizona schools claim more of the E-Rate funds available to them. Arizona schools are currently not using millions of dollars in E-Rate funds that could benefit Arizona schools. To assist schools claim more funds, it has been suggested that there be a state E-Rate liaison. GITA recommended hiring a state E-Rate coordinator which will help support GITA's goal to bring broadband to all Arizona schools. Cathy advised more details will be provided once the E-Rate committee has more information.

Mark Nichols gave the ELTF a couple of handouts on what other states are doing in eLearning. The first handout was on Network Nebraska and gave an overview of what Nebraska is doing. The second handout was on GALILEO, Georgia's Virtual Library. The last handout was Mark's points of interest pertaining to the sustainability and eLearning in Arizona.

Cathy Poplin introduced herself and acknowledged the guests in attendance from the TAPBI Charter Schools. Cathy began her update by sharing the press release: U.S. Department of Education Launches New Guide for Advanced Courses Online (Cathy will order copies for the ELTF). The separate table, also from the USDOE, shows what other states are doing in regards to online courses. A copy of the Instructional Technology System Pilot Program Grant Application ($1 million dollar school) was given to each ELTF member. Cathy asked the ELTF to turn to page 15 of the application. Cathy asked for recommendations or suggestions of how to craft a statement to K-4 and K-5 schools pertaining to line C, page 15 of the application. Members of the ELTF discussed verbiage recommendations for Cathy's statement to K-4 and K-5 schools interested in applying to the Instructional Technology System Pilot Program Grant.

Cathy informed the ELTF that due to potential state budget cuts pending legislative and gubernatorial decision, funds may be reduced or eliminated during the 2008 Legislative session.

Cathy asked the ELTF members to review the minutes from the December ELTF meeting; the minutes will be approved at the next ELTF meeting in February.

Pinnacle Education Charter TAPBI Overview – *Michael R. Matwick, Pinnacle Education*
Cathy Poplin introduced Michael Matwick from Pinnacle Education; a TAPBI Charter school. Michael began by introducing himself and his team; Kristen Boilini with ADEA - the legislative liaison for the association of TAPBI charter schools. Also joining Michael from the Sequoia TAPBI schools was Jerry Lewis, Patrick Groom and Superintendent Ron Neil.
Michael explained to the ELTF how the TAPBI charter schools operate. Pinnacle Education was one of the first charter schools in the state to be presented to the Arizona State Education of Board for approval as a charter school. Pinnacle was the first newly charter to be accredited by NCA in 1996. Pinnacle Education has six high schools with 600 Average Daily Attendance, one elementary school with approximately 125 ADA, one TAPBI school with about 650 to 700 maybe as high as 1,000 ADA this year. They currently have about 135 employees and 10,000 student enrollments projected for this year.

In 1999 Pinnacle Education started distance learning. Currently they have 3 different programmatic offerings. The first area is a Fulltime Virtual Enrollment; the students in this program take two courses at a time for six weeks. At the conclusion of the six weeks they will receive five high school credit hours. The second area is known as Concurrent Enrollment where the student chooses to take a course formatted for six or twelve weeks. Concurrent Enrollment students are also enrolled fulltime in a traditional high school at the same time and need these courses for credit recovery. The third area is I.Q. Academy, a partnership with KC Distance Learning out of Portland. I.Q. Academy is the standard two semesters, six courses a day.
Pinnacle has expanded their I.Q. Academy to offer it as a Fulltime Virtual Enrollment for six weeks, Concurrent Enrollment and as the traditional I.Q. Academy format.

Michael shared with the ELTF that 30% of all high school students will fail one course. The TAPBI charter schools noticed that a large number of their enrolled students are enrolled for credit recovery. Other problems the TAPBI schools are noticing are many of their students are having difficulty in transferring their credits to another school. Many traditional school districts loose a portion of their funding if a student chooses Distance Learning. Since the districts lose some of their funding, many districts are discouraging students to enroll in Distance Learning.

Superintendent Ron Neil introduced himself and shared with the ELTF that distance learning is growing in Arizona. Credit recovery is just a small part of distance learning. Supt. Neil has noticed a growing trend in partnership development with other schools. Ron stated that if you remove the big school districts in Arizona, you will find that half or more of the remaining schools have a limited course offering. And due to the federal requirement to provide a highly qualified teacher, it is becoming more challenging to offer a variety of courses in every school. Developing a partnership with these schools will help them offer courses they normally wouldn't be able to offer. Funding is a major issue that hinders a school from suggesting their students take a distance learning course.

Cathy Poplin interjected that many students have taken a distance learning course but now the school districts will not accept their credits. Cathy asked if the reason for the district backlash is a funding issue or is it a quality issue. Michael answered by stating they have district partners that use the same content that the distance education uses. One of the Pinnacle's district partners came about as a result of the fact that a district was losing many students to distance education. Michael suggested to the district that they form a partnership and the partnership went smoothly for several years. However, when the district lost additional students due to other reasons, it appeared that the district no longer valued the partnership and did not accept some of the credits the district students tried to transfer. Michael believes it is a funding issue more than a quality issue.

Theodore Kraver asked if the ELTF needed to study the funding issues around eLearning. Mike answered by stating if the growth of eLearning is going to continue it cannot face the same kind of barriers that Pinnacle Education is facing. Michael used I.Q. Academy as an example because it is used in other states. Wisconsin has a statewide system to deliver content; but because of the push back that is driven by the funding issue, districts are denying the acceptance of the credits. This causes the students to not take the courses, which means their being denied the opportunity to have distance learning as an option.

Cathy Poplin thanked the TAPBI schools for coming and invited Sequoia TAPBI Schools back to the ELTF meeting in February.

The ELTF members discussed possible recommendations for a statewide data warehouse to assist districts and charters with the transference of student transcripts from one school to another.

Arizona Technology Council Overview – *Ron Schott, Executive Emeritus*
Cathy Poplin introduced Ron Schott, the Executive Emeritus for the Arizona Technology Council. Ron began by giving a brief overview of the Arizona Technology Council's mission and vision statement. The vision of the Arizona Technology Council is to assist Arizona with being recognized as a top-tier Technology State. The mission of the organization is to support their members and unify their partners to grow Arizona's economy with technology and innovation.

The Technology Council has a membership of around 500 Corporations. 60% of their memberships are industries within the technology field and 12% are other organizations (such as academia). Almost all of the Universities are part of the council. Service providers that supply services to the technology industry make up 28% of the remaining membership.

The Technology Council hosts a large number of events -- 70 to 80 a year. The biggest event of the year is what is known as the "Technology Oscars for Arizona." This is the Governor's celebration for innovation. Ron shared two magazines the Technology Council publishes. The magazines cover a variety of technology issues and innovations within the state of Arizona.

For the 2006 elections, the Technology Council sent out a survey before the legislative election with the legislative agenda that they were trying to propose. They sent it out pre-primary to all of the candidates that have a good track record with the Technology Council. For those that do not have a good track record, they call them in for an interview. After the interviews, the public policy committee gets together to make their recommendations. Then they get together as a whole group and take it to the executive committee of the Arizona Technology Council for endorsement. The Technology Council does not mandate or endorse candidates from any particular district. The Council may even skip a district; endorse candidates from the same party or even endorse opposing candidates. If asked why they are endorsing a candidate's opposition, the reply is the Technology Council will support those that support the initiatives the Technology Council is interested in.

At the end of the legislative session, the Technology Council sends to the legislatures a report card that relates to the technology industry and technology education. The report card shows how the Technology Council perceives the legislatures end product on the various technology initiatives. The first year the report card is sent, they inform the legislatures it is for their eyes only. However, the next year they publish the report on the back of their agenda. The council has received very positive comments from the legislatures regarding the report card. For the last three legislative years, the Technology Council plus another group of organizations, has gotten fifteen legislatives technology bills passed.

The Technology Council has also has a public policy committee, a financial services committee, a law and technology committee and an ambassador committee that helps provide business values to members. One of the Technology Council purpose is to help businesses promote their business and interact with other businesses and the Arizona community at large.

District/School Application for Middle School Math Pilot – *Ruth Catalano*
Cathy Poplin asked Ruth Catalano to explain how the application process will work in relationship to awarding the Math RFP. At the December ELTF meeting, the consensus was to hold the release of the application for the schools until the awarded of the contract. Ruth proposed to the ELTF that if they hold

the application for the schools until after the RFP was awarded, that they will very likely not get any answers to those schools of the final analysis until April or May. Ruth requested the ELTF start the final consensus on the RFP on January 24, 2008; with the release of the application that week with a caveat. Nothing will be screened until the applicant's schools have seen the final results. Ruth suggested that with the complexity of the application and the amount of thought the schools will have to put into the application and the creation of the application; the schools will not have enough time without some overlap.

Theodore Kraver made a motion for the ELTF to put the application out at the same time the ELTF does their final recommendation at the end of January. Rod seconded the motion. The release of the application was unanimously approved; Joe O'Reilly abstained from voting.

iTunes U
Cathy Poplin informed the ELTF due to time restraint she will discuss the agenda item not covered in today's meeting; iTunes K-12, will be discussed at the next ELTF meeting

Next Meeting Date
The next ELTF meeting will be February 8, 2008. Cathy hopes to have the results from the RFP review by the JLBC for the next ELTF meeting. The next JLBC hearing will be Thursday, January 10, 2008.

Public Testimony
No one requested to speak.

Adjourn
Meeting was adjourned 12:06PM

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
1535 W. Jefferson Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Phone: (602) 364-1349

ARIZONA E-LEARNING TASK FORCE

MEETING NOTICE
OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

Date: Friday, February 8, 2008
Time: 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Place: Arizona Department of Education, Room 417

AGENDA

1. Welcome and Introduction of Taskforce Member(s) & Guests
   a. Update from each Taskforce Member (2 minutes maximum)

2. Approval of Minutes from December 18, 2008 and January 7, 2008

3. Update on Instructional Technology Systems Pilot Grant Process – Cathy Poplin

4. Update in the eLearning Summit Feb 20, 2008 & New Legislative – Ted Kraver

5. Update on Middle School Math RFP Update and RRP Evaluation – Hank Stabler

6. Update on District/School Application for Middle School Math Pilot – Ruth Catalano & Hank Stabler

7. Presentation by Sequoia Choice Arizona Distance Learning (TAPBI Charter) – Ron Neil and company

8. Presentation by Arizona Virtual Academy (TAPBI Charter) – Mary Gifford

9. Next Meeting – March 7, 2008

10. Public Testimony

11. Adjourn

MEMBERS

Chris Cummiskey
Rosalina Escandon
Joseph O'Reilly
Casey Loman
Mark Nichols
Lisa Long
Theodore Kraver
Rod Lenniger
Debra Lorenzen
Sandi Grandberry
Cathy Poplin, Chair

People with disabilities may request accommodations such as interpreters, alternative formats, or assistance with physical accessibility. Requests for accommodations must be made with 72 hours prior notice. If you require accommodations, please contact Elizabeth Tuttle at (602) 364-2425

Arizona eLearning Taskforce

Minutes of the Meeting
Friday, February 8, 2008
10:00am – 12:00pm
Arizona Department of Education
Conference Room 417

Members Present:
Brian Sherman – Representing Chris Cummiskey
Sandi Grandberry – via conference phone
Lisa Long – via conference phone
Theodore Kraver
Rosalina Escandon
Joseph O'Reilly
Cathy Poplin

Members Not Present:
Debra Lorenzen
Rod Lenniger
Casey Loman
Mark Nichols

Handouts:
- Agenda for February 8, 2008
- January 7, 2008 Meeting Minutes
- eLearning Task Force Program Exploration Categories
- Congratulations - schools selected to move to Phase II in the Instructional Technology Systems Pilot Grant
- Middle School Math Pilot Directions & Application
- House Bill 2064
- Greater Arizona eLearning Association (GAZEL)/Arizona Summit 2008

Welcome and Introductions – *The meeting is recorded on tape and available for full review*
Cathy Poplin called the meeting to official order at 10:10 am. Cathy welcomed those in attendance and asked the ELTF members to introduce themselves and give a brief two minute update.

Rosalina Escandon introduced herself and informed the ELTF that Cartwright School District will be having their technology conference on March 7th & 8th. Rosalina is still looking for presenters and asked if anyone on the Task Force would be interested. Cathy said she would do a presentation on IDEAL.

Brian Sherman was representing Chris Cummiskey and filling in for DJ Harper. Brian is part of the Strategic Planning Unit of GITA.

Cathy Poplin introduced herself and began her update by informing the ELTF members that the Educational Technology Unit will now report to Margaret Garcia-Dugan, the Deputy Superintendent and it is no longer a part of the School Effectiveness Division. Cathy informed

the ELTF members that she has a draft of the *Reports and Recommendations* from the Twenty First Century Summit - Fall 2007. Cathy did not make copies of the draft report but did say she will email copies of the report to the ELTF members.
Cathy pointed out that within the handouts present is a copy of an email from Rod Lenniger. Rod is out of town and unable to attend the meeting. At the last ELTF meeting Mark Nichols said he would create suggested areas of exploration spreadsheet for the ELTF. A copy of the spreadsheet is within the handouts. The spreadsheet will assist the ELTF with exploring different eLearning projects in Arizona.

Cathy asked that the guests in attendance introduce themselves and they included: Jerry Lewis, Associate Superintendent of Sequoia Chart Schools; Ron Neil, Superintendent of Sequoia Charter Schools;, Mary Gifford, Director of the Arizona Virtual Academy; and John Kelly and Elise Piatt with Triadvocates.

Approval of Minutes from December 18, 2008 & January 7, 2008
A quorum was determined. Cathy asked the ELTF to review the December 18, 2008 and the January 7, 2008 minutes. ELTF members noted no changes. Theodore Kraver made a motion to accept the minutes and Rosalina Escandon seconded the motion. Minutes were unanimously approved and will be posted.

Update on Instructional Technology Systems Pilot Grant Process – Cathy Poplin
Cathy referred the ELTF to the "Congratulations" handout. The handout lists the schools that have been selected to move to Phase II in the Instructional Technology Systems Pilot Grant. They are:

- Puente de Hozho, Flagstaff USD
- Edison, Phoenix ESD
- Simonton, JO Combs SD, Queen Creek
- Navajo, Scottsdale SD
- Robins, Tucson USD

Theodore Kraver represented the ELTF in the reviewing process. Theodore shared with the ELTF the reviewing process. Lisa Long shared with the ELTF the excitement of one of the schools on the list. Cathy informed the ELTF the Phase II application is due March 21, 2008. The reviewing team will reconvene and begin the review. The review team will visit the top three schools. Cathy would like to have the recommendations by April for the State Board Meeting.

Update on the eLearning Summit Feb. 20, 2008 & New Legislation – Theodore Kraver
Theodore gave an overview of what the eLearning Summit will entail. The summit is February 20, 2008 at the Mesa Convention Center for one day only. The ELTF is one of the sponsoring organizations for the Summit. Superintendent Tom Horne and Cathy Poplin are scheduled to speak. Theodore shared with the ELTF what Superintendent Horne feels are our strongest areas of Educational Technology. Super. Horne's gave a speech at the opening of the new Pearson building and the eight areas are IDEAL, Statewide Instructional Technology (SIT) Project, the ELTF, the Middle School Math Pilot Project, eighth grade Tech Literacy Program, the Instructional Technology Systems Pilot Grant, E-Rate & the ADE 1 to 1 laptop initiative.

Theodore gave an update on three new legislative bills. House Bill 2064 has seven new areas of responsibilities for the eLearning Taskforce. Ted also talked about Senate Bill 1104 which is about TAPBI schools and will increase the number of TABPI schools. House Bill 2816 is TABPI school bill. This bill will deal with TAPBI funding and will begin to tackle the issue of seat time.

Update on Middle School Math RFP Update and RRP Evaluation – Hank Stabler
Hank Stabler briefly went over the evaluation process. There were twelve submittals and the first meeting for the evaluation team was on January 24, 2008. Expert advisors joined the evaluation team to review specific components of the submittals. The next meeting is scheduled for February 19, 2008. The evaluation team is hoping to narrow the field down and have final selections by the middle of March.

Update on District/School Application for Middle School Math Pilot – Ruth Catalano & Hank Stabler
Ruth Catalano asked the ELTF to look at the list of five finalists for the Instructional Technology System Pilot Grant and consider those serving grades 6 – 9 as possible candidate for the Middle School Math Pilot.

Theodore asked if the Middle School Math application was the same as the Instructional Technology Systems pilot application. Ruth replied there was a great deal of overlap. Any part missing would have need to be given by the schools. For example, math details were not a part of the Instructional Technology System Pilot Grant. Thus, these schools would need to send in their math details if they wanted to apply for the Middle School Math pilot project. Theodore commented that automatically holding two positions would not be fair to the other schools that applied.

Joseph O'Reilly suggested giving the two schools extra points or special consideration, but not to automatically consider them. Sandi Grandberry concurred with Ted and Joseph; it would not be fair to automatically consider them. Rosalina Escandon agreed with Joseph. The ELTF decided not to give the schools any special consideration.

Cathy Poplin informed the ELTF they will revise the application once more and hold two training webinars before it will be released. She will notify the ELTF before it is released.

Presentation by Arizona Virtual Academy (TAPBI Charter) – Mary Gifford, Director
Mary Gifford presented on the Arizona Virtual Academy. AZ Virtual Academy is based in Tucson with a Phoenix office. AZ Virtual Academy is the largest of the TAPBI schools with 3,600 full time students in grades K-11. AZ Virtual Academy has been in operation for six years.

Once a child enrolls in the school, each student is sent home four to six boxes of curriculum materials needed for their classes. For example, they send the microscopes for Science, globes for Geography, workbooks, etc. One computer, monitor and printer are furnished per household/family, except high school. Every high school student receives a computer and print/fax scanner for their home. AZ Virtual Academy has an Internet reimbursement program; they reimburse families for their Internet usage on a semester basis.

AZ Virtual Academy's curriculum is aligned with Arizona State Standards. Families must use the AZ Virtual Academy's curriculum; Parents may not substitute any of the materials. Mary showed examples of their Math, Science and Reading curriculum. Certified teachers are assigned to each family. Special Education and Title I students receive an additional teacher. High school students have a content specific teacher. State testing and instructional help are all a part of AZ Virtual Academy. Full teacher and administrative support, technical support is available twenty-four hours a day seven days a week.
Parents must sign a commitment letter. AZ Virtual Academy has a parent mentoring program to assist new parents to the school. AZ Virtual Academy has stated that 96% of the parents do not withdraw their children from the school if they are a part of the parent mentoring program. Parents must enter their child's attendance for everyday.

Theodore Kraver asked if AZ Virtual Academy created their curriculum/software or if they purchased it from a vendor. Mary said they create their own curriculum/software. AZ Virtual Academy has their own software company called K-12, the Curriculum Company. Oxford and K-5 Math are purchased commercially. Theodore also asked what was the student to teacher ratio. Mary informed the ELTF that they have 30-35 families per teacher and Special Education has 20-25 families to a teacher.

Presentation by Sequoia Choice Arizona Distance Learning (TAPBI Charter) – Ron Neil, Superintendent and Jerry Lewis, Associate Superintendent
Superintendent Ron Neil began his presentation by stating that Sequoia Choice originally started out as a program for deaf students. Now only a small percentage of their enrolled students are deaf.

Ron gave each ELTF member a folder of materials highlighting the different areas and advantages of the Sequoia Choice Distance Learning Program and gave an overview of his program.

Sequoia Choice TAPBI Schools are aligned with the Arizona State Standard and focused on teacher accountability. They provide constant communication between the teachers and the students. Video conferencing is used for the teacher and student communication. All teachers are highly qualified and certified. There are two teachers in every computer lab. Online teachers are required to travel and visit all the computer labs. Teachers work 365 days a year. Teachers are responsible for reporting on student progress and the success of their students.

When a student transfers from a traditional "brick and mortar" school, Sequoia Choice gives the student a pre-assessment test to insure they are prepared for the grade level their transcripts indicate. Independent assessments are used along with the curriculum assessments to insure the assessments are accurate. Cathy Poplin asked what independent assessment they used. Superintendent Neil replied FAST Math, a Sequoia Choice built program. The independent reading assessment they use was developed by the Ministry of Education from Ontario Canada.

Superintendent Neil stated the common misconception is that distance learning is only a student at home with a computer. To truly assist the student at home they require more. Students receive

textbooks along with an online version of their curriculum.

Cathy asked the ELTF if they would like to continue their discussion regarding TAPBI Schools. The ELTF agreed they would like to continue this discussion.

Next Meeting
Cathy informed the ELTF the next meeting will be March 7, 2008.

Public Testimony
No guest comment

Adjourn
Cathy Poplin adjourned the meeting at 12:17pm

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
1535 W. Jefferson Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Phone: (602) 364-1349

ARIZONA E-LEARNING TASK FORCE
MEETING NOTICE
OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

Date: Friday, March 7, 2008
Time: 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Place: Arizona Department of Education, Room 417

AGENDA

1. Welcome and Introduction of Taskforce Member(s) & Guests
   a. Update from each Taskforce Member (2 minutes maximum)
2. Approval of Minutes from February 8, 2008
3. Report from the eLearning Summit Feb 20, 2008 – Ted Kraver
4. Broadband Access Update – Galen Updike
5. Update on Middle School Math RFP Evaluation – Hank Stabler
6. Final review of Middle School Math Pilot Application – Ruth Catalano & Hank Stabler
7. Report on Distance Learning meeting sponsored by Rep. Tobin – Cathy Poplin
8. Presentation by Tempe Union High School TAPBI – Mike Ruppel and Cecilia Johnson
9. Next Meeting – April 4, 2008
10. Public Testimony
11. Adjourn

MEMBERS

Chris Cummiskey
Rosalina Escandon
Joseph O'Reilly
Casey Loman
Mark Nichols
Lisa Long
Theodore Kraver
Rod Lenniger
Debra Lorenzen
Sandi Grandberry
Cathy Poplin, Chair

People with disabilities may request accommodations such as interpreters, alternative formats, or assistance with physical accessibility. Requests for accommodations must be made with 72 hours prior notice. If you require accommodations, please contact Elizabeth Tuttle at (602) 364-2425

Arizona eLearning Taskforce
Minutes of the Meeting
Friday, March 7, 2008
10:00am – 12:00pm
Arizona Department of Education
Conference Room 417

Members Present:
Galen Updike – Representing Chris Cummiskey
Debra Lorenzen
Theodore Kraver
Joseph O'Reilly
Cathy Poplin
Mark Nichols

Members Not Present:
Lisa Long
Sandi Grandberry
Rod Lenniger
Casey Loman

Handouts:

- Agenda for March 7, 2008
- February 8, 2008 Meeting Minutes
- Agenda for the Congress on the Future of Content Texas Hearing Agenda
- Arizona Virtual Library
- Teaching and Learning for the 21st Century Summary Report
- GAZEL Summit Education Workshop Policy and Strategy Results Maximizing the Impact: The Pivotal Role of Technology in a 21st Century Education System
- Legislative Presentation Handout – Original Proposal for TAPBI.

Welcome and Introductions – *The meeting is recorded on tape and available for full review*
Cathy Poplin called the meeting to order at 10:08 am. Cathy welcomed those in attendance and asked the ELTF members to introduce themselves and give a brief update.

- Theodore Kraver introduced himself and stated he would give his update during his time as stated on the agenda.
- Debra Lorenzen introduced herself and gave a brief update on a Ready To Learn initiative called Raising Readers. Debra will provide more information as the program progresses.
- Mark Nichols introduced himself and gave a brief update on the upcoming Microcomputers in Education Conference (MEC) at ASU, March 10th – 12th.
- Joseph O'Reilly introduced himself with no updates.
- Galen Updike was representing Chris Cummiskey and filling in for DJ Harper. Galen is the Telecommunications Development Manager for GITA. Galen informed the ELTF he is working on creating a 211 system for Arizona. 211 is a number that the public can call to get "up to date" information regarding their social and public needs.

This will help relieve stress on 911 calls by thirty percent. GITA is also looking into increasing cyber security for all Arizona state agencies. Galen is focused on increasing broadband access.

- Hank Stabler, ADE consultant, introduced himself and gave a brief update on HB2787. The bill deals with the collection of data related to teachers. The bill has just passed the Education Committee and is going before the House. Hank advised he would keep the ELTF informed as this bill progresses.
- Ruth Catalano, ADE consultant introduced herself with no updates.
- Cathy Poplin introduced herself and updated the ELTF on a hearing she attended. Cathy informed the ELTF that she went to Austin, Texas February 26th and 27th and testified at the Congress on the Future of Content. The majority of the participants were publishers. The publishers are trying to understand their role in a paperless society, and to move towards digital textbooks without eliminating the content. The publishers are being asked to create a digital textbook not to simply create a PDF version of a regular textbook. Cathy noted that she was the only representative from a non-textbook adoption state and most of her testimony was based on the Math RFP that the ELTF created.

Cathy asked the guests in attendance to introduce themselves: Elise Piatt with Triadvocates: Larissa Krew with Carnegie Learning: Nan Williams, Brett Hinton with ADE and Mike Ruppel with Tempe Union High School District #213.

Report on Distance Learning meeting sponsored by Rep. Tobin – Cathy Poplin
Cathy gave an update on a meeting she attended regarding the Arizona Virtual Library. The meeting was hosted by Dr. Carol Peck with The Rodel Foundation and led by Rep. Andy Tobin. This meeting is a continuation from Representative Andy Tobin's vision for an online learning library/virtual classroom. The University of Phoenix has offered to allow the state of Arizona to use of their online infrastructure. The next step for this group will be to discuss the creation of a "Seal of Approval" by ADE that will indicate which online courses have met Arizona Standards and AIMS. Cathy stated the small group covered much ground and Cathy will keep the ELTF informed as the discussions progress.

Approval of Minutes from February 8, 2008
Cathy Poplin asked the ELTF to review the meeting minutes from February for approval. ELTF members noted no changes. Joseph O'Reilly made a motion to accept the minutes and Theodore Kraver seconded the motion. Minutes were unanimously approved and will be posted to the ADE website.

Report from the eLearning Summit February 20, 2008 – Theodore Kraver
Theodore Kraver gave the ELTF an update on HB2064. This bill strengthens the ELTF duties. The bill has been approved and assigned to the House Education Committee and Senate. This bill doesn't have any money attached to it and should pass without any problems. Theodore will keep the ELTF informed.

Ted also provided a summary of the GAZEL eLearning Summit held on February 20, 2008. The focus of the summit was on Policy and Strategy. There were five workshops to address policy

and implementation of strategy. The policy sessions were held in the morning with the strategy sessions in the afternoon. Theodore facilitated the eLearning Education Workshop with approximately 40 people in attendance. There was representation from all of the communities except in the area of research. Theodore handed out a report that summarized the results from the workshop he conducted and gave an overview of the report. Cathy Poplin asked if there would be a report on the other workshops from the eLearning Summit. Theodore replied yes, and once they are available he would supply Cathy with a copy of those reports.

Cathy Poplin asked the ELTF for permission to re-arrange a few of the agenda items, to allow more time for all the presentations listed on the agenda. The ELTF agreed.

Update on Middle School Math RFP Evaluation – Hank Stabler
Hank Stabler gave an update on the Middle School Math RFP evaluations. The first round of evaluations has concluded and the field has been narrowed down to four candidates. The remaining four candidate's names have been given to the ADE Procurement Department. The Procurement Specialist will be contacting the four candidates to schedule demonstrations on their systems for the evaluation committee. Procurement is giving the candidates 7-10 days to prepare for their demonstrations. The candidates will have the option of choosing a face to face evaluation or a webinar presentation. Once those evaluations are complete the ELTF will then be able to make a recommendation to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee (JLBC).

Final review of Middle School Math Pilot Application – Ruth Catalano
Ruth Catalano informed the ELTF that the process is taking a little longer than expected and that many schools will be going on Spring Break. Rather than have some schools receive the notification and some not, the application will be postponed until a content provider has been selected. A majority of schools have already begun their budget process and their scheduling for their students. Since this pilot will impact their scheduling and budget it was best thought to allow them time to provide accurate and up to date information.

Broadband Access Update – Galen Updike
Galen Updike from GITA gave a PowerPoint Presentation to the ELTF entitled Twenty-First Century Public Administrators and Elected Officials Must Use and Understand New Technologies. The main point of this presentation is to educate public administrators and elected officials on new technology. Public administrators and elected officials must understand that the current generation absorbs knowledge differently than generations in the past. Government officials need to understand that in order for the new technology to be used effectively, it will also take faster broadband connections to implement the new technology. The United States has moved from first place (2001) in regards to the world's position on broadband and technology deployment to 15th-21st place, depends on which national index you use.

The minimum standard by the FCC that we are measured against for broadband connection is 200 kbit/s (as of March 19, 2008 the FCC increased the minimum speed to 768 kbit/s). 384 kbps is the minimum speed to send a live video at 30 frames per second across a full 1920 pixel screen. The next speed is 1.5 mbps; this is the standard for which we have measured by for years, more commonly known as a T1 line. 45mbps is an intermediate speed, more commonly used for "YouTube" type activity. This speed is known as a DS3, ranging in cost from $4,500 to $5,000 a

month for a school to use. 80mbps is what the market would bare if everyone had all the different types of Internet activity. For example, 80mbps is needed in order to have HDTV in your home via your Internet connection.

Currently one million citizens in the state of Arizona do not have the FCC definition of broadband access. At the school district level, 20% of the districts have a school that only has dial-up access. Rural areas are affected the most. To assist the rural areas with obtaining broadband access, GITA is working on a budget to build the Middle Mile. The Middle Mile is the pipeline of fiber optic lines that provide broadband access from the urban areas to the rural areas. When vendors are putting in the fiber optic lines, they look at the economic return of investment (ROI). When a vendor's ROI is too low for them they bypass the rural areas. GITA will have a budget, if it passes, of approximately two million dollars to select six or seven communities in which to build the Middle Mile.

GITA is putting together a survey based on school district areas to gather data on the location and type of broadband access/connection points throughout the state of Arizona. The survey will also provide information statewide on the costs per user for broadband access in a certain areas. GITA is aiming for a budget approval of $500,000. The first $50,000 will be spent towards creating the survey. Pending budget approval, the survey will be completed by November 2008.

Presentation by Tempe Union High School TAPBI – Mike Ruppel
Cathy Poplin introduced Mike Ruppel, Chief Information Officer, Tempe Union High School. Mike Ruppel gave everyone a copy of The Tempe Union High School District #213 Legislative Presentation Handout – Original Proposal for TAPBI. The handout goes over the TUHS TAPBI project process. One of the first hurdles TUHS District had to overcome was the district's curriculum adoption policy. To tackle this issue it was decided to create online courses using the curriculum they already offer. They created their own learning management system to assist with the transition. The transition includes: instructional materials, project based activities, practice testing, achievement testing and all the components necessary to administer the entire course, interactively, with students not located in a regular classroom setting. Courses are not self paced, must have a teacher present and the duration of the course is one full semester.

TUHS TAPBI has thirty-three courses, 200-250 seats (1 kid, 1 section), 10-12 students counting toward ADM, 0 fulltime TAPBI students. TUHS TAPBI only serves students that want to take an online course or would like to take an extra course. TAPBI teachers are retired or work on a part time basis. Cathy Poplin asked how TUHS TAPBI will move forward. Mike replied progression will be slow and deliberate.

Public Testimony
No guest comments

Next Meeting April 4, 2008.

Adjourn
Cathy Poplin adjourned the meeting at 12:10 pm

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

1535 W. Jefferson Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007
Phone: (602) 364-1349

ARIZONA eLEARNING TASK FORCE
MEETING NOTICE

OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

Date: Friday, April 4, 2008
Time: 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Place: Arizona Department of Education, Room 417

AGENDA

1. Welcome and Introduction of Task Force Member(s) & Guests
   a. Update from each Task Force Member (2 minutes maximum)

2. Approval of Minutes from March 7, 2008

3. Update on Middle School Math RFP Update and RRP Evaluation – Hank Stabler

4. Review of Preliminary Legislative Report – Cathy Poplin

5. Recommendations for Legislature to include in the Annual Report – Cathy Poplin

6. Phone Conference Susan Patrick, President and Chief Executive Officer of the North American Council for Online Learning (NACOL). Call will cover:

   - Efforts being made to affect pre-service teachers in preparation for e-Learning.
   - Essential conditions for providing quality e-learning programs and offerings.
   - Best practices for procurement and adoption of digital curriculum that will help maximize accessibility, portability, usability and reusability.
   - What advice would you have to help us move the e-learning effort forward in the State?
   - Perspective on the continuum of on line learning from Hybrid to pure CAI.

7. Next Meeting – May 1, 2008

8. Public Testimony

9. Adjourn

MEMBERS

Chris Cummiskey	Theodore Kraver	Cathy Poplin, Chair
Lisa Long	Sandi Grandberry	Casey Loman
Debra Lorenzen	Joseph O'Reilly	Mark Nichols
Rosalina Escandon	Rod Lenniger	

Website: www.azed.gov/eLearning

People with disabilities may request accommodations such as interpreters, alternative formats, or assistance with physical accessibility. Requests for accommodations must be made with 72 hours prior notice. If you require accommodations, please contact Jackie Jones at (602) 364-242

State of Arizona

Department of Education

Request For Information Cover Page

Arizona Department of Education
Procurement Section/3rd Floor
1535 W. Jefferson Street, Bin 37
Phoenix, AZ 85007
Phone: (602) 364-2517
Fax: (602) 364-0598

Appendix B: Request for Information

Please Respond By: **April 3, 2007**

Submittal Location: Arizona Department of Education
Procurement Section/3rd Floor
1535 West Jefferson Street, Bin #37
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Description of Project: **E-Learning Pilot Project**

Responses may be submitted either by hard copy, Fax or E-mail. The mailing address and fax number are provided above. E-mails are to be addressed to Richard.Adickes@azed.gov. Please indicate the project description on all responses

Please address all questions concerning this Request for Information to the Procurement Officer.

NOTE: This is **not** a solicitation for services or commodities. Responses will be used for planning assistance only.

Richard Adickes
Procurement Officer

(602 364-2517
Telephone Number

March 9, 2007
Date

SECTION 1
PROJECT SCOPE

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Procurement Section
1535 West Jefferson Street, Bin #37
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

E-LEARNING PILOT PROJECT

1 INTRODUCTION

This document is intended to provide sufficient information for suppliers to determine whether they are interested in participating in the project. It is not intended that suppliers prepare detailed proposals at this stage. It is important that they provide basic information regarding capabilities and an indication, in broad terms, as to how they would approach working with ADE and the e-Learning Task Force to achieve the objectives set out in this document.

The e-learning Pilot Project
History and Scope

The Arizona State Legislature passed House Bill 1512 in 2006 creating an e-Learning Task Force to establish an e-learning Pilot Program. The project has been funded by the legislature for $3 million (less 5% for ADE staff and support) over a 3 year period. The project is limited to no more than 10 sites and/or 10,000 students. The project is to focus on the single curriculum area of middle school math and to achieve academic and motivational gains compared to state and national averages.

1.1.2 Project Goal

The purpose of the Pilot is to develop and provide an example of a highly effective adoption process for digital curriculum in one subject area over multiple grade levels. The project will reflect the levels of decision requirements such as state policy, state system development, district and school adoption, and digital curriculum and teacher professional development enhancement.

1.1.3 Current School Environment

Schools around the State of Arizona have, through local initiative, begun to expand the use of laptop computers and digital curriculum to support and enhance student achievement. While many of these individual efforts show promise there has not been a concerted attempt to identify and establish a researched based set of guidelines or recommendations for this process in Arizona.

1.2 Project Overview

The e-Learning project is the establishment of the Arizona State Legislature (HB1512) The State of Arizona (Senate Bill 1512 http://www.azleg.gov/legtext/47leg/2r/bills/sb1512c.pdf) . The State wishes to implement a pilot program to deliver electronic digital curriculum consisting of complete mathematics courses aligned to Arizona State Academic Standards along with assessments for grades 6 through 9 using laptop computers. Specifically the program or methodology must have documentation of proven success in other venues. The legislation directs that solutions be "innovative." For purposes of this RFP, e-Learning is defined as*: The use of electronic technologies or information and communications technologies (ICT) in education. May occur both in distance and conventional education and may involve electronic media that do not use online delivery*[1].

1.2.1 Specific objectives of the project are as follows:

- Explore innovative **solutions** and strategies for selecting and implementing digital based academic curriculum and resources in Arizona schools to increase academic achievement.
- Initiate a Pilot program for middle school math, grades 6 - 9 that will achieve[2] academic gains exceeding state and national averages.
- Evaluate the impact on student motivation of immediate feedback on individual and group performance.
- Provide comprehensive reports for the legislature and ADE with data based on sound psychometric principles.

---

[1] *A Synthesis of New Research on K – 12 Online Learning*. Learning Point and Associates. 2005
[2] The legislation requires that participating schools have a minimum of two of the targeted grade levels in the same site.

- Provide a program of professional development that will ensure effective use of the digital curriculum and equipment as well as expanding teacher competencies that include strategies and techniques to successfully integrate technological and digital resources into the daily work of students.
- Identify and provide hardware necessary for a teacher to facilitate the classroom pilot project.

1.2.2 The project involves the following key steps:

- Issuance of this document to a list of potential suppliers by March 9, 2007
- Responses to be received by April 3, 2007
- Based on responses to the RFI, a Request for Proposal (RFP) will be issued with detailed requirements for the products and services, contractual details and key success criteria for successful bidders. (May/June 2007)
- Selection of the Pilot sites by ADE and the e-learning Task Force. (Fall, 2007)
- Development of the implementation plan by the selected vendor in collaboration with the ADE and e-Learning Task Force (Spring, 2008).
- Initiation of the Professional Development component by the selected vendor for the selected pilot site's participating teachers (June, 2008).
- Testing of the delivery system components and functional testing of the software (July, 2008).
- Implementation of the Pilot (August, 2008)

SECTION 2
PROJECT REQUIREMENTS

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Procurement Section
1535 West Jefferson Street, Bin #37
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

E-LEARNING PILOT PROJECT

2. REQUIREMENTS

2.1 Requirements for the Pilot Project

2.1.1 The focus of the e-Learning Pilot Project is to improve student achievement using innovative solutions, laptop computers and digital curriculum geared to middle school math. All components of a successful implementation need to be identified and included in the solution. The core requirements for an acceptable solution are:

- Program management including psychometric analysis, system analysis and comprehensive reporting to inform and advise the e-Learning Task Force and the appropriate legislative committees of the level of student achievement over the course of the project.
- Laptops for students and teachers
- Web based curriculum and delivery
- Core Math Digital Curriculum for 6th through 9th grades
- Constant formative assessment feedback to students and teachers and benchmarking reports for project managers.
- Summative assessment aligned to **Arizona's Instrument to Measure Standards** (**AIMS**), a standards-based test.
- High quality Professional Development

2.2 Software requirements

Software should be web based, platform neutral and capable of being delivered to up to 50,000 students across the state. The software should be comprehensive and capable of providing a complete math curriculum with assessments for 6th through 9th grade students.

2.3 Professional development requirements

The vendor must be capable of providing a complete professional development program for participating teachers and any supporting staff to ensure adequate preparation to use all the project components successfully. The Professional development must include initial training, ongoing training and program support for the term of the project.

2.4 Hardware requirements

2.4.1 The laptop will be

- The primary delivery system for the digital curriculum and each participating student and teacher will receive either a PC or Mac depending on the sites platform standard.
- In compliance with the State's Government Information and Technology Agency's (GITA) platform standards
- Equipped with a wireless card which will provide Internet connection via the school's wireless system and Local Area Network to an Internet Service Provider.

2.4.2 The Delivery System must be:

- SIF compliant
- Capable of being remotely monitored
- Use data standards compatible with the Department of Education's Data Warehouse System.

3. INSTRUCTIONS TO SUPPLIERS

Response Requirements

We are looking forward to hearing about your capabilities, but would like to minimize the amount of preparation that you need to do at this stage. Our requirements are therefore intended not to require significant new material to be prepared.

With this mind, please provide the following information, 2 copies of marketing brochures and 2 CDs with your response to this RFI for distribution to the e-Learning Task Force members. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Please answer the following questions:

Question	Response
Company name: Parent company:	
Company address	
Name of person responsible for the information contained in this RFI	
Telephone number: Facsimile number: Email address: Web page:	
Initial year of operations:	
Company location: Corporate office: Local offices: Other office:	
Number of employees as follows: ・US total ・Development ・Implementation ・Sales and Administration ・Support ・Key employees	
A copy of your latest credit report, e.g. Dun & Bradstreet.	
If you are a Value Added Reseller (VAR), total number of installations of the version of the software being proposed, which have been carried out by your organization?	
Describe any third party alliances/relationships	
Please provide details of any outstanding legal action against your company or any directors of partners.	
Are there any anticipated mergers or acquisitions pending?	
Would your company be the sole contractor or would you subcontract portions of the project to other vendors? If you would subcontract please provide a list of the other providers.	
Please provide information on your implementation methodology, e.g. project planning templates, training models, testing protocols etc.	
What documentation is provided for the software/system?	
What level of researched based evidence of success has been developed at this time?	
Was your software written by your organization or acquired from a third party?	
・ What type of initial and on-going training do you offer to assure your digital curriculum will deliver the highest level of academic performance and motivation to students? ・ Describe your training materials including sources and	

Question	Response
delivery methods used to support your digital curriculum.	
• Please provide details of how the product is supported across multiple sites. • What levels of support are available, definitions of each level and what are the hours of operation and response times? • Where are the support services located? • Does support include product updates, as well as bug fixes at no extra charge? • What is the helpdesk escalation procedure?	
What incentives have you found effective in implementing your program/system to increase individual student and group motivation?	
Provide a description and explanation of your computer adaptive testing system and how it can be used to improve the testing process.	
Explain how computer adaptive testing is used for end-of-unit testing as well as general math proficiency on a growth scale (scaled scores).	
How does your curriculum and management program accommodate students capable of testing out early through a computer adaptive testing system?	
How will you create a baseline (starting point) of student data for a project of this scope?	

Appendix C: Project Investment Justification

Project Investment Justification

A Statewide Standard
Document for Information Technology Projects

Project Title: ***eLearning Pilot Program***

Version 4.0

Prepared by:

Name	***Steve Holzinger***
Agency	***Arizona Department of Education***
Date	***August 1, 2007***

Table of Contents

Section I. Business and Technology Assessment 92
A. Management Summary 92
B. Proposed Changes and Objectives, “To Be” 93
C. Existing Situation and Problem, “As Is” 94
D. Proposed Technology 94
E. Major Deliverables and Outcomes 96
F. Roles and Responsibilities 96
G. Other Alternatives Considered 97
H. Summary Project Management Schedule 97
Section II. Public Value and Benefits 98
A. Value to the Public 98
B. Benefits to the State 99
Section III. Financial Assessment 101
A. Development Costs 101
B. Operating Costs 102
C. Total Project Cost 104
D. Special Terms and Conditions 104
E. Funding 104
1. Funding Timeline 104
2. Funding Source 105
Section IV. Risk Assessment 105
A. Risk Summary 105
B. Risk Evaluation 106
1. Strategic 106
2. Management 106
3. Operational 107
4. Scope and Requirements 108
5. Technology Competency 109
6. Infrastructure Dependencies 109
Section V. Project Approvals 111
A. CIO Review 111
B. Project Approvals 111
Glossary 112
Appendix A. Itemized List with Costs 112
Appendix B: Connectivity Diagram 112
Appendix C: Gantt Chart, Project Management Timeline 113
APPENDIX D. Request for Proposals 114
Appendix E. e-Learning Task Force 115
Appendix F. e-Learning Legislation 116

Section I. Business and Technology Assessment

Agency Name and Address	*Contact Name, Phone, FAX, email*
Arizona Department of Education 1535 West Jefferson Phoenix, AZ 85007	Steve Holzinger phone: 542-7394 fax 364-1937 Steve.Holzinger@azed.gov

Project Investment Name	*Date*
eLearning Pilot Program	August 1, 2007

A. Management Summary

There is no state-led eLearning program in Arizona. The state legislature mandates that the Arizona Department of Education (ADE), in cooperation with the eLearning Task Force, establish a three-year eLearning pilot program to help schools achieve academic and motivational gains. A three-year pilot program is to be established. A central digital curriculum system is to deliver mathematics course work, with coursework and assessments aligned with State Board of Education academic standards. Teachers and students in the pilot program will employ portable technology. Assessment results will be produced at the individual student level to monitor each student's growth, and comprehensive reports will be given to the legislature and ADE. Teachers will be able to access information in real time, and both school and district administrators will be able to access data at the student, class, school, grade, and district level.

The Arizona Legislature established a pilot program for technology-assisted project-based instruction (TAPBI) in 1998, to "improve pupil achievement and extend academic options beyond the four walls of the traditional classroom." Fourteen schools in Arizona, seven traditional public schools and seven charter schools, are currently authorized to offer this program. They may employ a variety of technology-assisted learning methodologies, including computer assisted learning systems, virtual classrooms, virtual tutoring, electronic field trips, on-line help desks, group chat sessions, and even non-computer-based activities in order to address the unique needs and learning styles needed today.

When they are away from the school, most students in the TAPBI programs access coursework online; when at the school they go to computer-equipped classrooms. "Off-site" students can participate using online access at their home, or at community-based sites where online instruction is available. Schools may develop curricula themselves or purchase from outside vendors. To qualify for credit, the students must complete the (generally self-paced) courses within a specified period of time.

For fiscal year 2006, TAPBI sites reported 16,442 pupils enrolled, 54 percent full-time, 42 percent concurrent, and 4 percent part-time. Concurrent students attend both a TAPBI site and another public school in the same academic year; state funding must be shared according to the percent of time attending each one. Sites with particularly large percentages of concurrent students indicate that their students often sign up for TAPBI in order to make up credits, accelerate their schedule or make time for band or other extracurricular activities at their "home" public school.

The existing TAPBI program may address aspects of eLearning, it does not satisfy either the needs of the state or the specifics of the state mandate: TAPBI is not led centrally at the state level, but is administered on a local basis; TAPBI lacks the required central digital curriculum system to deliver mathematics course work; TAPBI's focus differs from that of the legislature's new three-year pilot program; TAPBI does not take advantage of the laptop technology which the state mandates for its eLearning program. In short, TAPBI cannot fulfill the legislature's mandate to the Arizona Department of Education and the eLearning Task Force.

The proposed three-year eLearning pilot program will comprise an estimated 1125 students and 45 teachers, each employing portable technology, at a cost of $1,541,600 for hardware, $1,080,000 for software, $95,700 for training, and $300,000 for development and support, a total cost of $2,996,700.

Is this project mandated by law, court case or rule?
Yes: ARS §15-1044 SB1512 - Forty-seventh Legislature, Second Regular Session, 2006

The following table contains summary information taken from the other sections of the PIJ document.

Description	Section	Significance
Value Rating	II. A. Value to the Public	26
Economic Benefits	II. B. Benefits to the State	
Total Development Cost	III. A. Development Costs	$1,671,000
Total Project Cost	III. C. Summary of Costs by Year	$2,996.700
Score for Risks	IV. A. Risk Summary (Maximum 37)	27

B. Proposed Changes and Objectives, "To Be"

The Arizona Department of Education (ADE), together with the Arizona eLearning Task Force, intends to contract for subscription services in order to implement a three-year eLearning pilot program, with program management by an application service provider. eLearning, or electronic learning, is computer-enhanced learning. It encompasses the use of learning management software, web-based teaching materials, multimedia, and mobile technologies. The specific goal of this pilot program is to use eLearning to help participating schools to achieve academic and motivational gains.

The overall e-learning system will be implemented through a three-year pilot program by an entity or a group of entities that delivers the following elements:

Program management by an organization that is capable of each of the following:

Delivering reliable psychometric analysis of academic gains.

Evaluating coursework for alignment with the academic standards adopted by the state board of education.

Performing reliability analysis of electronic systems delivering coursework and assessments.

Analysis and direction towards system improvements.

Delivering monthly reports on the performance of the system and directing any corrective steps required to achieve success.

A central delivery or supporting system with the ability to deliver course work to fifty thousand students simultaneously at the highest reliability level both at home and at school.

Mathematics instruction through a digital curriculum system with coursework and assessments that are aligned with the academic standards adopted by the state board of education. The assessments will provide formative and cumulative assessments aligned with the coursework, and will provide percentile rank, grade level and scale scores on the Arizona Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS) test at the individual, classroom and school level on a real-time basis. The scale score reports on the AIMS test will be on the same scale as the passing scale score for a high school diploma in this state. The entity or group of entities delivering the assessments will be able to demonstrate the capability of delivering these assessments with computer adaptive testing (CAT).

Laptop technology to teachers and students involved in the pilot program.

Teacher training and professional development coursework and assessment. The teacher development and training will be delivered by an entity or group of entities that has experience providing teacher training and professional development coursework, and shall include both initial and ongoing components. The coursework will include strategies and techniques to successfully integrate technological and digital resources into the daily work of students.

The pilot project will develop and provide an example of a highly effective adoption process for digital curriculum in one subject area over multiple grade levels. The project will reflect all levels of educational decision making including state, district and school, that impact digital curriculum selection and adoption and associated teacher professional development. Training teachers in the effective use of digital content using laptop computers and a real time assessment and reporting system will be the focus of the Professional Development component.

Assessments will be available in real time for students and classroom teachers providing for immediate feedback and monitoring of progress based on benchmark assessments. A database of longitudinal assessment data at the student, class, school and district level will be developed and made available to the appropriate level of instructional or administrative authority.

The proposed three-year eLearning pilot program will comprise an estimated 1125 students and 45 teachers, each employing portable technology, at a cost of $1,541,600 for hardware, $1,080,000 for software, $95,700 for training, and $300,000 for development and support, a total cost of $2,996,700.

C. Existing Situation and Problem, "As Is"

14 Arizona schools offer online courses in a pilot program for technology assisted project-based instruction, or TAPBI (described below), we have no state-led eLearning program. By comparison, online education programs are offered in several other states, with student enrollment growing in 2006 as much as 20 percent, and in some cases even 50 percent.

The Arizona State legislature has mandated that an eLearning Task Force be created, and that the Department of Education, in cooperation with the task force, establish an eLearning pilot program at up to ten schools. The eLearning Task Force has been created, and $3 million has been appropriated for this purpose.

TAPBI The TAPBI program was established by the Legislature in 1998 (Laws 1998, Chapter 224) in order to "improve pupil achievement and extend academic options beyond the four walls of the traditional classroom." . Currently, seven traditional public schools and seven charter schools in Arizona are authorized to offer the TAPBI program:

TAPBI schools may employ technology-assisted learning methodologies, such as computer assisted learning systems, virtual classrooms, virtual tutoring, electronic field trips, on-line help desks, group chat sessions and non-computer based activities to address the unique needs and learning styles needed in the information age.

Though the TAPBI programs differ at each school, most pupils either access coursework online "off-site" or physically attend computer equipped classrooms "on-site" at the school. "Off-site" students can take online courses at their home or at community-based sites with access to online instruction. Schools may use curricula that are developed "in-house" or purchased from outside curriculum providers. The courses are generally self-paced, but must be completed within a certain period of time to qualify for credit.

TAPBI sites reported a total of 16,442 enrolled pupils for FY 2006. This total consisted mostly of "full-time" students (54%), followed by "concurrent" students (42%) and "part-time" students (4%). "Concurrent" students attend both a TAPBI site and another public school during the same academic year, which are required by law to share state funding for them based on the percent of time attended at each site. Sites with particularly large percentages of concurrent students indicate that their students often enroll in TAPBI in order to make up credits, accelerate their schedule, or make time for band or other extracurricular activities at their "home" public school.

D. Proposed Technology

The legislation calls for the project to be based on digital content and computer laptops using wireless connections to the schools sites local area network and internet provider.

Schools selected through an application process will be required to have the necessary local area network technology to ensure operational effectiveness.

Current laptops meeting GITA standards that are either Mac or PCs will be used based on the current standards of the individual school sites selected for the project.

The digital content will consist of a web based core mathematical curriculum for 6th through 9th grades

deliverable via the Internet. The provider of this software will be determined by an RFP process to be completed following the Project Investment Justification process with the scope of work guided by the legislation. Software applications must comply with GITA standards. Any vendor development needed (specifically the motivation component) will also meet GITA standards.
A comprehensive management system that will provide ongoing assessment and data reporting, system performance analysis and remote monitoring will also be part of the system requirements and is expected to be provided by the vendor selected from the RFP. Data including demographics and student academic results will be housed in compliance with ADE/GITA policy and standards including security layers to ensure FERPA compliance.

The eLearning Pilot Project is intended to demonstrate the feasibility of delivering digital mathematics curriculum and the collection of associated student level assessment results. Successfully accomplishing these goals requires aligning any proposed solutions with the Arizona Department of Education's practices related to information technology security, performance measurement, support, quality assurance, and architectural standards and data protection. The primary areas requiring integration include:

User authentication and data management
Student level data management
Data transmission and transformation
Consolidating reporting
Estimating the resource cost of enterprise technical asset and process integration includes:
Quality assurance technician 1 man month
Business analyst 1 man month
Management 1 man month
Developer(s) 9 man months (1.5 people for six months)
Estimated integration hardware/systems costs (not part of the learning management application cost) include:
Zone integration server (landing zone for transported data) $20,600

Enterprise Architecture (EA) Technology Domain Definitions	Project EA Conformance (Yes/ No)	Non-Conformance Explantation
Network: Defines policies and standards for the State's communications infrastructure, which includes the various topologies and protocols necessary to facilitate the interconnection of server platforms, mainframes, intra-building and office networks (LANs), and inter-building and mall/campus networks (WANs).	**Yes**	
Security: Identifies security technologies, policies, and standards necessary to protect the information assets of the State and to ensure isolation and confidentiality of information, integrity of data, and the availability of IT resources to the State's workforce and citizens, as appropriate.	**Yes**	
Platform: Defines policies and standards for IT devices and associated operating systems, which include mainframes, mid-size computers, servers, storage devices, client platforms (PCs, workstations, PDAs, telephony, etc.).	**Yes**	
Software/Application: Defines policies and standards for software applications, application development tools, productivity software tools, etc.	**Yes**	
Data/Information: Defines policies and standards for the organization of information related to citizens, locations, and objects the State must collect, store, maintain, and access.	**Yes**	

E. Major Deliverables and Outcomes

RFP developed and published to potential vendors
Selection of vendor and awarding of contract
Initial project plan created
Application procedures established for schools applying for pilot program participation
Selection criteria established for schools applying for pilot program participation
Final project plan established (including disaster plan)
Pilot program rolled out
Evaluation of Pilot Program results
Task Force makes recommendations for future adoptions

F. Roles and Responsibilities

The eLearning task force will function as the "oversight" of the project with development of all documents, review and selection of vendors in response to the RFP and develop the application for LEA's to participate in the pilot, manage the review and selection of participants and provide oversight to the pilot itself.
ADE's Math Standards department will review and approve the digital content selection.
ADE's Assessment department will be invited to provide input at the selection and oversight stages
ADE's IT would exercise oversight of the information technology and information technology security associated with the project, including the technology implemented in the schools.
JBLC and House and Senate Education committees will receive communication on progress as the pilot proceeds.

LEA will ensure that all stakeholders have input (specifically ensuring that parents, students and "general community") are involved in the implementation of the pilot (included in the application process) and on-going through the pilot.

G. Other Alternatives Considered

This project is mandated by the Arizona Legislature

Summary Project Management Schedule

June 2007 Submit PIJ to GITA and ITAC
Aug 2007 Submit proposed eLearning RFP to GITA and JLBC
Sept 2007 RFP finalized and published to potential vendors
Initial project plan created
Develop specifications for the third party evaluator
Sept 2007 Application procedures established for schools applying for pilot program participation
Release alert to schools re pending application with initial qualifications
Nov 2007 Selection of vendor and awarding of contract
Final project plan established in conjunction with eLearning Task Force and vendor
Release application to schools
Select the third party evaluator to immediately start review of data for reporting purposes
Dec 2007 Report to JBLC for contract review (provided by ADE)
Jan 2008 Select site participants and notification of acceptance
Report status to all concerned parties
Feb 2008 Professional development started, classrooms, initial equipment ordered
June 2008 Analysis of collected data, and report to legislature (round 1 of professional development, equipment and installation established for start of school)
Aug 2008 Full implementation in the classroom
Oct 2008 Report to all parties on status of the pilot
TBD Evaluations and status reports
Nov 2011 Final report to Legislature on pilot. (Summarize the result of the pilot)

Section II. Public Value and Benefits

A. Value to the Public
Score: 0=None, 1=Minor, 2=Moderate, 3=Considerable, 4=Substantial, 5=Extensive.

Description	*Score*
Client Satisfaction: Rate how stakeholders may respond to anticipated improvements. This could apply to health and welfare services, quality of life or life safety functions.	*5*
Customer Service: Rate anticipated improvements to internal and external customer service delivery. Give consideration to faster response, greater access to information, elimination or reduction in client complaints.	*5*
Life Safety Functions: Applies to public protection, health, environment, and safety. Consider how this project will reduce risk in these functions.	*3*
Public Service Functions: Applies to licensing, maintenance, payments, and tax. Consider how this project will enhance services in these functions.	*3*
Legal Requirements: Consideration should be given to projects mandated by federal or state law. Other consideration could be given if there are interfaces with other federal, state, or local entities.	*5*
Product Quality: Applies to the information and services delivered to internal and external customers and the public.	*5*
Other: List any other applicable value or benefits.	
Total	*26*

Detail Description of Project Benefits

(Describe in detail any category in the *Value to the Public* with a score greater than 3)
Client Satisfaction: Stakeholders in this project start with students, then parents, teachers, educational administrators at all levels, and the community at large.
Students are expected to benefit through increased motivation as a result of using current technology to deliver their math coursework in a manner that challenges them without leaving them behind on skills and knowledge necessary to success at the next level. They will know immediately if they are successful in their learning endeavors and they will be provided the necessary remedial resources to master any objective they have not successfully completed. Students will be able to work at their own pace and achieve a level of mastery independent of other students.
Parents will have ready access to the information that is available and provided to them at appropriate intervals. They will be able to know specifically what their students are working on and provide the level of support that reinforces the teacher's efforts in the classroom.
Teachers will benefit from the immediate feedback on student performance to inform their instructional planning. Students can be assigned the level of work appropriate to their level of mastery and not be moved beyond their ability level.
Educational Administrators will benefit from having the ability to monitor how individual classes, schools and districts are performing to assist in analyzing needs and resource allocations.
The Community will benefit from the development of an improved instructional delivery and support system that provides a level of transparency and accountability desired by all.
Customer Service: The instructional system with built in assessment and reporting functions will provide the data so essential to the students and teachers in monitoring and improving the instructional process will also provide meaningful data to the community to assist in ensuring adequate resources are provided and areas of low performance are identified for improvement.
Legal Requirements: This is a project that is mandated by Arizona Law, specifically Arizona Revised Statutes, Section 15-1044, Title 41, Chapter 27, Article 2, Section 41 – 3016
Product Quality: The "products" are defined as: the reports of student achievement and increased motivation and total pilot effectiveness. "Services" are defined as: teacher's professional development that changes the delivery of instruction to integrate technology into a highly effective learning situation, the management component of the pilot and the scalability of the pilot. The project will be monitored and evaluated by a third party well versed in evaluating educational projects. Criteria for an external evaluator will ensure that the products and services meet the legislative intent.

B. Benefits to the State

***Score:* 0=None, 1=Minor, 2=Moderate, 3=Considerable, 4=Substantial, 5=Extensive.**

Description	*Score*	*Savings*
Agency Performance: The extent to which duties and processes will improve or positively affect business functions. Consider reduced redundancy and improved consistency for the agency.	*3*	
Productivity Increase: The improvements in quantity or timeliness of services or deliverables. Consider improved turnaround time or expanded capacity of key processes.	*5*	
Operational Efficiency: Rating may be based on improved use of resources, greater flexibility in agency responses to stakeholder requests, reduction or elimination of paperwork, legacy systems, or manual tasks.	*5*	
Accomplishment Probability: The extent to which this project is expected to have a high level of success in completing all requirements for the division or agency.	*5*	

Functional Integration: The impact the project will have in eliminating redundancy or improve consistency. Consider the impact of information sharing between departments or divisions, or between agencies in the State.	*3*	
Technology Sensitive: The implementation of the right types of technology to meet clear and defined goals and to support key functions. Consider technologies and systems already proven within the agency, division, or other similar organizations.	*5*	
Other: List any other applicable benefit.		
Total	*26*	

Additional Information on Savings

(Describe in detail the calculation for any item with a total greater than $50,000)

Productivity Increase: The eLearning project will identify and develop a model for delivery of instruction via web based curriculum resources that provide for on-going benchmarking and periodic assessment of student performance. The performance data will be used by the student and teacher to focus their efforts in the teaching and learning process. The system will assist teachers in determining appropriate levels of instruction and coursework appropriate to the level of the student.

Operational Efficiency: If successful will provide a model of RFP, management and reduce time and paperwork. The model is scalable to be statewide, includes stakeholder communication and develops a model for changing classroom behaviors from "legacy" instruction to a 21st Century model. Develops an effective adoption process for digital curriculum and a student "feedback" model for instruction use.

Accomplishment Probability: The deliverable as stated in Section 1 E of this PIJ will be accomplished and will lead to a successful implementation of the middle school math digital curriculum.

Deliverables will be as follows:

RFP developed and published to potential vendors

Selection of vendor and awarding of contract

Initial project plan created

Application procedures established for schools applying for pilot program participation

Selection criteria established for schools applying for pilot program participation

Final project plan established (including disaster plan)

Pilot program rolled out

Evaluation of Pilot Program results

Technology Sensitive: The technology, both existing and to be purchased, will meet GITA standards, thereby ensuring interoperability within the LEA and State agency systems.

Section III. Financial Assessment
A. Development Costs

Fiscal Year						
Description	*FY 2007*	*FY 2008*	*FY 2009*	*FY 2010*	*FY 2011*	*Total**
The number of FTE and third-party positions						
1. IT FTE Positions		0.3				**(Do not use)**
2. User FTE Positions						
3. Professional and Outside Positions		0.7				
4. Total Positions *		1.0				
The development costs in thousands ($000)						
5. IT FTE COST (Include ERE)		23.4				23.4
6. User FTE COST (Include ERE)						
7. IT Services (Professional and Outside Cost)		106.0				106.0
8. Hardware		20.6	1,521.0			1,541.6
9. Software						
10. Communications						
11. Facilities						
12. Licensing and Maintenance Fees						
13. Other						
14. Total**		150.0	1521.0			1,671.0

* Items 1 through 3 are included in ***Section I. F. Roles and Responsibilities***.
** Items 7 through 13 are included in ***Appendix A. Itemized List with Costs.***

B. Operating Costs

Fiscal Year						
Description	*FY 2007*	*FY 2008*	*FY 2009*	*FY 2010*	*FY 2011*	*Total***
The number of FTE and third-party positions						
1. IT FTE						(Do not use)
2. User FTE						
3. Professional & Outside Positions						
4. Total Positions *						
The operating costs in thousands ($000)						
5. IT FTE COST (Include ERE)						
6. User FTE COST (Include ERE)						
7. IT Services (Professional and Outside Cost)						
8. Hardware contingent on results of RFP						
9. Software/subscription services – contingent on results of RFP			360.0	360.0	360.0	1,080.0
10. Communications						
11. Facilities						
12. Licensing and Maintenance Fees						

13. Other – travel, materials, support for eLearning Task Force (5% for ADE support) Professional Development for teachers and administrators on Digital Content - contingent on results of RFP	30.0	30.0	30.0 38.3	30.0 28.7	30.0 28.7	150.0 95.7
14. Total**	30.0	30.0	428.3	418.7	418.7	1,325.7

* Items 1 through 3 are described in ***Section I .F. Roles and Responsibilitie****s.*

** Items 7 through 13 are described in ***Appendix A. Itemized List with Costs.***

C. Total Project Cost

Fiscal Year ($000)						
Description	*FY 2007*	*FY 2008*	*FY 2009*	*FY 2010*	*FY 2011*	*Total*
1. Development Costs		150.0	1,521.0			1,671.0
2. Operating Costs	30.0	30.0	428.3	418.7	418.7	1325.7
3. Total Project Costs	30.0	180.0	1,949.3	418.7	418.7	2,996.7

Special Terms and Conditions INSTRUCTIONS

D. Special Terms and Conditions

Explanation

E. Funding

1. Funding Timeline

Five Year Total ($000)						
Agency	*FY 2007*	*FY 2008*	*FY 2009*	*FY 2010*	*FY 2011*	*Total*
1. Available Base Funding	3,000.0					3,000.0
2. Additional Appropriations						
3. Other Funding Source						
4. GITA Special Funds						
5. Total Funding (*)	3,000.0					3,000.0

2. Funding Source

Funding Source ($000)			
Name of Funding Source	***Available Base***	***New Appropriations Request***	***Total***
1. General Fund			
2. E-Learning Pilot Program, FY 2007 appropriation	$3,000		$3,000
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7. Federal Funding			
8. Funding Source Total (*)	$3,000.0		$3,000.0

(*) Total equals ***Section III. C. Total Project Costs***.

Section IV. Risk Assessment

A. Risk Summary

Category	***Maximum Possible***	***Score***	***Description***
1. Strategic	6	5	Aligns with Agency and Statewide Enterprise Architecture, goals, objectives, policies, standards and IT strategic plan.
2. Management	6	5	Senior and intermediate management is involved in, and supports, the project. A steering committee/project team is in place.
3. Operational	5	3	Adverse effects on current operations are unlikely or contingency plans are in place. Supports Agency Performance Measures.
4. Scope and Requirements	7	3	Scope and requirements are, or will be, clearly defined and approved. Effect on business processes has been assessed.
5. Technologies Competency	7	6	Agency has available, or will secure appropriate skills to implement the project. Organizational readiness has been assessed.
6. Infrastructure Dependencies	6	5	All key elements are included to fully implement the project. No additional costs are anticipated to deliver benefits.
Total	37	27	

General Comments:

B. Risk Evaluation
1. Strategic

Score 1 Rating Point for a "Yes" Answer	***Yes***	***No****
1. Does this project directly accomplish a strategic goal as outlined in your agency IT strategic plan?	x	
2. Is there a written assessment of short-term and long-term effects the project will have on operations?		x
3. Is the project technology already in place in your agency so that IT/user training is minimized?	x	
4. Have you evaluated implementations of this technology in other agencies or businesses?	x	
5. Will this project accommodate business operations, without additional upgrades, for the next 3-5 years?	x	
6. Will the project meet or exceed statewide Enterprise Architecture standards?	x	

Total Rating Points	5

*Explain all "No" Responses:

1. Does not appear in previous IT plan; Will appear in this year's plan.

2. Assessment will be made after receipt of responses to RFP, and vendor selection.

2. Management

Score 1 Rating Point for a "Yes" Answer	***Yes***	***No****
1. Are core business activities supported by the project?	x	
2. Does this project have a senior management sponsor?	x	
3. Has a project management team with relevant experience been formed?		x
4. Are project planning and project management practices in place?	x	
5. Are managers prepared to commit user time necessary for training?	x	
6. Has the designated Project Manager successfully implemented projects of this scope in the past?	x	

Total Rating Points	5

*Explain all "No" Responses:

The project management team will be formed by the time project development has begun. It is anticipated that the following will be a part of it:
E-Learning Taskforce
Vendor Representative
ADE IT Representative
ADE representative

3. Operational

Score 1 Rating Point for a "Yes" Answer	***Yes***	***No****
1. Can technical personnel continue maintenance/support and implement the project concurrently?	**x**	
2. Has, or will a user acceptance-testing plan been devised?	**x**	
3. Has the project's effect on current operations been thoroughly assessed?	**x**	
4. Does the system affect one location only? If not, is a statewide roll-out plan in place?		**x**
5. Has a disaster recovery or contingency plan been devised in the event of project failure or delayed implementation?		**x**

Total Rating Points	3

*Explain all "No" Responses:

4. The statewide roll-out plan is one of the deliverables of this project.

5. The disaster recovery plan is one of the deliverables of this project.

4. Scope and Requirements

Score 1 Rating Point for each "Yes" answer	***Yes***	***No****
1. Have Management and the Project Team approved a Requirements Document?		**x**
2. Have deliverables been clearly identified and appropriately scheduled?	**x**	
3. Have critical success factors been identified and agreed to by users and the Project Team?		**x**
4. Is there a Change Management process in place?	**x**	
5. Have "In Scope" and "Out of Scope" items been identified and agreed to by all stakeholders?		**x**
6. Have technical personnel documented core business processes?	**x**	
7. Have all data conversion/data entry tasks been defined and time allocated in the implementation plan?		**x**

Total Rating Points	3

*Explain all "No" Responses:

1, 3, 5, and 7 will be determined and satisfied with the final agreement and award of the vendor contracts.

5. Technology Competency

Score 1 Rating Point for each "Yes" answer	***Yes***	***No****
1. Do project technical personnel possess required skills?	**x**	
2. Has adequate training been included for both users and technical personnel?	**x**	
3. Have technical personnel developed other systems using the proposed platform/language?	**x**	
4. Are technical personnel fully versed in core business operations?	**x**	
5. Do all technical personnel possess sufficient experience developing systems using the proposed technology?	**x**	
6. If a vendor is involved, is the vendor financially stable and well established?		**x**
7. Has the assigned project team delivered projects of similar complexity on time and on budget, in the past?	**x**	

Total Rating Points	6

*Explain all "No" Responses:

The vendor will be chosen after responses to a request for proposals (RFP) are received. Vendors submitting proposals will be evaluated for financial stability.

6. Infrastructure Dependencies

Score 1 Rating Point for each "Yes" answer	***Yes***	***No****
1. Will the project deliver full functionality without future upgrades and additional development cost?	**x**	
2. Is all existing technology compatible with the proposed system?	**x**	
3. Have all environmental, electrical and security concerns been studied and addressed in the plan?	**x**	
4. Is key hardware/software available within the project plan constraints?	**x**	
5. If key services will be replaced, has the impact on users been evaluated, and have users agreed to the changes?		
6. Have all current and future operating costs related to the project been included in the PIJ?	**x**	

Total Rating Points	5

* Explain all “No” Responses:

4. The availability of key hardware/software within the project plan constraints will not be known until receipt of responses to the RFP.

6. Operating costs related to the project may exceed the legislature’s $3 million appropriation; however the legislation allows the expenditure of other funds: “The e-learning fund is established consisting of monies appropriated by the legislature *and monies received from any other public and private sources*. The department of education shall administer the fund, subject to the direction of the e-learning task force.” [emphasis added]

Section V. Project Approvals

A. CIO Review

Key Management Information	***Yes***	***No***
1. Is this project for a mission critical application system?	x	
2. Is this project referenced in your agency's Strategic IT plan?	x	
3. Is this project consistent with the agency's and State's policies, standards and guidelines?	x	
4. Is this project in compliance with the Arizona Revised Statutes and GRRC rules?	x	
5. Is this project in compliance with the statewide policy regarding the Accessibility to Equipment and Information Technology for Citizens with Disabilities?	x	

This project has been mandated by the Arizona legislature

B. Project Approvals

The PIJ must be transmitted to GITA by email. Project approvals may be sent to GITA by mail or FAX.
Include the Project Title for identification.

Project Title: **eLearning Pilot Program**

Responsibility	*Approval Signature and Title*	*Date*
Project Manager:		8/2/07
Agency CIO:		8/2/07
Project Sponsor:		8/2/07
Agency Director:		8/3/07

Glossary

ADE Arizona Department of Education
AIMS Arizona Instrument to Measure Standards
CAT computer-adaptive testing: a method for administering tests adapting to the examinee's ability level (also called “tailored testing”)
eLearning electronic learning: computer-enhanced learning; may employ learning management software, web-based teaching materials, and mobile technologies
JLBC Joint Legislative Budget Committee
LEA local education agency (school district or charter holder)
LMS learning management system: software for management and delivery of online content to learners; usually web-based to allow access to learning content and administration any time, any place, any pace. Allows for learner registration, delivery of learning activities, and learner assessment; may include tools such as competency management, skills-gap analysis, succession planning, certifications, and resource allocation (venues, rooms, textbooks, instructors, etc.)
TAPBItechnology assisted project-based instruction

Appendix A. Itemized List with Costs

Final itemized list with costs will be adjusted after results of the Request For Proposal (RFP) have been received. The total cost is expected to remain within the range of $3 million, as funded by the legislature.

	Cost/unit	Units	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Total
Training:	85	1125 students	0	0	38,300	28,700	28,700	95,700
Hardware:	1,300	1125 students	0	0	1,462,500	0	0	1,462,500
Hardware:	1,300	45 teachers	0	0	58,500			58,500
Hardware:	Zone Integration Server			20,600				20,600
Software:	Subscription Services		0	0	360,000	360,000	360,000	1,080,000
Human Resources:	IT Services and IT Staff		0	129,400	0	0	0	129,400
Other:	Travel, Materials, Support, Admin		30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	150,000
Total:			**30,000**	**180,000**	**1,949,300**	**418,700**	**418,700**	**2,996,700**

Appendix B: Connectivity Diagram

Connectivity diagram will be finalized when results of the RFP have been received.

Appendix C: Gantt Chart, Project Management Timeline

Detailed project management timeline will be finalized when results of the RFP have been received.

Fiscal year:	**Q4–07**	**Q1–08**	**Q2–08**	**Q3–08**	**Q4–08**	**Q1–09**	**Q2–09**
Submit PIJ to GITA and ITAC	6'07						
Proposed eLearning RFP to GITA and JLBC		7'07					
RFP finalized and published to potential vendors		9'07					
Initial project plan created		9'07					
Develop specifications for the third party evaluator		9'07					
Application procedures established for schools applying for pilot program participation		9'07					
Release alert to LEA re pending application with initial qualifications		9'07					
Selection of vendor and awarding of contract			11'07				
Final project plan established in conjunction with eLearning Task Force and vendor			11'07				
Release application to LEA			11'07				
Select the third party evaluator to immediately start review of data for reporting purposes			11'07				
Report to JBLC for contract review (provided by ADE)			12'07				
Select site participants and notification of acceptance				1'08			
Report status to all concerned parties				1'08			
Professional development started, classrooms, initial equipment ordered				2'08			
Analyze data, report to legislature (round 1 professional development, equipment and installation established for start of school)					6'08		
Full implementation in the classroom						8'08	
Report to all parties on status of the pilot							10'08

Final report to Legislature on pilot. (Summarize the result of the pilot) November 2011

APPENDIX D. Request for Proposals

The Arizona Department of Education, through the Arizona eLearning Task Force, will prepare an actionable request for proposals (RFP) to implement a three-year eLearning pilot program to help participating schools to achieve academic and motivational gains based on the state and national average.

All responses to the RFP will be required to meet the government information technology agency standards.

Before the final RFP is issued, a preliminary RFP will be submitted to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee (JLBC) for review and comment.

The RFP is to include:

The scope of work, including programmatic, performance and technical requirements, conceptual design, specifications and functional and operational elements for the delivery of the completed components of the pilot program.

A description of the qualifications required of the entity or group of entities that will be selected for the pilot program.

Copies of the contract documents that the successful bidder or group of bidders will be expected to sign.

A timeline for the design and completion of the pilot program.

The estimated cost of the components of the pilot program.

Any other information relevant to the pilot program.

Based on the comments received from the joint legislative budget committee, the task force shall finalize the request for proposals and the department of education shall issue the finalized request for proposals within thirty days after the hearing conducted by the JLBC.

Appendix E. e-Learning Task Force

Purpose:
To examine E-learning programs in other states, analyze potential methods to implement E-learning programs in this state, and develop innovative E-learning solutions. The Task force shall report annually to the Legislature regarding E-learning programs and solutions.
Members:
• The Director of the Government Information Technology Agency (GITA) or the Director's designee:
- **Mr. Chris Cummiskey, Director, Government Information Technology Association**

• One member with a background in psychometrics, appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:
- **Dr. Jerry D'Agostino, University of Arizona**

• One member representing a public, private or charter school that provides instruction in grade six, seven, eight or nine, appointed by the Governor:
- **Ms. Rosalina Escandon, Cartwright School District**

• One member with expertise in curriculum development, appointed by the President of the Senate:
- **Ms. Sandi Grandberry, For the Love of Software**

• The Superintendent of Public Instruction or the Superintendent's designee:
- **Ms. Cathy Poplin, Director of Education Technology, Arizona Department of Education**

• One representative of the business community with expertise in technology issues, appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:
- **Mr. Theodore Kraver, eLearning Systems for Arizona Teachers and Students**

• One representative of the business community with expertise in technology issues, appointed by the Governor:
- **Mr. Rod Lenniger, iCrossing, Inc.**

• One teacher who provides instruction in grade six, seven, eight or nine in a public, private or charter school, appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:
- **Ms. Casey Loman, ReSolutions ESP, Inc.**

• One member with expertise in curriculum development, appointed by the Governor:
- **Ms. Lisa Long, Tucson Unified School District**

• One member representing an entity that has at least ten years of experience in teacher training and professional development coursework and that has provided such training and coursework to at least five thousand teachers, appointed by the President of the Senate:
- **Ms. Debra Lorenzen, Executive Director, ASSET-Eight, Arizona State University**

• One member with a background in psychometrics, appointed by the President of the Senate:
- **Mr. Joseph O'Reilly, Mesa School District.**

Notes: The Task Force shall annually elect a Chair from among the members of the Task Force. The Department of Education shall provide staff support for the Task Force. Except for the Superintendent of Public Instruction or the Director of the Government Information Technology Agency, or their designees, initial members shall assign themselves by lot to terms of one, two and three years in office. Subsequent members shall serve three year terms. The Chair shall notify the appointing authority of these terms.

Appendix F. e-Learning Legislation

State of Arizona SENATE BILL 1512
Forty-seventh Legislature Second Regular Session 2006

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Arizona:

Section 1. Title 15, chapter 9, article 8, Arizona Revised Statutes, is amended by adding section 15-1044, to read:

15-1044. Arizona e-learning task force; duties

A. The Arizona E-learning task force is established. The task force shall consist of the following members who shall be appointed on or before august 31, 2006:

1. Two representatives of the business community with expertise in technology issues, one of whom shall be appointed by the governor and one of whom shall be appointed by the speaker of the House of Representatives.
2. Two persons who shall have a background in psychometrics, one of whom shall be appointed by the president of the senate and one of whom shall be appointed by the speaker of the House of Representatives.
3. Two persons who have expertise in curriculum development, one of whom shall be appointed by the governor and one of whom shall be appointed by the president of the senate.
4. One teacher who provides instruction in grade six, seven, eight or nine in a public, private or charter school and who is appointed by the speaker of the House of Representatives.
5. One person who represents a public, private or charter school that provides instruction in grade six, seven, eight or nine and who is appointed by the governor.
6. One person who represents an entity that has at least ten years of experience in teacher training and professional development coursework and that has provided such training and coursework to at least five thousand teachers and who is appointed by the president of the senate.
7. The superintendent of public instruction or the superintendent's designee.
8. The director of the government information technology agency or the director's designee.

B. The task force shall annually elect a chairperson from among the members of the task force. The department of education shall provide staff support for the task force.

C. The initial members appointed pursuant to subsection a, paragraphs 1 through 6 shall assign themselves by lot to terms of one, two and three years in office. All subsequent members appointed pursuant to subsection a, paragraphs 1 through 6 serve three year terms. The chairperson shall notify the appointing authority of these terms.

D. The task force shall:

1. Examine e-learning programs in other states.
2. Analyze potential methods to implement e-learning programs in this state.
3. Develop innovative e-learning solutions.
4. Annually report to the legislature regarding e-learning programs and solutions.

E. Task force members are not eligible for compensation, but task force members who are appointed pursuant to subsection a, paragraphs 1 through 6 are eligible for reimbursement of expenses pursuant to title 38, chapter 4, article 2 from monies appropriated to the department of education.

Sec. 2. Title 41, chapter 27, article 2, Arizona revised statutes, is amended by adding section 41-3016.01, to read:

41-3016.01. E-learning task force; termination July 1, 2016

A. The E-learning task force terminates on July 1, 2016.

B. Section 15-1044 is repealed on January 1, 2017.

Sec. 3. E-learning pilot program

A. The department of education, in cooperation with the e-learning task force established by section 15-1044, Arizona revised statutes, as added by this act, shall establish an e-learning pilot program at up to ten schools.

B. On or before December 15, 2006, the e-learning task force, in cooperation with the department of

education, shall prepare an actionable request for proposals to implement a three-year e-learning pilot program to help participating schools to achieve academic and motivational gains based on the state and national average and shall submit the preliminary request for proposals to the joint legislative budget committee for review and comment. The request for proposals shall require all responses to meet the government information technology agency standards. The request shall include:

1. The scope of work, including programmatic, performance and technical requirements, conceptual design, specifications and functional and operational elements for the delivery of the completed components of the pilot program.
2. A description of the qualifications required of the entity or group of entities that will be selected for the pilot program.
3. Copies of the contract documents that the successful bidder or group of bidders will be expected to sign.
4. A timeline for the design and completion of the pilot program.
5. The estimated cost of the components of the pilot program.
6. Any other information relevant to the pilot program.

C. Based on the comments received from the joint legislative budget committee, the task force shall finalize the request for proposals and the department of education shall issue the finalized request for proposals within thirty days after the hearing conducted by the joint legislative budget committee.

D. The department of education shall award a contract or contracts within one hundred eighty days after the issuance of the finalized request for proposals.

E. At least ten days before the department of education enters into a contract or contracts that result from the request for proposals, the superintendent of public instruction shall submit the provisions of the contract or contracts for review by the joint legislative budget committee in executive session.

F. The overall e-learning system shall be implemented through a three-year pilot program by an entity or a group of entities that delivers the following elements:

1. Program management by an organization that is capable of each of the following:

(a) delivering reliable psychometric analysis of academic gains.

(b) evaluating coursework for alignment with the academic standards adopted by the state board of education.

(c) performing reliability analysis of electronic systems delivering coursework and assessments.

(d) analysis and direction towards system improvements.

(e) delivering monthly reports on the performance of the system and directing any corrective steps required to achieve success.

2. A central delivery or supporting system with the ability to deliver course work to fifty thousand students simultaneously at the highest reliability level both at home and at school.

3. Mathematics instruction through a digital curriculum system with coursework and assessments that are aligned with the academic standards adopted by the state board of education. The assessments shall provide formative and cumulative assessments aligned with the coursework, and shall provide percentile rank, grade level and scale scores on the Arizona Instrument to Measure Standards test at the individual, classroom and school level on a real-time basis. The scale score reports on the Arizona instrument to measure standards test shall be on the same scale as the passing scale score for a high school diploma in this state. The entity or group of entities delivering the assessments shall be able to show that the entity or group of entities are capable of delivering these assessments with computer adaptive testing.

4. Lap-top technology to teachers and students involved in the pilot program.

5. Teacher training and professional development coursework and assessment. The teacher development and training shall be delivered by an entity or group of entities that has experience providing teacher training and professional development coursework and shall include both initial and ongoing components. The coursework shall include strategies and techniques to successfully integrate technological and digital resources into the daily work of students.

G. After the department of education and the e-learning task force have awarded a contract to the entity or group of entities that will implement the e-learning pilot program, the department of education,

in cooperation with the e-learning task force, shall establish application procedures and additional selection criteria for schools that wish to apply for participation in the pilot program. The pilot program shall be conducted at up to ten schools that provide instruction in any two grades consisting of grade six, seven, eight or nine. Pupils in preschool programs, kindergarten programs, grades one through five and grades ten, eleven and twelve are not eligible to participate in the pilot program. These schools shall be able to demonstrate that the teachers who will participate in the pilot program are committed to the pilot program. The affected teachers shall complete the initial training and professional development component of the pilot program by the end of the fall semester of 2007.

H. In cooperation with the e-learning task force, the department of education shall submit a report on or before November 15, 2010 to the governor, the president of the senate and the speaker of the House of Representatives that summarizes the results of the pilot program. The academic effectiveness of pupils in the pilot program shall be measured according to the existing assessment mechanisms prescribed in title 15, Arizona revised statutes. The department of education shall provide a copy of this report to the secretary of state and the director of the Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records.

I. Schools and pupils that participate in the technology assisted project-based instruction program established pursuant to section 15-808, Arizona revised statutes, are not eligible for participation in the pilot program.

Sec. 4. E-learning fund

The E-learning fund is established consisting of monies appropriated by the legislature and monies received from any other public and private sources. The department of education shall administer the fund, subject to the direction of the e-learning task force.

Sec. 5. Delayed repeal

Sections 4 and 5 of this act, relating to the e-learning pilot program and the e-learning fund, are repealed from and after august 31, 2011.

Sec. 6. Appropriation; department of education; e-learning pilot program; exemption

A. The sum of $3,000,000 is appropriated from the state general fund to the department of education in fiscal year 2006-2007 to carry out the e-learning pilot program established by this act. The department of education may distribute the monies appropriated in this section in fiscal years 2006-2007, 2007-2008, 2008-2009, 2009-2010 and 2010-2011.

B. The appropriation made in subsection A of this section is exempt from the provisions of section 35-190, Arizona revised statutes, relating to lapsing of appropriations.

C. The department of education may retain up to five per cent of the monies appropriated pursuant to subsection A of this section for administrative costs of the department in connection with the e-learning pilot program, to provide technical assistance to schools that participate in the pilot program.

Appendix D: Request for Proposal RFP ED08-0020

State of Arizona

Department of Education

Request For Proposal Cover Page

Arizona Department of Education
Procurement Section/3rd Floor
1535 W. Jefferson Street, Bin 37
Phoenix, AZ 85007
Phone: (602) 364-2517
Fax: (602) 364-0598

Solicitation Number: **RFP ED08-0020**

Solicitation Due Date / Time: December 14**,** 2007, at 3:00 P.M. Mountain Standard Time

Submittal Location: Arizona Department of Education
Procurement Section/3rd Floor
1535 West Jefferson Street, Bin #37
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Description of Procurement: **E-Learning Pilot Program**

Pre-Offer Conference Date, Time and Location: 2005 N. Central Avenue, #100, Phoenix, AZ 85004 on November 16**,** 2007 at 9:00 A.M. Mountain Standard Time

In accordance with A.R.S. § 41-2534, competitive sealed proposals for the materials or services specified will be received by the Arizona Department of Education's Procurement Section at the above specified location until the time and date cited. Offers received by the correct time and date will be opened and the name of each Offeror will be publicly read.

Offers must be in the actual possession of the Arizona Department of Education's Procurement Section on or prior to the time and date, and at the submittal location indicated above. ***Late offers will not be considered.***

Offers must be submitted in a sealed envelope or package with the Solicitation Number and the Offeror's name and address clearly indicated on the envelope or package. All offers must be completed in ink or typewritten. Additional instructions for preparing an offer are included in this Solicitation.

Persons with disabilities may request special accommodations such as interpreters, alternate formats, or assistance with physical accessibility. Requests for special accommodations must be made with 72 hours prior notice. Such requests are to be addressed to the Solicitation Contact Person or Procurement Officer.

OFFERORS ARE STRONGLY ENCOURAGED TO CAREFULLY READ THE ENTIRE SOLICITATION.

Richard Adickes
Procurement Officer

(602) 542-4234
Telephone Number

Nov 1, 2007
Date

OFFER AND AWARD

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Procurement Section
1535 West Jefferson Street, Bin #37
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

SOLICITATION NO. RFP NO. ED08-0020

OFFER

The Undersigned hereby offers and agrees to furnish the materials, service(s) or construction in compliance with all the terms, conditions, specifications and amendments in the solicitation.

Company Name _____ Name of Person Authorized to Sign Offer _____

Street Address _____ Title of Authorized Person _____

City State Zip Code _____ Signature of Authorized Person _____ Date of Offer _____

Telephone Number: _____ Facsimile Number: _____

Offeror's Arizona Transaction (Sales) Privilege Tax License Number: _____

Offeror's Federal Employer Identification Number: _____

Acknowledgement of Amendment(s): *(Offeror acknowledges receipt of amendment(s) to the Solicitation for Offers and related documents numbered and dated*

Amendment No.	Date	Amendment No.	Date

ACCEPTANCE OF OFFER AND CONTRACT AWARD

(For State of Arizona Use Only)

Your Offer, dated _____, is hereby accepted as described in the Notice of Award. You are now bound to perform based upon the solicitation and your Offer, as accepted by the State.

This Contract shall henceforth be referred to as Contract Number **ED08-0020-_____**.

You are hereby cautioned not to commence any billable work or provide any material, service or construction under this contract until you receive an executed purchase order, contract release document, or written notice to proceed, if applicable.

State of Arizona

Awarded this _____ day of _____ 2007

_____
Douglas C. Peeples, MBA, CPPB, CPCM
Chief Procurement Officer

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Procurement Section
1535 West Jefferson Street, Bin #37
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

SOLICITATION NO. RFP NO. ED08-0020

Section	Title	Page
	Solicitation Cover Page	
	Offer and Award Form	1
	Table of Contents	2
1	Scope of Work	3
2	Special Terms and Conditions	12
3	Uniform Terms and Conditions	20

No table of contents entries found. (These standard documents must be completed and returned by the Offeror. Other documents may be *required.* Refer to Special Instructions to Offerors.)

6.1 Prices

6.2 Offeror's References

6.3 Offeror's Organization

6.4 Offeror's Personnel Qualifications

6.5 Offeror's Financial Disclosure

6.6 Sole Proprietor Certificate Waiver

6.7 Digital Content, Professional Development and Delivery Narrative

6.8 Self-Assessment of Proposed Program Design and Deliverables

6.9 Peripheral Equipment Specifications

6.10 Offeror’s Checklist

7 Exhibits

7.1 Certificate of Insurance

7.2 (Other Exhibits as Necessary)

Appendix A - Timeline and Design Considerations for the e-Learning Pilot Project

SECTION 1
SCOPE OF WORK

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Procurement Section
1535 West Jefferson Street, Bin #37
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

SOLICITATION NO. RFP NO. ED08-0020

BACKGROUND:

The State of Arizona (Senate Bill 1512 - http://www.azleg.gov/legtext/47leg/2r/bills/sb1512c.pdf) wishes to implement an elearning pilot program to deliver digital middle school mathematics content aligned to Arizona State Academic Standards. The program will provide the digital content with assessments for math grades 6 through 9 and use laptop computers. Professional development is a critical component of success for the project and will be included in the design and implementation of the program. For purposes of this RFP, elearning is defined as*: The use of electronic technologies or Information, Communication, Technology (ICT)'s in education. ELearning may occur both in distance and conventional education and may involve electronic media that do not use online delivery*[3].

The goal of the legislation is to implement a three-year eLearning pilot program to help schools achieve academic and motivational gains based on state and national standards. The scope of the pilot will be limited to three full academic years for up to a maximum of 10 sites and 10,000 or fewer students. However, vendors must be able to provide a delivery system with the digital math content capable of scaling up to 50,000 students at over 225 districts and 450 charter schools at school and home. The digital content must also provide for students who are above or below grade level.

Schools will be selected through an application process developed by the eLearning Taskforce (ELTF) in conjunction with the Arizona Department of Education (ADE). The selection process will ensure a representative sample of students reflecting, as close as possible, the state's student population profile.
The number of participating sites and students will depend on the project's cost per student and the available funds.

Laptops provided for the pilot must include wireless cards, meet the Arizona Government Information Technology Agency (GITA) platform standards and match the platform standard (PCs or Mac) of the pilot schools.

The award will be based on the system that provides the highest quality digital content and professional development that focuses on effective teacher/student interaction.

Proposed Project Timeline:
Aug 2007 Submit proposed eLearning PIJ to GITA.
Sept 2007 Submit draft RFP JLBC.
Publish RFP.
Develop specifications for the third party evaluator.
Oct 2007 Develop application for LEA's participation.
Create tentative project plan and schedule.
Release alert advisory to schools regarding upcoming application including site qualification requirements.
Nov 2007 Selection of vendor and award of contract.
Develop and approve final project plan in conjunction with selected vendor.
Release application to schools.
Select the third party evaluator to immediately start review of data for reporting purposes.
Dec 2007 Report to JBLC for contract review (provided by ADE).
Jan 2008 Select site participants and issue notification of acceptance.
Report status to all concerned parties.
Feb 2008 Implement the Professional development and community awareness phase of the pilot.
June 2008 Report to legislature.
Ensure delivery of equipment, professional development schedule and site readiness milestones are on track.
Aug 2008 Establish full implementation for all participating LEAs.
Oct 2008 Report to all parties on status of the pilot.
TBD Evaluations and status reports.
Nov 2011 Final report to Legislature on pilot.

[3] *A Synthesis of New Research on K – 12 Online Learning*. Learning Point and Associates. 2005

SECTION 1
SCOPE OF WORK

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Procurement Section
1535 West Jefferson Street, Bin #37
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

SOLICITATION NO. RFP NO. ED08-0020

Project Oversight/Management Team
The project will be directed by the eLearning Taskforce and supported by the Arizona Department of Education (ADE). LBC and House and Senate Education committees will receive communication on progress as the pilot proceeds. The eLearning Taskforce will provide oversight of the project including approval of all documents, conducting the RFP evaluation and selection of vendors, development of the application for LEA's, and selection of participants.
The eLearning Taskforce consists of:

The Superintendent of Public Instruction or his designee.
The Director of the Government Information Technology Agency (GITA) or his designee.
Nine appointed persons representing:
Two members of the business community with expertise in technology issues.
Two psychometricians.
Two individuals with expertise in curriculum development.
One teacher from a public, private or charter school who provides instruction in grades 6, 7 or 8.
One person who represents a public, private or charter school.
Two persons who represent higher education (experts in education technology and 21st century learning.
One person with background in online or digital format formative assessment.
One person who represents an entity that provides teacher training and professional development.

Advisory Support for the Management Team:
ADE's Math Standards department will review and approve the digital content selection.
ADE's Assessment department will provide input during the selection and oversight stages
ADE's IT Department will exercise oversight of the technical and data aspects of the project.
Project Funding
The State has appropriated $3,000,000 with 5% being reserved for administration costs of the Arizona Department of Education. This state funding in the fund is the only funding directly available at this time to carry out the pilot program. Other funds from private and public sources may become available to add to the fund.

Fixed Costs

ADE administrative fixed costs		$ 150,000.00
ADE's IT data integration fixed costs		$ 150,000.00
	Total	**$ 300,000.00**

The remainder of the funds, $ 2,700,000, will be spent on the following:
Digital content/assessment
Professional development
Hardware

The ELTF will select a qualified third party to evaluate the pilot project. The evaluation will include measures of student attitudinal, motivational, cognitive and behavioral variables, teacher attitudinal and training factors, and student achievement measures. The evaluation questions and reports will address adoption, implementation and outcome issues, as well as all levels of decision making including state policy, state system development, district and school decisions, digital curriculum standards and professional development standards. The specific evaluation questions and plan will be determined in conjunction with the winning bidder and ADE, with the final plan requiring approval by the e-learning task force.

PURPOSE

Select and implement an innovative **solution** that includes digital mathematics content, assessments, professional development and hardware for a pilot of Arizona schools with the goal of increasing student academic achievement beyond one year's growth per academic year and improving student motivation.

The proposed solution will include:
A pilot program for digital middle school math content at schools that have at least 2 continuous grades at the sixth through ninth grade levels. (See Appendix A for model of implementation.)
Professional development that will ensure effective use of the digital math content, including use of equipment and appropriate pedagogical strategies. Training will also address using the laptop technology to positively impact the daily work of students.
Comprehensive progress reports for the legislature and ADE with appropriate student data based on sound psychometric principles.
The necessary hardware to effectively implement the digital content for students and teachers, i.e. laptop computers with wireless capability.
A central delivery system with the ability to deliver course work to 50,000 students simultaneously at the highest reliability level both at home and school.

3. REQUIREMENTS

A. OFFERORS REQUIREMENTS

The offeror shall meet the requirements below and shall provide the appropriate supporting documentation. Offeror's proposed digital content must stand firmly on scientifically-based research. The Offeror and **prime** vendor must be the provider of the digital content and may choose to partner with other vendors, as appropriate, in submitting a single proposal.

The Offeror must:
Be capable of providing effective leadership in a joint effort with the selected partners. Previous successful joint efforts similar to this project should be referenced.

Have successfully implemented the current product or immediate predecessor in a variety of educational settings. Provide a list of references of schools that have used the digital content or predecessor products in similar situations. (Provided in Attachment 6.2)

Submit a comprehensive written narrative of the design and implementation plan to accomplish the project. The implementation plan must include a projected timeline sequencing all major events and project tasks that specifically detail the duration of all tasks in increments of eight (8) hour days.

Provide access to full versions of the proposed digital content/curriculum to ELTF members for evaluation of the RFP and to the Arizona Legislative committee members identified in the enabling legislation Access for a minimum of 25 users will be required during the evaluation phase. The full digital content shall be available from the submission to the date the award process is completed.

Identify and provide specifications for any peripheral equipment required or recommended to maximize effective use of the system. (This information will be attached to the Offeror's proposal as Attachment 6.9)

Provide a sample of the laptop(s) being offered that meet the specifications recommended for the pilot program for testing during the evaluation phase.

Provide a site readiness checklist that will ensure the participating sites are equipped with the required technical infrastructure and Internet bandwidth.

Describe how and what the vendor will report to the legislature, ADE, ELTF, and pilot districts and schools. The legislation states that the vendor will be required to deliver "Monthly reports on the performance of the system and direct any corrective steps required to achieve success."

Provide the name(s) and qualifications of the Project Management team and support staff with individual roles and

responsibilities identified.

B. DIGITAL CONTENT REQUIREMENTS:

The focus of the project is sixth through ninth grade mathematics. The math digital content will be platform neutral and delivered via the Internet for school and home use. The software design needs to allow the student the ability to be self-paced at times as well as allow the teacher to use it as a part of direct instruction. The teacher's role may change over time to be more of a facilitator in the classroom. Given the possibility that some students will not have Internet connection at home, vendors are encouraged to offer alternatives for providing digital activities and resources utilizing the student laptop to meet the needs of these students. The proposed digital content must be firmly grounded on scientifically-based research with a high degree of validity and reliability. The vendor shall provide documentation for this research.

The Digital Content Must:
Be aligned with the Arizona K-12 Academic Math Standards **(http://www.ade.state.az.us/standards/math/articulated.asp)**. The digital content will address every math standard/strand and concept, down to the performance objective for 6-9 grades.

Be designed to be used in a one to one (1:1) environment to allow students to progress at their own pace as well as allow the teacher to use in direct instruction.

Accommodate students that are performing above and below grade level.

Be designed using appropriate pedagogy, learning theory, and instructional strategies to increase student achievement.

Provide authentic activities and relevant learning examples to address individualized needs of students**.**

Provide sensitivity to the ethnic, cultural and socio-economic demographics of Arizona when providing content examples and assessment items.

Be accessible beyond the 180 day academic school year (for example intersession, summer school).

Provide a delivery system that has the ability to provide course work to 50,000 students at the highest reliability level both at school and home.

Comply with federal 2004 IDEA parameters (can accommodate IEPs and work with assistive technologies)

Be designed to "increased student motivation" related to math.

Be platform neutral and delivered via the Internet for school and home use. Vendors are encouraged to offer alternatives for providing digital activities and resources utilizing the student laptop to meet the needs of students not having home access to the Internet.

Provide engaging and interactive experiences for students (allow for all learning styles) which will include but not be limited to:
visual (color, motion, graphics)
auditory
aesthetic appeal
intuitive navigation
reading level fits the recommended audience
use of gaming strategies

Desirable but not required:
Provide alignment to the National Math Curriculum Focus (NMCF), h**ttp://www.nctm.org/focalpoints/news_cfpnctm.asp**).

Provide for parental involvement with the ability to monitor learning and progress both electronically and in alternative formats.

Provide for a student "help desk" on-line for technical issues throughout the duration of the pilot.

Provide for a free student "math homework hotline" a minimum of 2 hr per "evening"

Provide a collaborative student platform.

C. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS:

Effective professional development is critical to the success of this pilot. All schools are required by NCLB to provide highly qualified teachers in the classroom; however, participating pilot teachers will have a variety of educational and technical experience. Learning to use digital content effectively requires acquiring new knowledge and skills. The professional development provided must be based on National Staff Development Council standards, Arizona Professional Teaching standards, National Educational Technology Standards for Teachers (NETS-T) and lessons learned from previous similar pilot programs. The prime vendor will need to provide sufficient professional development and follow up support to ensure that the pilot is implemented with fidelity and that all teachers deliver the program with confidence. To assist the prime vendor in the implementation, the selected pilot sites will provide documentation of the teachers' content skills, years of experience, and other data as appropriate.

<u>The Professional Development Must:</u>
Provide evidence that all professional development is aligned:
Arizona Professional Teaching Standards http://www.ade.state.az.us/certification/downloads/Teacherstandards.pdf
National Staff Development Council Standards http://www.nsdc.org/standards/index.cfm.
National Educational Technology Standards for Teachers http://cnets.iste.org/teachers/t_stands.html

Provide both initial and ongoing professional development for teachers and their administrator that:
Ensures effective use of the acquired digital content, assessments and equipment.
Uses appropriate strategies and techniques to successfully integrate technological and digital resources into the daily work of students.
Accommodates unscheduled teacher replacements during the school year.
Offers a variety of formats, e.g. face-to-face, mentoring/coaching teachers in the classroom, workshops, peer-to-peer mentoring, web-based and/or other.
Ensures that teachers can use real-time data to differentiate instruction based on the ability to analyze data and adjust learning as needed.
Increases student motivation and success related to achieving Arizona Math standards.

Provide training syllabi with teacher time commitment for maximum results.

Provide digital records of registration, course or class completion and other units of professional development to the Arizona Department of Education for monitoring and recertification purposes.
Provide evidence that all professional development provided by the prime vendor is conducted by personnel with proven classroom experience (resume required).

<u>Desirable but not required:</u>
Provide on-line and/or toll-free phone teacher support during the normal school week hours (8-5) for the academic year.

Provide mentoring and coaching of teachers as follow-up for the duration of the project.

Provide materials and content for the schools to utilize for informing and communicating with parents/guardians of participating students.

Provide incentives for the teacher participation in the program.

D. STUDENT ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS:

The legislative sponsor is interested in determining how real-time feedback can be used to motivate individuals and groups. The eLearning Taskforce is interested in determining if the pilot solution will offer a large-scale solution for improving student achievement in math. Both the interests of the legislative sponsor and the ELTF will require focused, real-time and informative assessment to make data-driven decisions. The academic effectiveness of the pupils in the pilot program shall be measured according to the existing assessment mechanisms prescribed in Title 15 Article 3, in the Arizona Revised Statutes as well as assessments throughout the project.

The Student Assessment Component Must:
Provide items aligned with the Arizona Mathematic Standard (at the concept and performance objective), and formatted consistent with the Arizona's Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS).

Provide formative and summative assessments that:
Utilize computer adaptive testing[4]
Are embedded in instruction
Provide reliable and valid assessment results at the individual student level
Provide real-time feedback for both student and class
Produce vertical growth scale (over 3 years)
Provide scale scores across all the grades included in this pilot.[5]
Produces two types of mastery scores (end of unit and state standard proficiency)
Provides three year longitudinal data collection over the course of the pilot
Establishes baseline data
Provide for analysis of results and provide teachers with recommendations for re-teaching
Provide appropriate feedback to students with additional content review as needed.
Allow for aggregation of longitudinal data by student, class, grade, school and state levels.
Provide visual interpretation of degrees of mastery of the content

Provide examples of all reports specified in this RFP.

E. TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS:

All technical responses shall meet the requirements of the Government Information Technology Agency standards specifically those found at http://azgita.gov/enterprise_architecture/.

Enterprise Architecture (EA) Technology Domain Definitions
Network: Defines policies and standards for the State's communications infrastructure, which includes the various topologies and protocols necessary to facilitate the interconnection of server platforms, mainframes, intra-building and office networks (LANs), and inter-building and mall/campus networks (WANs).

[4] CAT is defined here as an automated computer based testing module that administers students test questions from an item pool that targets their ability level. Questions increase or decrease in difficulty based on student responses.
[5] "The entity or group of entities delivering the assessments shall be able to show that the entity or group of entities are capable of delivering these assessments with computer adaptive testing SB 1512.

Security: Identifies security technologies, policies, and standards necessary to protect the information assets of the State and to ensure isolation and confidentiality of information, integrity of data, and the availability of IT resources to the State's workforce and citizens, as appropriate.
Platform: Defines policies and standards for IT devices and associated operating systems, which include mainframes, mid-size computers, servers, storage devices, client platforms (PCs, workstations, PDAs, telephony, etc.).
Software/Application: Defines policies and standards for software applications, application development tools, productivity software tools, etc.
Data/Information: Defines policies and standards for the organization of information related to citizens, locations, and objects the State must collect, store, maintain, and access.

The proposed delivery system must be "platform neutral" so that selected sites can utilize their existing platform base standards (assuming either Windows 2000 or higher or Mac OS X or higher).

The ELTF will entertain proposals that have either "lease with buy-out" or outright purchase options for the individual laptops. Laptops may be acquired using Arizona's State Procurement Office's current Laptop contract which by definition will be in compliance with the Government Information Technology Agency (GITA) standards or the vendor may provide the same equipment via their own OEM equipment agreements

The enabling legislation requires that the vendor provided system be capable of remote accessing, monitoring and reliability analysis of the electronic system delivering the coursework and assessments. The analysis should be directed towards system improvement.

Platform Requirements:

Teachers and students in the pilot will be provided a laptop with wireless capability and a carrying case for the duration of the project. Participating schools will be allowed to select either a PC or Mac laptop and wireless cards based on their district's policy and practice.

The minimum requirements for laptops are:

Specifications	**WINDOWS PC**	**APPLE MACINTOSH**
Operating System	Windows XP Professional SP2 Media Center Edition 2005	Macintosh OS 10.4 or Above
Productivity Tools	Microsoft Office 2003/2007 or Equivalent	Microsoft Office for Mac 2004/2008 or Equivalent
Processor Speed	Core Duo (not Celeron)	1.83 Ghz
Memory	1 GB RAM	1 GB RAM
Hard Drive	60 GB	60 GB
Graphics Card	Integrated card	Integrated card
Warranty	3 year parts and labor *(on-site strongly recommended)*	3 year parts and labor Applecare
Insurance	Comprehensive breakage, theft, hazard (strongly recommended)	
Virus and Spyware Protection Software	Appropriate virus and spyware protection software	
Browser	As appropriate for digital content	Firefox/ Mozella

The proposed laptops' operating system must be compatible with digital math content requested under **Section B - DIGITAL CONTENT REQUIREMENTS**.

Technical System Must Be:
Based on widely-accepted principles and open architectures, supported by open- and/or pervasive-industry standards and best practices as defined by Arizona's statewide IT P700 series of policies and S700 standards addressing Network, Platform, Software, and Data/information Architectures.

Interoperable, portable, scalable, adaptive and comply with the ADE's technical guidelines for initiatives and strategies.

Compatible and interoperable with ADE's IDEAL project. (http://www.ideal.azed.gov)

Security System Must:
Securely and economically protect all districts and schools business/system functions and its data/information as defined by Arizona's statewide IT P800 Security Policy and S800 series of security standards. This shall include district, teacher, and student access to appropriate levels of information and resources pertaining to district/school reporting, academic reporting, coursework and assessments, and student scores.

Comply with existing Federal and State statutes on confidentiality, privacy, accessibility, availability, and integrity. All access to data must be in compliance with FERPA, Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act. (http://www.ed.gov/offices/OM/fpco/index.html)

Be certified to have 99% real-time reliability for users. Successful bidders will post bond or provide proof of insurance to cover any costs incurred as a result of "loss of use" during the pilot.

Management and Reporting System Must:
Be user friendly and require minimal training to operate effectively. The system must have the capacity for remote monitoring and support.

Include a complete explanation of the operation of the management system, from set-up and testing to final implementation

Provide a strategy to do ongoing system analysis of the pilot project itself and implement improvements.

Provide samples of appropriate monthly reports on system performance.

Provide capacity for ad hoc queries on student usage and performance.

Provide a tech support strategy including a help desk function that will ensure the highest level of operational capacity and maximum instructional usage.

Data Standards Must Be:
SIF compliant (http://www.sifinfo.org)

Capable of importing data to and exporting data from any student information system meeting Arizona's Student Accountability Information System (SAIS) requirement.

Compliant with Arizona Educational data standards and systems to facilitate data transfer and reporting to the school/district student information system and to the state's data warehouse system.

Site Infrastructure Evaluation and Remote Management Must:
Be able to assess the participating school's wireless and network infrastructure, Internet bandwidth capacity and identify any deficiencies that would impact system performance.

Be able to remotely monitor and analyze participating schools' wireless and network infrastructure, Internet bandwidth capacity and make systems improvements as required. (The pilot schools will assure that site infrastructure meets or exceeds the requirements of the vendor's system.)

Ensure that at least one on-site individual be trained to be able to log students off when computers freeze or tampering has occurred (or the ability to do this remotely with toll-free access or email with 10 min response time during the academic day).

4. COSTS

In Attachment 6.1, include: total cost, breakdown cost by software, annual support costs, hardware, professional development required and optional, and finally a cost per student per year. Budget items should be cross-referenced to the proposal components (digital content, motivational aspect (if separate), assessment, professional development, technical support, equipment and management).

SECTION 2
SPECIAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Procurement Section
1535 West Jefferson Street, Bin #37
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

SOLICITATION NO. RFP NO. ED08-0020

1. Definition of Terms Used in these Special Terms and Conditions. As used in these Special Terms and Conditions, the following terms, in addition to those terms defined in Section 3, Paragraph 1, have the following meaning:

A. *"ADE"* means the Arizona Department of Education.

B. *"Department"* means the Arizona Department of Education.

C. *"Services"* means services performed, workmanship and material furnished or used in the performance of services.

2. Changes.

A. The Procurement Officer may at any time, by written order, and without notice to the sureties, if any, make mutually acceptable changes within the general scope of this Contract in any one or more of the following:

(1) Description of services to be performed;

(2) Time of performance (i.e., hours of the day, days of the week, etc.); and

(3) Place of performance of the services.

B. If any such change causes an increase or decrease in the cost of, or the time required for, performance of any part of the work under this Contract, whether or not changed by the order, the Procurement Officer shall make an equitable adjustment in the Contract price, the delivery schedule, or both, and shall modify the contract.

C. The Contractor must assert its right to an adjustment under this provision within 30 days from the date of receipt of the written order. However, if the Procurement Officer decides that the facts justify it, the Procurement Officer may receive and act upon a proposal submitted before final payment of the Contract.

D. If the Contractor's proposal includes the cost of property made obsolete or excess by the change, the Procurement Officer shall have the right to prescribe the manner of the disposition of the property.

E. Failure to agree to any adjustment shall be a dispute under the Contract Claims provision of this Contract. However, nothing in this provision shall excuse the Contractor from proceeding with the Contract as changed.

3. Indemnification.

Contractor shall indemnify, defend, save and hold harmless the State of Arizona, its departments, agencies, boards, commissions, universities and its officers, officials, agents, and employees (hereinafter referred to as "Indemnitee") from and against any and all claims, actions, liabilities, damages, losses, or expenses (including court costs, attorneys' fees, and costs of claim processing, investigation and litigation) (hereinafter referred to as "Claims") for bodily injury or personal injury (including death), or loss or damage to tangible or intangible property caused, or alleged to be caused, in whole or in part, by the negligent or willful acts or omissions of Contractor or any of its owners, officers, directors, agents, employees or subcontractors. This indemnity includes any claim or amount arising out of or recovered under the Workers' Compensation Law or arising out of the failure of such contractor to conform to any federal, state or local law, statute, ordinance, rule, regulation or court decree. It is the specific intention of the parties that the Indemnitee shall, in all instances, except for Claims arising solely from the negligent or willful acts or omissions of the Indemnitee, be indemnified by Contractor from and against any and all claims. It is agreed that Contractor will be responsible for primary loss investigation, defense and judgment costs where this indemnification is applicable. In consideration of the award of this contract, the Contractor agrees to waive all rights of subrogation against the State of Arizona, its officers, officials, agents and employees for losses arising from the work performed by the Contractor for the State of Arizona.

This indemnity shall not apply if the contractor or sub-contractor(s) is/are an agency, board, commission or university of the

State of Arizona.

4. Insurance.
Contractor and subcontractors shall procure and maintain until all of their obligations have been discharged, including any warranty periods under this Contract, are satisfied, insurance against claims for injury to persons or damage to property which may arise from or in connection with the performance of the work hereunder by the Contractor, his agents, representatives, employees or subcontractors.

The *insurance requirements* herein are minimum requirements for this Contract and in no way limit the indemnity covenants contained in this Contract. The State of Arizona in no way warrants that the minimum limits contained herein are sufficient to protect the Contractor from liabilities that might arise out of the performance of the work under this contract by the Contractor, its agents, representatives, employees or subcontractors, and Contractor is free to purchase additional insurance.

A. **MINIMUM SCOPE AND LIMITS OF INSURANCE:** Contractor shall provide coverage with limits of liability not less than those stated below.

1. **Commercial General Liability – Occurrence Form**
Policy shall include bodily injury, property damage, personal injury and broad form contractual liability.
General Aggregate $2,000,000
Products – Completed Operations Aggregate $1,000,000
Personal and Advertising Injury $1,000,000
Blanket Contractual Liability – Written and Oral $1,000,000
Fire Legal Liability $ 50,000
Each Occurrence $1,000,000
The policy shall be endorsed to include the following additional insured language: ***"The State of Arizona, its departments, agencies, boards, commissions, universities and its officers, officials, agents, and employees shall be named as additional insureds with respect to liability arising out of the activities performed by or on behalf of the Contractor".***

b. Policy shall contain a waiver of subrogation against the State of Arizona, its departments, agencies, boards, commissions, universities and its officers, officials, agents, and employees for losses arising from work performed by or on behalf of the Contractor.

2. **Worker's Compensation and Employers' Liability**
Workers' Compensation Statutory
Employers' Liability
Each Accident $ 500,000
Disease – Each Employee $ 500,000
Disease – Policy Limit $1,000,000

a. Policy shall contain a waiver of subrogation against the State of Arizona, its departments, agencies, boards, commissions, universities and its officers, officials, agents, and employees for losses arising from work performed by or on behalf of the Contractor.

b. This requirement shall not apply to: Separately, EACH contractor or subcontractor exempt under A.R.S. § 23-901, AND when such contractor or subcontractor executes the appropriate waiver (Sole Proprietor/Independent Contractor) form.

B. **ADDITIONAL INSURANCE REQUIREMENTS:** The policies shall include, or be endorsed to include, the following provisions:

1. The State of Arizona, its departments, agencies, boards, commissions, universities and its officers, officials, agents, and employees wherever additional insured status is required such additional insured shall be covered to the full limits of liability purchased by the Contractor, even if those limits of liability are in excess of those required by this Contract.

2. The Contractor's insurance coverage shall be primary insurance with respect to all other available sources.
3. Coverage provided by the Contractor shall not be limited to the liability assumed under the indemnification provisions of this Contract.

C. **NOTICE OF CANCELLATION:** Each insurance policy required by the insurance provisions of this Contract shall provide the required coverage and shall not be suspended, voided, canceled, or reduced in coverage or in limits except after thirty (30) days prior written notice has been given to the State of Arizona. Such notice shall be sent directly to the person named in paragraph 20.D of this section and shall be sent by certified mail, return receipt requested.

D. **ACCEPTABILITY OF INSURERS:** Insurance is to be placed with duly licensed or approved non-admitted insurers in the state of Arizona with an "A.M. Best" rating of not less than A- VII. The State of Arizona in no way warrants that the above-required minimum insurer rating is sufficient to protect the Contractor from potential insurer insolvency.

E. **VERIFICATION OF COVERAGE:** Contractor shall furnish the State of Arizona with certificates of insurance (ACORD form or equivalent approved by the State of Arizona) as required by this Contract. The certificates for each insurance policy are to be signed by a person authorized by that insurer to bind coverage on its behalf.

All certificates and endorsements are to be received and approved by the State of Arizona before work commences. Each insurance policy required by this Contract must be in effect at or prior to commencement of work under this Contract and remain in effect for the duration of the project. Failure to maintain the insurance policies as required by this Contract, or to provide evidence of renewal, is a material breach of contract.

All certificates required by this Contract shall be sent directly to the person named in paragraph 20.D of this section. The State of Arizona project/contract number and project description shall be noted on the certificate of insurance. The State of Arizona reserves the right to require complete, certified copies of all insurance policies required by this Contract at any time**.** **DO NOT SEND CERTIFICATES OF INSURANCE TO THE STATE OF ARIZONA'S RISK MANAGEMENT SECTION.**

F. **SUBCONTRACTORS:** Contractors' certificate(s) shall include all subcontractors as insureds under its policies or Contractor shall furnish to the State of Arizona separate certificates and endorsements for each subcontractor. All coverages for subcontractors shall be subject to the minimum requirements identified above.

G. **APPROVAL:** Any modification or variation from the *insurance requirements* in this Contract shall be made by the Department of Administration, Risk Management Section, whose decision shall be final. Such action will not require a formal Contract amendment, but may be made by administrative action.

H. **EXCEPTIONS:** In the event the Contractor or sub-contractor(s) is/are a public entity, then the Insurance Requirements shall not apply. Such public entity shall provide a Certificate of Self-Insurance. If the contractor or sub-contractor(s) is/are a State of Arizona agency, board, commission, or university, none of the above shall apply.

Contract Term. The term of this Contract shall commence on the date the Procurement Officer signs the Offer and Acceptance Form, signifying ADE's acceptance of the Offeror's proposal and will remain in effect through June 30, 2011, unless terminated, canceled, or extended as otherwise provided herein.

Option to Extend the Term of the Contract.

A. ADE may, at its sole option, extend the term of this Contract by written notice to the Contractor within sixty (60) calendar days of the Contract expiration date.
B. If ADE exercises this option, the extended Contract shall be considered to include this option provision as well as all other terms and conditions of the original contract, as modified.
C. The total duration of this Contract, including the exercise of any options under this provision, shall

not exceed five (5) years.

Pricing. All pricing shall be firm, fixed and be inclusive of all labor, equipment, materials, products, freight (FOB Destination), consumable supplies, insurance, and all other costs incidental to the services provided.

Price Adjustments.

A. The Procurement Officer may review a fully documented request for a price increase only after the Contract has been effect for one year. Any requested increase(s) shall be based on a cost increase to the Contractor that was clearly unpredictable at the time of the Offer and is directly correlated to the price of the services contractually covered.

B. All written requests for price adjustments made by the Contractor shall be initiated at least 90 calendar days in advance of any desired price increase. The 90 calendar days advance notice is required to allow the Procurement Officer sufficient time to make a fair and equitable determination to any such request.

C. The Procurement Officer shall determine whether the requested price increase or an alternate option is in the best interest of the State.

Removal of Contractor Personnel. The Contractor agrees to utilize only experienced, responsible and capable employees in the performance of the work. ADE may require that the Contractor remove from the job, by this Contract, employees who endanger person or property or whose continued employment under this Contract is, in the opinion of ADE, not justified due to unacceptable performance of duties, or is inconsistent with the interests of ADE.

Employment of State Personnel. The Contractor shall not employ any person or persons in the employ of the State of Arizona for any work required by the terms of this Contract, without prior written approval of the Procurement Officer.

Warranty of Services.

A. The Contractor warrants that all services provided hereunder will conform to the requirements of the Contract, including all descriptions, specifications and attachments made a part of this Contract. ADE's acceptance of services or goods provided by the Contractor shall not relieve the Contractor from its obligations under this warranty.

B. In addition to its other remedies, ADE may, at the Contractor's expense, require prompt correction of any services failing to meet the Contractor's warranty herein. Services corrected by the Contractor shall be subject to all the provisions of this Contract in the manner and to the same extent as services originally furnished hereunder.

Inspection of Services – Fixed Price.

A. The Contractor shall provide and maintain an inspection system acceptable to ADE covering the services under this Contract. Complete records of all inspection work performed by the Contractor shall be maintained and made available to ADE during contract performance and for as long afterwards as the Contract requires.

B. ADE has the right to inspect and test all services called for by the Contract, to the extent practicable at all times and places during the term of the Contract. ADE shall perform inspections and tests in a manner that will not unduly delay the work.

C. If any of the services do not conform to Contract requirements, ADE may require the Contractor to perform the services again in conformity with Contract requirements, at no increase in Contract amount. When the defects in services

cannot be corrected by re-performance, ADE may -

(1) Require the Contractor to take necessary action to ensure that future performance conforms to Contract requirements; and

(2) Reduce the Contract price to reflect the reduced value of the services performed.

D. If the Contractor fails to promptly perform the services again or to take the necessary action to ensure future performance in conformity with Contract requirements, ADE may -

(1) By Contract or otherwise, perform the services and charge to the Contractor any cost incurred by ADE that is directly related to the performance of such service; or

(2) Terminate the Contract for default.

Ownership. All deliverables and/or other products of this Contract (including, but not limited to, all software documentation, reports, records, summaries and other matter and materials prepared or developed by the Contractor specifically in performance of this Contract) shall be the sole, absolute and exclusive property of ADE, free from any claim or retention of rights thereto on the part of the Contractor, its agents, subcontractors, officers, or employees, with the exception of third party proprietary software packages which may be procured under this or separate agreement. Products developed by the Contractor for other purposes and used in performance of this contract shall be the sole, absolute and exclusive property of the Contractor, free from any claim or retention of rights thereto on the part of ADE. The Contractor shall grant ADE a no-cost license to use these products during the term of this contract.

Inclusive Offeror. Offeror(s) are encouraged to make every effort to utilize subcontractors that are small, women-owned and/or minority owned business enterprises. Offerors who are committing a portion of their work to such subcontractors shall do so by identifying the type of service and work to be performed by providing detail concerning your organization's utilization of small, women-owned and/or minority business enterprises. Emphasis should be placed on specific areas that are subcontracted and percentage of contract utilization and how this effort will be administered and managed, including reporting requirements.

Cooperation with Other Contractors and Subcontractors. The Contractor shall fully cooperate with other ADE contractors, subcontractors and assigns and shall carefully plan and perform its own work to accommodate the work of other ADE contractors. The Contractor shall not intentionally commit or permit any act which will interfere with the performance of work by any other ADE contractors.

Report Standards. Reports or written materials prepared by the Contractor in response to the requirements of this Contract shall be thoroughly researched for accuracy of content, shall be grammatically correct and not contain spelling errors, shall be submitted in a format approved in advance by the Procurement Officer, and shall be submitted in draft form for advance review and comment by the Procurement Officer, if necessary or specified. The cost of correcting grammatical errors, correcting report data, or other revisions required to bring the report or written material into compliance with the Contract requirements shall be borne by the Contractor.

Offshore Performance of Work Prohibited
Due to security and identity protection concerns, direct services under this contract shall be performed within the borders of the United States. Any services that are described in the specifications or scope of work that directly serve the State of Arizona or its clients and may involve access to secure or sensitive data or personal client data or development or modification of software for the State shall be performed within the borders of the United States. Unless specifically stated otherwise in the specifications, this definition does not apply to indirect or “overhead” services, redundant back-up services or services that are incidental to the performance of the contract. This provision applies to work performed by subcontractors at all tiers. Offerors shall declare all anticipated offshore services in the proposal.

Federal Immigration and Nationality Act:
The contractor shall comply with all federal, state and local immigration laws and regulations relating to the immigration status of their employees during the term of the contract. Further, the contractor shall flow down this requirement to all subcontractors utilized during the term of the contract. The State shall retain the right to perform random audits of contractor and subcontractor records or to inspect papers of any employee thereof to ensure compliance. Should the State determine that the contractor and/or any subcontractors be found noncompliant, the State may pursue all remedies allowed by law, including, but not limited to; suspension of work, termination of the contract for default and suspension and/or debarment of the contractor.

Payments.

A. The Contractor shall submit invoices in one (1) original and one (1) copy. Invoices shall include:

(1) Name and address of the Contractor.

(2) Invoice date.

(3) Contract number or other authorization for supplies delivered or services performed (including order number and contract line item number).

(4) Description, quantity, unit of measure, unit price, and extended price of supplies delivered or services performed.

(5) Shipping and payment terms (e.g., shipment number and date of shipment, prompt payment discount terms).

(6) Name and address of Contractor official to whom payment is to be sent (must be the same as that in the Contract or in a proper notice of assignment).

(7) Name (where practicable), title, phone number, and mailing address of person to be notified in the event of a defective invoice.

(8) Any other information or documentation required by the Contract (such as evidence of shipment).

B. Submittal of an invoice constitutes Contractor's certification that services have been delivered as specified on the invoice in accordance with the Contract.

C. Submit invoices to the following address:

Arizona Department of Education
Accounting, Bin #1
1535 West Jefferson Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007
Contract Administration

A. Address to which Contractor payment(s) should be mailed, if different than that listed on the Offer and Award Form.

_____
(Company Name)

_____
(Street Address)

_____
(City & State) (Zip Code)

B. Contractor representative to contact for contract administration purposes:

_____
(Name and Title)

_____
(Street Address)

_____
(City & State) (Zip Code)

_____
(Telephone & Facsimile Numbers)

_____
(E-Mail Address)

C. The ADE representative to contact for technical or programmatic matters concerning contract performance (NOTE: this person is <u>not</u> authorized to direct contractor performance or make changes in contract requirements.)

Cathy Poplin, Deputy Associate Superintendent
Educational Technology
1535 West Jefferson Street, Bin #8
Phoenix, AZ 85007
Phone: (602) 364-1349
Fax: (602) 542-5388
E-mail: Cathy.Poplin@azed.gov

D. All contract administration matters will be managed by the Procurement Officer named below. All correspondence concerning this contract shall be directed to this individual.

Richard Adickes, Procurement Manager
Contracts Management Unit
1535 West Jefferson Street, Bin #37C
Phoenix, Arizona 85007
Phone: (602) 542-4232
FAX: (602) 542-4056
E-Mail: Richard.Adickes@azed.gov

SECTION 3
UNIFORM TERMS AND CONDITIONS

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Procurement Section
1535 West Jefferson Street, Bin #37
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

SOLICITATION NO. RFP NO. ED08-0020

Version 7

1. Definition of Terms. As used in this Solicitation and any resulting Contract, the terms listed below are defined as follows:

A. *"Attachment"* means any item the Solicitation requires the Offeror to submit as part of the Offer.

B. *"Contract"* means the combination of the Solicitation, including the Uniform and Special Instructions to Offerors, the Uniform and Special Terms and Conditions, and the Specifications and Statement or Scope of Work; the Offer and any Final Proposal Revisions; and any Solicitation Amendments or Contract Amendments.

C. *"Contract Amendment"* means a written document signed by the Procurement Officer that is issued for the purpose of making changes in the Contract.

D. *"Contractor"* means any person who has a Contract with the State.

E. *"Days"* means calendar days unless otherwise specified

F. *"Exhibit"* means any item labeled as an Exhibit in the Solicitation or placed in the Exhibits section of the Solicitation.

G. *"Gratuity"* means a payment, loan, subscription, advance, deposit of money, services, or anything of more than nominal value, present or promised, unless consideration of substantially equal or greater value is received.

H. *"Materials"* means all property, including equipment, supplies, printing, insurance and leases of property but does not include land, a permanent interest in land or real property or leasing space.

I. *"Procurement Officer"* means the person duly authorized by the State to enter into and administer Contracts and make written determinations with respect to the Contract or their designee.

J. *"Services"* means the furnishing of labor, time or effort by a contractor or subcontractor which does not involve the delivery of a specific end product other than required reports and performance, but does not include employment agreements or collective bargaining agreements.

K. *"Subcontract"* means any Contract, express or implied, between the Contractor and another party or between a subcontractor and another party delegating or assigning, in whole or in part, the making or furnishing of any material or any service required for the performance of the Contract.

L. *"State"* means the State of Arizona and Department or Agency of the State that executes the Contract.

M. *"State Fiscal Year"* means the period beginning with July 1 and ending June 30.

2. Contract Interpretation.

A. Arizona Law. The Arizona law applies to this Contract including, where applicable, the Uniform Commercial Code as adopted by the State of Arizona and the Arizona Procurement Code, Arizona Revised Statutes (A.R.S.) Title 41, Chapter 23, and it's implementing rules, Arizona Administrative Code (A.A.C.) Title 2, Chapter 7.

B. Implied Contract Terms. Each provision of law and any terms required by law to be in this Contract are a part of this Contract as if fully stated in it.

C. Contract Order of Precedence. In the event of a conflict in the provisions of the Contract, as accepted by the State and as they may be amended, the following shall prevail in the order set forth below:

(1) Special Terms and Conditions;

(2) Uniform Terms and Conditions;

(3) Statement or Scope of Work;

(4) Specifications;

(5) Attachments;

(6) Exhibits;

(7) Documents referenced or included in the Solicitation.

D. Relationship of Parties. The Contractor under this Contract is an independent Contractor. Neither party to this Contract shall be deemed to be the employee or agent of the other party to the Contract.

E. Severability. The provisions of this Contract are severable. Any term or condition deemed illegal or invalid shall not affect any other term or condition of the Contract.

F. No Parol Evidence. This Contract is intended by the parties as a final and complete expression of their agreement. No course of prior dealings between the parties and no usage of the trade shall supplement or explain any terms used in this document and no other understanding either oral or in writing shall be binding.

G. No Waiver. Either party's failure to insist on strict performance of any term or condition of the Contract shall not be deemed a waiver of that term or condition even if the party accepting or acquiescing in the nonconforming performance knows of the nature of the performance and fails to object to it.

3. Contract Administration and Operation.

A. Records. Under A.R.S. § 35-214 and § 35-215, the Contractor shall retain and shall contractually require each subcontractor to retain all data and other "records" relating to the acquisition and performance of the Contract for a period of five years after the completion of the Contract. All records shall be subject to inspection and audit by the State at reasonable times. Upon request, the Contractor shall produce a legible copy of any or all such records.

B. Non-Discrimination. The Contractor shall comply with State Executive Order No. 99-4 and all other applicable Federal and State laws, rules and regulations, including the Americans with Disabilities Act.

C. Audit. Pursuant to A.R.S. § 35-214, at any time during the term of this Contract and five (5) years thereafter, the Contractor's or any subcontractor's books and records shall be subject to audit by the State and, where applicable, the Federal Government, to the extent that the books and records relate to the performance of the Contract or Subcontract.

D. Facilities Inspection and Materials Testing. The Contractor agrees to permit access to its facilities, subcontractor facilities and the Contractor's processes or services, at reasonable times for inspection of the facilities or materials covered under this Contract. The State shall also have the right to test, at its own cost, the materials to be supplied under this Contract. Neither inspection of the Contractor's facilities nor materials testing shall constitute final acceptance of the materials or services. If the State determines non-compliance of the materials, the Contractor shall be responsible for the payment of all costs incurred by the State for testing and inspection.

E. Notices. Notices to the Contractor required by this Contract shall be made by the State to the person indicated on the Offer and Acceptance form submitted by the Contractor unless otherwise stated in the Contract. Notices to the State required

by the Contract shall be made by the Contractor to the Solicitation Contact Person indicated on the Solicitation cover sheet, unless otherwise stated in the Contract. An authorized Procurement Officer and an authorized Contractor representative may change their respective person to whom notice shall be given by written notice and an amendment to the Contract shall not be necessary.

F. Advertising, Publishing and Promotion of Contract. The Contractor shall not use, advertise or promote information for commercial benefit concerning this Contract without the prior written approval of the Procurement Officer.

G. Property of the State. Any materials, including reports, computer programs and other deliverables, created under this Contract are the sole property of the State. The Contractor is not entitled to a patent or copyright on those materials and may not transfer the patent or copyright to anyone else. The Contractor shall not use or release these materials without the prior written consent of the State.

H. Ownership of Intellectual Property. Any and all intellectual property, including but not limited to copyright, invention, trademark trade name, service mark, and/or trade secrets created or conceived pursuant to or as a result of this Contract and any related subcontract ("Intellectual Property"), shall be work made for hire and the State shall be considered the creator of such Intellectual Property. The agency, department, division, board or commission of the State of Arizona requesting the issuance of this Contract shall own (for and on behalf of the State) the entire right, title and interest to the Intellectual Property throughout the world. Contractor shall notify the State, within thirty (30) days, of the creation of any Intellectual Property by it or its subcontractor(s). Contractor, on behalf of itself and any subcontractor(s), agrees to execute any and all document(s) necessary to assure ownership of the Intellectual Property vests in the State and shall take no affirmative actions that might have the effect of vesting all or part of the Intellectual Property in any entity other than the State. The Intellectual Property shall not be disclosed by Contractor or its subcontractor(s) to any entity not the State without the express written authorization of the agency, department, division, board or commission of the State of Arizona requesting the issuance of this Contract.

4. Costs and Payments.

A. Payments. Payments shall comply with the requirements of A.R.S. Titles 35 and 41, Net 30 days. Upon receipt and acceptance of goods or services, the Contractor shall submit a complete and accurate invoice for payment from the State within thirty (30) days.

B. Delivery. Unless stated otherwise in the Contract, all prices shall be F.O.B. Destination and shall include all freight delivery and unloading at the destinations.

C. Applicable Taxes.

(1) Payment of Taxes. The Contractor shall be responsible for paying all applicable taxes.

(2) State and Local Transaction Privilege Taxes. The State of Arizona is subject to all applicable state and local transaction privilege taxes. Transaction privilege taxes apply to the sale and are the responsibility of the seller to remit. Failure to collect taxes from the buyer does not relieve the seller from its obligation to remit taxes.

(3) Tax Indemnification. Contractor and all subcontractors shall pay all Federal, state and local taxes applicable to its operation and any persons employed by the Contractor. Contractor shall, and require all subcontractors to hold the State harmless from any responsibility for taxes, damages and interest, if applicable, contributions required under Federal, and/or state and local laws and regulations and any other costs including transaction privilege taxes, unemployment compensation insurance, Social Security and Worker's Compensation.

(4) IRS W9 Form. In order to receive payment, the Contractor shall have a current I.R.S. W9 Form on

file with the State of Arizona, unless not required by law.

(5) Availability of Funds for the Next State Fiscal Year. Funds may not presently be available for performance under this Contract beyond the current state fiscal year. No legal liability on the part of the State for any payment may arise under this Contract beyond the current state fiscal year until funds are made available for performance of this Contract.

(6) Availability of Funds for the Current State Fiscal Year. Should the State Legislature enter back into session and reduce the appropriations or for any reason and these goods or services are not funded, the State may take any of the following actions:

a. Accept a decrease in price offered by the Contactor;

b. Cancel the Contract;

c. Cancel the Contract and re-solicit the requirements.

5. Contract Changes.

A. Amendments. This Contract is issued under the authority of the Procurement Officer who signed this Contract. The Contract may be modified only through a Contract Amendment within the scope of the Contract. Changes to the Contract, including the addition of work or materials, the revision of payment terms, or the substitution of work or materials, directed by a person who is not specifically authorized by the Procurement Officer in writing or made unilaterally by the Contractor are violations of the Contract and of applicable law. Such changes, including unauthorized written Contract Amendments shall be void and without effect, and the Contractor shall not be entitled to any claim under this Contract based on those changes.

B. Subcontracts. The Contractor shall not enter into any Subcontract under this Contract for the performance of this Contract without the advance written approval of the Procurement Officer. The Contractor shall clearly list any proposed subcontractors and the subcontractor's proposed responsibilities. The Subcontract shall incorporate by reference the terms and conditions of this Contract.

C. Assignment and Delegation. The Contractor shall not assign any right nor delegate any duty under this Contract without the prior written approval of the Procurement Officer. The State shall not unreasonably withhold approval.

6. Risk and Liability.

A. Risk of Loss. The Contractor shall bear all loss of conforming material covered under this Contract until received by authorized personnel at the location designated in the purchase order or Contract. Mere receipt does not constitute final acceptance. The risk of loss for nonconforming materials shall remain with the Contractor regardless of receipt.

B. General Indemnification. To the extent permitted by A.R.S. § 41-621 and § 35-154, the State of Arizona shall be indemnified and held harmless by the Contractor for its vicarious liability as a result of entering into this Contract. Each party to this Contract is responsible for its own negligence.

C. Indemnification.

(1) Contractor/Vendor Indemnification (Not Public Agency). The parties to this Contract agree that the State of Arizona, its departments, agencies, boards and commissions shall be indemnified and held harmless by the Contractor for the vicarious liability of the State as a result of entering into this Contract. However, the parties further agree that the State of Arizona, its departments, agencies, boards and commissions shall be responsible for its own negligence. Each party to this Contract is responsible for its own negligence.

(2) Public Agency Language Only. Each party (as 'indemnitor') agrees to indemnify, defend, and hold harmless the other party (as 'indemnitee') from and against any and all claims, losses, liability, costs, or expenses (including reasonable attorney's fees) (hereinafter collectively referred to as 'claims') arising out of bodily injury of any person (including death) or property damage but only to the extent that such claims which result in vicarious/derivative liability to the indemnitee, are caused by the act, omission, negligence, misconduct, or other fault of the indemnitor, its officers, officials, agents, employees, or volunteers.

(3) Indemnification – Patent and Copyright. The Contractor shall indemnify and hold harmless the State against any liability, including costs and expenses, for infringement of any patent, trademark or copyright arising out of Contract performance or use by the State of materials furnished or work performed under this Contract. The State shall reasonably notify the Contractor of any claim for which it may be liable under this paragraph. If the Contractor is insured pursuant to A.R.S. § 41-621 and § 35-154, this section shall not apply.

D. Force Majeure.

(1) Except for payment of sums due, neither party shall be liable to the other nor deemed in default under this Contract if and to the extent that such party's performance of this Contract is prevented by reason of force majeure. The term *"force majeure"* means an occurrence that is beyond the control of the party affected and occurs without its fault or negligence. Without limiting the foregoing, force majeure includes acts of God; acts of the public enemy; war; riots; strikes; mobilization; labor disputes; civil disorders; fire; flood; lockouts; injunctions-intervention-acts; or failures or refusals to act by government authority; and other similar occurrences beyond the control of the party declaring force majeure which such party is unable to prevent by exercising reasonable diligence.

(2) Force Majeure shall not include the following occurrences:

a. Late delivery of equipment or materials caused by congestion at a manufacturer's plant or elsewhere, or an oversold condition of the market;

b. Late performance by a subcontractor unless the delay arises out of a force majeure occurrence in accordance with this force majeure term and condition; or

c. Inability of either the Contractor or any subcontractor to acquire or maintain any required insurance, bonds, licenses or permits.

(3) If either party is delayed at any time in the progress of the work by force majeure, the delayed party shall notify the other party in writing of such delay, as soon as is practicable and no later than the following working day, of the commencement thereof and shall specify the causes of such delay in such notice. Such notice shall be delivered or mailed certified-return receipt and shall make a specific reference to this article, thereby invoking its provisions. The delayed party shall cause such delay to cease as soon as practicable and shall notify the other party in writing when it has done so. The time of completion shall be extended by Contract Amendment for a period of time equal to the time that results or effects of such delay prevent the delayed party from performing in accordance with this Contract.

(4) Any delay or failure in performance by either party hereto shall not constitute default hereunder or give rise to any claim for damages or loss of anticipated profits if, and to the extent that such delay or failure is caused by force majeure.

E. Third Party Antitrust Violations. The Contractor assigns to the State any claim for overcharges resulting from antitrust violations to the extent that those violations concern materials or services supplied by third parties to the Contractor, toward fulfillment of this Contract.

7. Warranties.

A. Liens. The Contractor warrants that the materials supplied under this Contract are free of liens and shall remain free of liens.

B. Quality. Unless otherwise modified elsewhere in these terms and conditions, the Contractor warrants that, for one year after acceptance by the State of the materials, they shall be:

(1) Of a quality to pass without objection in the trade under the Contract description;

(2) Fit for the intended purposes for which the materials are used;

(3) Within the variations permitted by the Contract and are of even kind, quantity, and quality within each unit and among all units;

(4) Adequately contained, packaged and marked as the Contract may require; and

(5) Conform to the written promises or affirmations of fact made by the Contractor.

C. Fitness. The Contractor warrants that any material supplied to the State shall fully conform to all requirements of the Contract and all representations of the Contractor, and shall be fit for all purposes and uses required by the Contract.

D. Inspection/Testing. The warranties set forth in subparagraphs 7A through 7C of this paragraph are not affected by inspection or testing of or payment for the materials by the State.

E. Year 2000.

(1) Notwithstanding any other warranty or disclaimer of warranty in this Contract, the Contractor warrants that all products delivered and all services rendered under this Contract shall comply in all respects to performance and delivery requirements of the specifications and shall not be adversely affected by any date-related data Year 2000 issues. This warranty shall survive the expiration or termination of this Contract. In addition, the defense of *force majeure* shall not apply to the Contractor's failure to perform specification requirements as a result of any date-related data Year 2000 issues.

(2) Additionally, notwithstanding any other warranty or disclaimer of warranty in this Contract, the Contractor warrants that each hardware, software, and firmware product delivered under this Contract shall be able to accurately process date/time data (including but not limited to calculation, comparing, and sequencing) from, into, and between the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, and the years 1999 and 2000 and leap year calculations, to the extent that other information technology utilized by the State in combination with the information technology being acquired under this Contract properly exchanges date-time data with it. If this Contract requires that the information technology products being acquired perform as a system, or that the information technology products being acquired perform as a system in combination with other State information technology, then this warranty shall apply to the acquired products as a system. The remedies available to the State for breach of this warranty shall include, but shall not be limited to, repair and replacement of the information technology products delivered under this Contract. In addition, the defense of *force majeure* shall not apply to the failure of the Contractor to perform any specification requirements as a result of any date-related data Year 2000 issues.

F. Compliance With Applicable Laws. The materials and services supplied under this Contract shall comply with all applicable Federal, state and local laws, and the Contractor shall maintain all applicable licenses and permit requirements.

G. Survival of Rights and Obligations after Contract Expiration or Termination.

(1) Contractor's Representations and Warranties. All representations and warranties made by the Contractor under this Contract shall survive the expiration or termination hereof. In addition, the parties hereto acknowledge that pursuant to A.R.S. § 12-510, except as provided in A.R.S. § 12-529, the State is not subject to or barred by any limitations of actions prescribed in A.R.S., Title 12, Chapter 5.

(2) Purchase Orders. The Contractor shall, in accordance with all terms and conditions of the Contract, fully perform and shall be obligated to comply with all purchase orders received by the Contractor prior to the expiration or termination hereof, unless otherwise directed in writing by the Procurement Officer, including, without limitation, all purchase orders received prior to but not fully performed and satisfied at the expiration or termination of this Contract.

8. State's Contractual Remedies.

A. Right to Assurance. If the State in good faith has reason to believe that the Contractor does not intend to, or is unable to perform or continue performing under this Contract, the Procurement Officer may demand in writing that the Contractor give a written assurance of intent to perform. Failure by the Contractor to provide written assurance within the number of Days specified in the demand may, at the State's option, be the basis for terminating the Contract under the Uniform Terms and Conditions or other rights and remedies available by law or provided by the Contract.

B. Stop Work Order.

(1) The State may, at any time, by written order to the Contractor, require the Contractor to stop all or any part, of the work called for by this Contract for period(s) of days indicated by the State after the order is delivered to the Contractor. The order shall be specifically identified as a stop work order issued under this clause. Upon receipt of the order, the Contractor shall immediately comply with its terms and take all reasonable steps to minimize the incurrence of costs allocable to the work covered by the order during the period of work stoppage.

(2) If a stop work order issued under this clause is canceled or the period of the order or any extension expires, the Contractor shall resume work. The Procurement Officer shall make an equitable adjustment in the delivery schedule or Contract price, or both, and the Contract shall be amended in writing accordingly.

C. Non-exclusive Remedies. The rights and the remedies of the State under this Contract are not exclusive.

D. Nonconforming Tender. Materials or services supplied under this Contract shall fully comply with the Contract. The delivery of materials or services a portion of the materials or services that do not fully comply constitutes a breach of contract. On delivery of nonconforming materials or services, the State may terminate the Contract for default under applicable termination clauses in the Contract, exercise any of its rights and remedies under the Uniform Commercial Code, or pursue any other right or remedy available to it.

E. Right of Offset. The State shall be entitled to offset against any sums due the Contractor, any expenses or costs incurred by the State, or damages assessed by the State concerning the Contractor's non-conforming performance or failure to perform the Contract, including expenses, costs and damages described in the Uniform Terms and Conditions.

9. Contract Termination.

A. Cancellation for Conflict of Interest. Pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-511, the State may cancel this Contract within three (3) years after Contract execution without penalty or further obligation if any person significantly involved in initiating, negotiating, securing, drafting or creating the Contract on behalf of the State is or becomes at any time while the Contract or an extension of the Contract is in effect an employee of or a consultant to any other party to this Contract with respect to the subject matter of the Contract. The cancellation shall be effective when the Contractor receives written notice of the cancellation unless the notice specifies a later time. If the Contractor is a political subdivision of the State, it may also cancel this Contract as provided in A.R.S. § 38-511.

B. Gratuities. The State may, by written notice, terminate this Contract, in whole or in part, if the State determines that employment or a Gratuity was offered or made by the Contractor or a representative of the Contractor to any officer or employee of the State for the purpose of influencing the outcome of the procurement or securing the Contract, an amendment to the Contract, or favorable treatment concerning the Contract, including the making of any determination or decision about contract performance. The State, in addition to any other rights or remedies, shall be entitled to recover exemplary damages in the amount of three times the value of the Gratuity offered by the Contractor.

C. Suspension or Debarment. The State may, by written notice to the Contractor, immediately terminate this Contract if the State determines that the Contractor has been debarred, suspended or otherwise lawfully prohibited from participating in any public procurement activity, including but not limited to, being disapproved as a subcontractor of any public procurement unit or other governmental body. Submittal of an offer or execution of a contract shall attest that the Contractor is not currently suspended or debarred. If the Contractor becomes suspended or debarred, the Contractor shall immediately notify the State.

D. Termination for Convenience. The State reserves the right to terminate the Contract, in whole or in part at any time, when in the best interests of the State without penalty or recourse. Upon receipt of the written notice, the Contractor shall immediately stop all work, as directed in the notice, notify all subcontractors of the effective date of the termination and minimize all further costs to the State. In the event of termination under this paragraph, all documents, data and reports prepared by the Contractor under the Contract shall become the property of and be delivered to the State upon demand. The Contractor shall be entitled to receive just and equitable compensation for work in progress, work completed and materials accepted before the effective date of the termination. The cost principles and procedures provided in A.A.C. R2-7-701 shall apply.

E. Termination for Default.

(1) In addition to the rights reserved in the Contract, the State may terminate the Contract in whole or in part due to the failure of the Contractor to comply with any term or condition of the Contract, to acquire and maintain all required insurance policies, bonds, licenses and permits, or to make satisfactory progress in performing the Contract. The Procurement Officer shall provide written notice of the termination and the reasons for it to the Contractor.

(2) Upon termination under this paragraph, all goods, materials, documents, data and reports prepared by the Contractor under the Contract shall become the property of and be delivered to the State on demand.

(3) The State may, upon termination of this Contract, procure, on terms and in the manner that it deems appropriate, materials or services to replace those under this Contract. The Contractor shall be liable to the State for any excess costs incurred by the State in procuring materials or services in substitution for those due from the Contractor.

F. Continuation of Performance Through Termination. The Contractor shall continue to perform, in accordance with the requirements of the Contract, up to the date of termination, as directed in the termination notice.

10. Contract Claims. All contract claims or controversies under this Contract shall be resolved according to A.R.S. Title 41, Chapter 23, Article 9, and rules adopted there under.

11. Arbitration. The parties to this Contract agree to resolve all disputes arising out of or relating to this Contract through arbitration, after exhausting applicable administrative review, to the extent required by A.R.S. § 12-1518, except as may be required by other applicable statutes (Title 41).

SECTION 4
SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS TO OFFERORS

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Procurement Section
1535 West Jefferson Street, Bin #37
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

SOLICITATION NO. RFP NO. ED08-0020

1. Definition of Terms Used in these Special Instructions. As used in these instructions, the following terms, in addition to those terms defined in Section 2, Paragraph 1, have the following meaning:

A. *"ADE"* means the Arizona Department of Education.

B. *"Department"* means the Arizona Department of Education.

2. Required Information. The following shall be submitted concurrent with and as part of the Offer:

A. Signed Offer and Contract Award Form;

B. Contract Administration; Section 2 Paragraphs 20.A and 20.B

C. Attachment 6.1, Prices;

D. Attachment 6.2, Offeror's References;

E. Attachment 6.3, Offeror's Organization;

F. Attachment 6.4, Offeror's Personnel Qualifications;

G. Attachment 6.5, Offeror's Financial Disclosure;

H. Attachment 6.6, Sole Proprietor Certificate (if necessary);

I. Attachment 6.7, Digital Content, Professional Development and Delivery Narrative;

J. Attachment 6.8, Self-Assessment of Proposed Program Design and Deliverables;

K Attachment 6.9, Peripheral Equipment Specifications (if necessary);

L. Attachment 6.10, Offeror's Checklist; and

M. Solicitation Amendments (if any).

3. Authorized Signature.

A. For any document that requires the Offeror's signature, the signature provided must be that of the Owner, Partner or Corporate Officer duly authorized to sign contractual agreements. Additionally, if requested by ADE, disclosure of ownership information shall be submitted.

(1) Privately Owned: The Owner must sign the contract.

(2) Partnership: A Partner must sign the contract.

(3) Corporation: A Corporate Officer must sign the contract.

B. If a person other than these specified individuals signs the contract, a Power of Attorney indicating the employee's authority must accompany the contract. All addenda to the contract shall be signed by the authorized individual who signed the contract except that they may be signed by a duly authorized designee.

SECTION 4
SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS TO OFFERORS

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Procurement Section
1535 West Jefferson Street, Bin #37
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

SOLICITATION NO. RFP NO. ED08-0020

4. Proposal Opening: As this is a Request For Proposals, Offers shall be opened publicly at the time and place designated on the cover page of this document. The name of each offeror shall be read publicly and recorded. Prices will not be read. Proposals will not be subject to public inspection until after Contract award.

Award of Contract. Award of a contract will be made to the most responsible Offeror(s) whose offer(s) is determined to be the most advantageous to the State based on the evaluation criteria set forth in the Solicitation.

Federal Immigration and Nationality Act:

By submission of the offer, the offeror warrants that both it and all proposed subcontractors are and shall remain in compliance with all federal, state and local immigration laws and regulations relating to the immigration status of their employees. The State may, at its sole discretion require evidence of compliance during the evaluation process. Should the State request evidence of compliance, the offeror shall have 5 days from receipt of the request to supply adequate information. Failure to comply with this instruction or failure to supply requested information within the timeframe specified shall result in the offer not being considered for contract award.

Offer Format and Content.

A. **One clearly marked original and five (5) copies** of offer(s) shall be submitted. Subcategories of information in each of the volumes should be highlighted for ease of evaluating the information contained therein. If the Offeror finds it necessary to take exception(s) to any of the requirements specified in this Solicitation, clearly indicate each such exception in the proposal along with a complete explanation of why the exception was taken and what benefit accrues to the State thereby. All substantive exceptions and supporting rationale shall be identified as such and consolidated into one section of the Offer.

B. To facilitate evaluation, the Offer must be specific, and complete to clearly and fully demonstrate the Offeror has a thorough understanding of the requirement, can provide detailed information and relate experience concerning previous performance of similar services. Statements that the Offeror understands, can or will comply with the Scope of Work, statements paraphrasing the Scope of Work or parts thereof, and phrases such as *"standard procedures will be employed"* or *"well-known techniques will be used"*, etc., will be considered unacceptable. Offerors should note that data previously submitted shall not be relied upon nor incorporated in the Offer by reference.

C. Binding and Labeling. Each copy of the Offer shall be presented in three ring binders with the cover indicating the Solicitation number, the Offeror's name and address and copy number (i.e. Copy 2 of 4).

D. Indexing. The sections of each copy of the Offer shall be indexed to indicate the applicable parts and elements. Orderliness of the Offer, readability and similar factors should be considered in offer preparation.

E. Format. The mandatory information to be placed in each copy of the Offer is listed below. Each copy shall furnish sections for information discussed in the Scope of Work. **Lack of these submissions may cause the Offer to be declared unacceptable.**

(1) Section One of the Offer shall be titled **Executive Summary**. This Section shall include a signed copy of the Offer and Award Form and completed Attachments 6.1, 6.3, 6.5 and 6.6 (if applicable).

(2) Section Two of the Offer shall be titled **Method of Approach and Implementation Plan** and shall provide a narrative on the methodology to be used to accomplish Scope of Work responsibilities to the extent possible for evaluation purposes. The language of the narrative should be straightforward and limited to facts, solutions to problems and proposed plans of action. This Section shall specifically address the requirements listed in Attachment 6.7. A completed Attachment 6.8 is also required.

(3) Section Three of the Offer shall be titled **Offeror's Experience, Expertise and Reliability** and shall provide information which reflects the Offeror's experience and reliability, including personnel, to accomplish Scope of Work responsibilities. This Section shall specifically address or include:

(a) At least three (3) verifiable professional references must be provided regarding services provided by the Offeror similar to those required under this Solicitation. This information should be provided on Attachment 6.2.

(b) Personnel qualifications, Attachment 6.4

Evaluation and Selection. Evaluation of offers may be accomplished in four steps.

A. Step One. Initial review of offer to determine basic responsiveness to the Solicitation, where offers will be reviewed to insure they include all required information.

B. Step Two. Evaluation of offer to assess the Offeror's capability to deliver the required services in accordance with the terms and conditions set forth in the Solicitation and requirements of the Scope of Work.

C. Step Three. (Optional) Discussions with Offerors concerning their offers. This step includes requests for Final Proposal Revisions from Offerors still considered susceptible of winning contract award(s).

D. Step Four. Contract award(s) made to the responsible Offeror(s) whose offer(s) is determined to be the most advantageous to the State, based on the following criteria (in bold print below), which are listed in descending order of importance.

(1) **Method of Approach and Implementation Plan;**

(2) **Offeror's Experience, Expertise and Reliability; and**

(3) **Price.**

Evaluation of Optional Terms. ADE will evaluate offers for award purposes by adding the total price for all options to the total price for the basic requirement. Evaluation of options will not obligate ADE to exercise the option(s).

Discussions. In accordance with A.R.S. § 41-2534, after the initial receipt of offers, ADE reserves the option to conduct discussions with those Offerors who submit offers determined by the State to be reasonably susceptible of being selected for award.

Final Proposal Revisions.

In the event the Procurement Officer determines discussions are required, discussions on the areas, items, and factors specified in this Solicitation will be held with all Offerors determined to be in the competitive range.

The Offeror is permitted to make revisions during negotiations. Offerors should be aware that a complete understanding as to pricing, technical, and all other terms and conditions of the proposed contract must exist between the Offeror and ADE at the conclusion of negotiations.

C. Discussions will be concluded when a mutual understanding has been reached with each Offeror remaining in the competitive range. This mutual understanding will become the basis for the Offeror's Final Proposal Revision.

D. The Final Proposal Revision must be returned, signed and dated by the Offeror within the time and date specified to be eligible for award.

Certificate of Insurance Form. ADE recommends that the Offeror consider using the sample Certificate of Insurance included in this Solicitation as Exhibit 7.1. If the Offeror wishes, it may submit a substantially similar Certificate of Insurance. If the Offeror so elects, the proposed Certificate of Insurance shall be submitted to ADE for review and approval.

SECTION 5
UNIFORM INSTRUCTIONS TO OFFERORS

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Procurement Section
1535 West Jefferson Street, Bin #37
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

SOLICITATION NO. RFP NO. ED08-0020

Version 7.1

1. Definition of Terms. As used in these Instructions, the terms listed below are defined as follows:

A. *"Attachment"* means any item the Solicitation requires an Offeror to submit as part of the Offer.

B. *"Contract"* means the combination of the Solicitation, including the Uniform and Special Instructions to Offerors, the Uniform and Special Terms and Conditions, and the Specifications and Statement or Scope of Work; the Offer and any Final Proposal Revisions; and any Solicitation Amendments or Contract Amendments; and any terms applied by law.

C. "*Contract Amendment"* means a written document signed by the Procurement Officer that is issued for the purpose of making changes in the Contract.

D. *"Contractor"* means any person who has a contract with the State.

E. *"Days"* means calendar days unless otherwise specified.

F. *"Exhibit"* means any item labeled as an Exhibit in the Solicitation or placed in the Exhibits section of the Solicitation.

G. *"Offer"* means bid, proposal or quotation.

H. *"Offeror"* means a vendor who responds to a Solicitation.

I. *"Procurement Officer"* means the person duly authorized by the State to enter into and administer Contracts and make written determinations with respect to the Contract or his or her designee.

J. *"Solicitation"* means an Invitation for Bids ("IFB"), a Request for Proposals ("RFP"), or a Request for Quotations ("RFQ").

K. *"Solicitation Amendment"* means a written document that is authorized by the Procurement Officer and issued for the purpose of making changes to the Solicitation.

L. *"Subcontract"* means any Contract, express or implied, between the Contractor and another party or between a subcontractor and another party delegating or assigning, in whole or in part, the making or furnishing of any material or any service required for the performance of the Contract.

M. *"State"* means the State of Arizona and Department or Agency of the State that executes the Contract.

2. Inquiries.

A. Duty to Examine. It is the responsibility of each Offeror to examine the entire Solicitation, seek clarification in writing (inquiries), and examine its Offer for accuracy before submitting the Offer. Lack of care in preparing an Offer shall not be grounds for modifying or withdrawing the Offer after the Offer due date and time, nor shall it give rise to any Contract claim.

B. Solicitation Contact Person. Any inquiry related to a Solicitation, including any requests for or inquiries regarding standards referenced in the Solicitation, shall be directed solely to the Solicitation contact person. The Offeror shall not contact or direct inquiries concerning this Solicitation to any other State employee unless the Solicitation specifically identifies a person other than the Solicitation contact person as a contact.

C. Submission of Inquiries. The Procurement Officer or the person identified in the Solicitation as the contact for inquiries may, except at the Pre-Offer Conference, require that an inquiry be submitted in writing. Any inquiry related to a Solicitation shall refer to the appropriate Solicitation number, page and paragraph. Do not place the Solicitation number on the

outside of the envelope containing that inquiry, since it may then be identified as an Offer and not be opened until after the Offer due date and time. The State shall consider the relevancy of the inquiry but is not required to respond in writing.

D. Timeliness. Any inquiry or exception to the Solicitation shall be submitted as soon as possible and at least seven days before the Offer due date and time for review and determination by the State. Failure to do so may result in the inquiry not being considered for a Solicitation Amendment.

E. No Right to Rely on Verbal Responses. An Offeror shall not rely on verbal responses to inquiries. A verbal reply to an inquiry does not constitute a modification of the Solicitation.

F. Solicitation Amendments. The Solicitation shall only be modified by a Solicitation Amendment.

G. Pre-Offer Conference. If a pre-Offer Conference has been scheduled under this Solicitation, the date, time and location shall appear on the Solicitation cover sheet or elsewhere in the Solicitation. Offerors should raise any questions about the Solicitation or the procurement at that time. An Offeror may not rely on any verbal responses to questions at the Conference. Material issues raised at the Conference that result in changes to the Solicitation shall be answered solely through a written Solicitation Amendment.

H. Persons With Disabilities. Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation, such as a sign language interpreter, by contacting the Solicitation contact person. Requests shall be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.

3. Offer Preparation.

A. Forms: No Facsimile or Telegraphic Offers. An Offer shall be submitted either on the forms provided in this Solicitation or their substantial equivalent. Any substitute document for the forms provided in this Solicitation must be legible and contain the same information requested on the forms unless the Solicitation indicates otherwise. A facsimile, telegraphic, mailgram or electronic mail Offer shall be rejected if submitted in response to requests for proposals or invitations for bids.

B. Typed or Ink; Corrections. The Offer shall be typed or in ink. Erasures, interlineations or other modifications in the Offer shall be initialed in ink by the person signing the Offer. Modifications shall not be permitted after Offers have been opened except as otherwise provided under applicable law.

C. Evidence of Intent to be Bound. The Offer and Acceptance form within the Solicitation shall be submitted with the Offer and shall include a signature (or acknowledgement for electronic submissions, when authorized) by a person authorized to sign the Offer. The signature shall signify the Offeror's intent to be bound by the Offer and the terms of the Solicitation and that the information provided is true, accurate and complete. Failure to submit verifiable evidence of an intent to be bound, such as an original signature, shall result in rejection of the Offer.

D. Exceptions to Terms and Conditions. All exceptions included with the Offer shall be submitted in a clearly identified separate section of the Offer in which the Offeror clearly identifies the specific paragraphs of the Solicitation where the exceptions occur. Any exceptions not included in such a section shall be without force and effect in any resulting Contract unless such exception is specifically accepted by the Procurement Officer in a written statement. The Offeror's preprinted or standard terms will not be considered by the State as a part of any resulting Contract.

(1) Invitation for Bids: An Offer that takes exception to a material requirement of any part of the Solicitation, including terms and conditions, shall be rejected.

(2) Request for Proposals: All exceptions that are contained in the Offer may negatively affect the State's proposal evaluation based on the evaluation criteria as stated in the Solicitation, or result in rejection of the Offer. An Offer that takes exception to any material requirement of the Solicitation may be rejected.

E. Subcontracts. Offeror shall clearly list any proposed subcontractors and the subcontractor's proposed responsibilities in the Offer.

F. Cost of Offer Preparation. The State will not reimburse any Offeror the cost of responding to a Solicitation.

G. Solicitation Amendments. Each Solicitation Amendment shall be signed with an original signature by the person signing the Offer, and shall be submitted no later than the Offer due date and time. Failure to return a signed copy of a Solicitation Amendment may result in rejection of the Offer.

H. Federal Excise Tax. The State of Arizona is exempt from certain Federal Excise Tax on manufactured goods. Exemption Certificates will be provided by the State.

I. Provision of Tax Identification Numbers. Offerors are required to provide their Arizona Transaction Privilege Tax Number and/or Federal Tax Identification number in the space provided on the Offer and Acceptance Form.

(1) Employee Identification. Offeror agrees to provide an employee identification number or social security number to the Department for the purposes of reporting to appropriate taxing authorities, monies paid by the Department under this Contract. If the federal identifier of the Offeror is a social security number, this number is being requested solely for tax reporting purposes and will be shared only with appropriate state and federal officials. This submission is mandatory under 26 U.S.C. § 6041A.

J. Identification of Taxes in Offer. The State of Arizona is subject to all applicable state and local transaction privilege taxes. All applicable taxes shall be included in the pricing offered in the Solicitation. At all times, payment of taxes and the determination of applicable taxes are the sole responsibility of the Contractor.

K. Disclosure. If the firm, business or person submitting this Offer has been debarred, suspended or otherwise lawfully precluded from participating in any public procurement activity, including being disapproved as a subcontractor with any Federal, state or local government, or if any such preclusion from participation from any public procurement activity is currently pending, the Offeror shall fully explain the circumstances relating to the preclusion or proposed preclusion in the Offer. The Offeror shall include a letter with its Offer setting forth the name and address of the governmental unit, the effective date of this suspension or debarment, the duration of the suspension or debarment, and the relevant circumstances relating to the suspension or debarment. If suspension or debarment is currently pending, a detailed description of all relevant circumstances including the details enumerated above shall be provided.

L. Solicitation Order of Precedence. In the event of a conflict in the provisions of this Solicitation, the following shall prevail in the order set forth below:

(1) Special Terms and Conditions;

(2) Uniform Terms and Conditions;

(3) Statement or Scope of Work;

(4) Specifications;

(5) Attachments;

(6) Exhibits;

(7) Special Instructions to Offerors;

(8) Uniform Instructions to Offerors;

(9) Other documents referenced or included in the Solicitation.

M. Delivery. Unless stated otherwise in the Solicitation, all prices shall be F.O.B. Destination and shall include all delivery and unloading at the destination(s).

4. Submission of Offer.

A. Sealed Envelope or Package. Each Offer shall be submitted to the submittal location identified in this Solicitation. Offers should be submitted in a sealed envelope or container. The envelope or container should be clearly identified with name of the Offeror and Solicitation number. The State may open envelopes or containers to identify contents if the envelope or container is not clearly identified.

B. Offer Amendment or Withdrawal. An Offer may not be amended or withdrawn after the Offer due date and time except as otherwise provided under applicable law.

C. Public Record. All Offers submitted and opened are public records and must be retained by the State. Offers shall be open to public inspection after Contract award, except for such Offers deemed to be confidential by the State. If an Offeror believes that information in its Offer should remain confidential, it shall indicate as confidential, the specific information and submit a statement with its Offer detailing the reasons that the information should not be disclosed. Such reasons shall include the specific harm or prejudice which may arise. The State shall determine whether the identified information is confidential pursuant to the Arizona Procurement Code.

D. Non-collusion, Employment, and Services. By signing the Offer and Acceptance Form or other official contract form, the Offeror certifies that:

(1) The Offeror did not engage in collusion or other anti-competitive practices in connection with the preparation or submission of its Offer; and

(2) The Offeror does not discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment or person to whom it provides services because of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, or disability, and that it

complies with all applicable Federal, state and local laws and executive orders regarding employment.

5. Evaluation.

A. Unit Price Prevails. Where applicable, in the case of discrepancy between the unit price or rate and the extension of that unit price or rate, the unit price or rate shall govern.

B. Prompt Payment Discount. Prompt payment discounts of thirty (30) days or more set forth in an Offer shall be deducted from the Offer for the purposes of evaluating that price.

C. Late Offers. An Offer submitted after the exact Offer due date and time shall be rejected.

D. Disqualification. An Offer (including each of its principals) who is currently debarred, suspended or otherwise lawfully prohibited from any public procurement activity shall have its Offer rejected.

E. Offer Acceptance Period. An Offeror submitting an Offer under this Solicitation shall hold its Offer open for the number of days from the Offer due date that is stated in the Solicitation. If the Solicitation does not specifically state a number of days for Offer acceptance, the number of days shall be one hundred-twenty (120). If a Final Proposal Revision is requested pursuant to a Request for Proposals, an Offeror shall hold its Offer open for one hundred-twenty (120) days from the Final Proposal Revision due date.

F. Waiver and Rejection Rights. Notwithstanding any other provision of the Solicitation, the State reserves the right to:

(1) Waive any minor informality;

(2) Reject any and all Offers or portions thereof; or

(3) Cancel a Solicitation.

6. Award.

A. Number or Types of Awards. The State reserves the right to make multiple awards or to award a Contract by individual line items or alternatives, by group of line items or alternatives, or to make an aggregate award, or regional awards, whichever is most advantageous to the State. If the Procurement Officer determines that an aggregate award to one Offeror is not in the State's best interest, "all or none" Offers shall be rejected.

B. Contract Inception. An Offer does not constitute a Contract nor does it confer any rights on the Offeror to the award of a Contract. A Contract is not created until the Offer is accepted in writing by the Procurement Officer's signature on the Offer and Acceptance Form. A notice of award or of the intent to award shall not constitute acceptance of the Offer.

C. Effective Date**.** The effective date of this Contract shall be the date that the Procurement Officer signs the Offer and Acceptance form or other official contract form, unless another date is specifically stated in the Contract.

7. Protests. A protest shall comply with and be resolved according to Arizona Revised Statutes Title 41, Chapter 23, Article 9 and rules adopted thereunder. Protests shall be in writing and be filed with both the Procurement Officer of the purchasing agency and with the Enterprise Procurement Administrator. A protest of a Solicitation shall be received by the Procurement Officer before the Offer due date. A protest of a proposed award or of an award shall be filed within ten (10) days after the protester knows or should have known the basis of the protest. A protest shall include:

A. The name, address and telephone number of the protester;

B. The signature of the protester or its representative;

C. Identification of the purchasing agency and the Solicitation or Contract number;

D. A detailed statement of the legal and factual grounds of the protest including copies of relevant documents; and

E. The form of relief requested.

8. Comments Welcome. The State Procurement Office periodically reviews the Uniform Instructions to Offerors and welcomes any comments you may have. Please submit your comments to: State Procurement Administrator, State Procurement Office, 100 North 15th Avenue, Suite 104, Phoenix, Arizona, 85007.

ATTACHMENT 6.1
PRICES/DELIVERY SCHEDULE
SOLICITATION NO. ED08-0020

Item	UNIT	Unit Price	Total
Software, including, any support costs	Each		
Hardware (Specify each item)	Each		
Professional Development	Lot		
Total Cost			

Subtotal $_____

_____%* Arizona Sales Tax, State and City* $_____

Total Offer $_____

Notice: If the transaction privilege (sales) taxes are not described and itemized on the offer, the State will assume that the price(s) offered includes all applicable taxes.

OFFERORS SHALL PROVIDE A MINIMUM OF THREE (3) REFERENCES.

1. Company/Organization _____

A. Address _____

_____

B. Point of Contact/Phone # _____

C. Description of Services and When Provided _____

_____

_____

2. Company/Organization _____

A. Address _____

_____

B. Point of Contact/Phone # _____

C. Description of Services and When Provided _____

_____

_____

3. Company/Organization _____

A. Address _____

_____

B. Point of Contact/Phone # _____

C. Description of Services and When Provided _____

_____

_____

ATTACHMENT 6.3
OFFEROR'S ORGANIZATION
SOLICITATION NO. ED08-0020

INSTRUCTIONS:

Offerors shall complete each item, using attachments where necessary. Attachments shall indicate the item number and heading being referenced as it appears below. Failure to make full and complete disclosure may result in the rejection of offers as unresponsive.

	NO	YES
1. Administrative Agent		
Is the Offeror acting as an administrative agent for any other agency, firm, or governmental agency? ***(If* YES*, provide a description of the relationship in both, legal and functional aspects.)***	[]	[]
2. Civil Rights Compliance Data		
Has any Federal or State agency ever made a finding of noncompliance with any relevant civil rights requirements with respect to the Offeror's business activities? ***(If* YES*, provide an explanation.)***	[]	[]
3. Prior Felony Conviction(s)		
Has the Offeror, its major stockholders with a controlling interest, or its officers been the subject of criminal investigations or prosecutions or convicted of a felony? ***(If* YES*, provide an explanation.)***	[]	[]
4. Suspension or Exclusion from Federal or State Program(s)		
Has the Offeror ever been suspended or excluded from any Federal or State Government program for any reason? ***(If* YES*, provide an explanation.)***	[]	[]
5. Does the Offeror have sufficient funds to meet obligations on time under the contract while awaiting payment from ADE? ***(If* NO*, provide an explanation.)***	[]	[]
6. Have any licenses ever been denied, revoked or suspended or provisionally issued within the past five (5) years? ***(If* YES*, provide an explanation.)***	[]	[]
7. Has the Offeror or the Offeror's firm terminated any contracts, had any contracts terminated, or been involved in contract lawsuits? ***(If* YES*, provide an explanation.)***	[]	[]
8. Does the Offeror, its staff, relatives, or voting members of the Board of Directors maintain any ownership's, employment's, public and private affiliations or relationships which may have substantial interest (as defined in A.R.S. 38-502, Conflict of Interest) in any contract, sale, purchase, or service involving ADE? ***(If* YES*, provide a full explanation of the situation.)***	[]	[]

ATTACHMENT 6.3
OFFEROR'S ORGANIZATION
SOLICITATION NO. ED08-0020

9. Phoenix area address and telephone number, if different than provided on the Offer and Award Form:

_____
(Street Number)

_____
(City and State) (Zip Code)

_____
(Telephone Number) (Fax Number)

10. Provide an overview of your firm that includes organizational structure, number and location of offices and the number of employees at each office location. Also indicate the extent and type of involvement of each office listed. Identify the office location from which a majority of the key personnel will be assigned to any resultant contract.

11. If the Offeror's firm is a division or subsidiary of another firm, indicate below the name and address of the parent firm. Also include a description of the working relationship between the Offeror's firm and the parent firm. Specify what impact, if any, this relationship would have on the Offeror's firm's ability to meet the requirements for services described in this Solicitation.

_____
(Firm's Name)

_____
(Street Number)

_____
(City and State) (Zip Code)

12. <u>If other than a government agency</u>

A. When was the Offeror's firm formed? _____

B. If the Offeror's firm is incorporated, provide a list of the names and addresses of the Board of Directors.

ATTACHMENT 6.4
OFFEROR'S PERSONNEL QUALIFICATIONS
SOLICITATION NO. ED08-0020

INSTRUCTIONS:

Complete a separate resume, specifically addressing each of the items listed below, for each person who will be proposed to fill the required positions as listed below. If attachments are used, indicate the item number and heading being referenced as it appears below. Attach to each form, the person's resume, current job description, and position(s) for which the person is proposed.

1. Name of Person.

2. Proposed position for contract service.

3. Position currently held in firm [] Owner/Partner
[] Other _____.

4. Number of years with firm.

5. Number of years of consulting experience.

6. Summarize the experience of the above-named person, where applicable, to the services to be provided under this contract.

7. Describe any related education and training (identify degree(s), certification(s), license(s), and professional affiliation(s).

8. Based on the area(s) of expertise specified in Paragraph 6, above, identify the primary function(s) of this person in terms of providing the services required by this solicitation.

9. Indicate the percentage of time this person WILL be assigned to work under any contract resulting from this solicitation.

ATTACHMENT 6.5
OFFEROR'S FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE
SOLICITAITON NO. ED08-0020

INSTRUCTIONS

Complete each item, using attachments where necessary. If attachments are used, indicate the item number and question being referenced as it appears below.

		YES	NO
1.	Are the Offeror's accounting records maintained in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP)?	[]	[]
2.	Does the Offeror have an accounting manual?	[]	[]
3	Does the Offeror's firm prepare a public annual financial statement? ***(If* YES*, provide a copy of the MOST RECENT annual financial statement with proposal.)***	[]	[]
4.	Does the Offeror's firm have interim financial statements prepared? ***(If* YES*, specify how often.)*** _____	[]	[]
5.	Is the Offeror's firm audited by an independent auditor? ***(If* YES*, answer A thru D below.)***	[]	[]
	A. How often are audits conducted? _____		
	B. By whom are they conducted: _____ _____		
	C. Provide a copy of the Offeror's most recent audit report and corresponding financial statements. Include reports of Internal Control and Compliance with Federal/Local regulations, if applicable.		
	D. Does the Offeror's firm have any uncorrected audit exceptions?	[]	[]
6.	Does the Offeror's firm have a formal basis to allocate indirect costs charged to this Contract? ***(If* YES*, submit a copy of the allocation plan with proposal.)***	[]	[]
7.	Are there any suits, judgments, tax deficiencies, or claims pending against the Offeror's firm? ***(If* YES*, answer A and B below.)***	[]	[]
	A. What is the dollar amount? $_____		
	B. In which state(s)? _____		
8.	Has the Offeror's firm ever gone through bankruptcy?	[]	[]

ATTACHMENT 6.6

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION
RISK MANAGEMENT SECTION
1818 WEST ADAMS
PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85007
FAX 542-1982

SOLE PROPRIETOR WAIVER

NOTE: THIS FORM APPLIES ONLY TO STATE OF ARIZONA AGENCIES, BOARDS, COMMISSIONS AND UNIVERSITIES UTILIZING SOLE PROPRIETORS WITH NO EMPLOYEES. IF YOU ARE CONTRACTING WITH A CORPORATION, LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY, PARTNERSHIP OR SOLE PROPRIETORS WITH EMPLOYEES, THIS FORM DOES NOT APPLY.

The following is a written waiver under the compulsory Workers' Compensation laws of the State of Arizona, A.R.S. §23-901 (et. seq.), and specifically, A.R.S. §23-961(L), that provides that a Sole Proprietor may waive his/her rights to Workers' Compensation coverage and benefits.

I am a sole proprietor and I am doing business as _____ (name of Sole Proprietors Business). I am performing work as an independent contractor for the State of Arizona, _____ _____, for Workers' Compensation purposes, and therefore, I am not entitled to Workers' Compensation benefits from the State of Arizona, _____.

I understand that if I have any employees working for me, I must maintain Workers' Compensation insurance on them.

Name of Sole Proprietor: _____

Social Security Number: _____**Telephone #:**_____

Street Address/P.O. Box: _____

City: _____ **State:** _____ **Zip Code:** _____

Signature of Sole Proprietor: **Date:**

Agency: **Arizona Department of Education**_____ **Agency #:**____**455**_____

Signature of Agency Contract Administrator: **Date:**

Both signatures must be signed and the completed form submitted to the State of Arizona, Department of Administration, Risk Management Section, Insurance Unit, 1818 W. Adams, Phoenix, Az 85007. An authorized Risk Management Representative will sign and return to the agency to be maintained in their records.

_____

Signature of Risk Management Authorized Signer **Date**

ATTACHMENT 6.7
Digital Content, Professional Development and Delivery Narrative
SOLICITATION NO. ED08-0020

Reviewer Name: _____ Date: _____

Company Name: _____

Instructions: **Respond to each of the questions below on a separate page. While the PRIME CONTRACTOR/VENDOR will be responding to these narrative questions, all the proposed partners much be included in the answers and sign that they are aware of the response and its implications. The proposal must include the following and will be reviewed according to the following:**

Proposal Narrative and Rating Criteria

Describe succinctly the nature and scope of your digital math content for this pilot project.

Provide evidence that your proposed digital content is based upon scientific-based research.

Provide how the digital content aligns with the Arizona Math Standards and how the professional development aligns with the Arizona Professional Teaching Standards, National Staff Development Council Standards and the National Educational Technology Standards for Teachers. (A chart of alignment will be acceptable).

Describe the innovative aspects of your proposed digital content.

Discuss how the assessment component(s) will help Arizona gather and report data on their progress to meet the Legislative mandate for this pilot.

Describe prime vendor's experience with offering face-to-face and online professional development. Provide three experiences / references directly related to delivery of professional development to support your narrative.

Describe the prime vendor and partners' technical resources and ability to meet the requirements of this RFP, including how pilot schools will be supported. Describe prime vendors and partners' ability to meet the requirements of the RFP within the proposed timeline including task relationships and dependencies.

Provide a realistic time frame to begin the following tasks once the award of contract is made:

Professional development schedule available and advertised
Hardware delivered and installed
Student set-up in digital content management system
Reporting system ready
Student pilot begins

Discuss any additional strengths and experiences of the prime vendor and its partners relevant to supporting this pilot.

ATTACHMENT 6.8
Self-Assessment of Proposed Program Design and Deliverables
SOLICITATION NO. ED08-0020

Company Name: _____ Date: _____

Instructions:
Complete this self-assessment form to determine how well you align with the Scope of Work requirements.

Requirements	Yes	No*	*Explanation
Offeror's Requirements			
1. Be capable of providing effective leadership in a joint effort with the selected partners. Previous successful joint efforts similar to this project should be referenced.			
2. Have successfully implemented the current product or immediate predecessor in a variety of educational settings. Provide a list of references of schools that have used the digital content or predecessor products in similar situations. (Provided in Attachment 6.2)			
3. Submit a comprehensive written narrative of the design and implementation plan to accomplish the project. The implementation plan must include a projected timeline sequencing all major events and project tasks that specifically detail the duration of all tasks in increments of eight (8) hour days.			
4. Provide access to full versions of the proposed digital content/curriculum to ELTF members for evaluation of the RFP and to the Arizona Legislative committee members identified in the enabling legislation. Access for a minimum of 25 users will be required during the evaluation phase. The full digital content shall be available from the submission to the date the award process is completed.			
5. Identify and provide specifications for any peripheral equipment required or recommended to maximize effective use of the system. (This information will be attached to the Offeror's proposal as Attachment 6.9)			
6. Provide a sample of the laptop(s) being offered that meet the specifications recommended for the pilot program for testing during the evaluation phase.			
7. Provide a site readiness checklist that will ensure the participating sites are equipped with the required technical infrastructure and Internet bandwidth.			
8. Describe how and what the vendor will report to the legislature. ADE, ELTF, and pilot districts and schools. The legislation states that the vendor will be required to deliver "Monthly reports on the performance of the system and direct any corrective steps required to achieve success."			
9. Provide the name(s) and qualifications of the Project Management team and support staff with individual roles and responsibilities identified.			

ATTACHMENT 6.8
Self-Assessment of Proposed Program Design and Deliverables
SOLICITATION NO. ED08-0020

Requirements	Yes	No*	*Explanation
Digital Content Requirements			
The Digital Content Must:			
1. Be aligned with the Arizona K-12 Academic Math Standards (http://www.ade.state.az.us/standards/math/articulated.asp). The digital content will address every math standard/strand and concept, down to the performance objective for 6-9 grades.			
2. Be designed to be used in a one to one (1:1) environment to allow students to progress at their own pace as well as allow the teacher to use in direct instruction.			
3. Accommodate students that are performing above and below grade level.			
4. Be designed using appropriate pedagogy, learning theory, and instructional strategies to increase student achievement.			
5. Provide authentic activities and relevant learning examples to address individualized needs of students.			
6. Provide sensitivity to the ethnic, cultural and socio-economic demographics of Arizona when providing content examples and assessment items.			
7. Be accessible beyond the 180 day academic school year (for example intersession, summer school).			
8. Provide a delivery system that has the ability to provide course work to 50,000 students at the highest reliability level both at school and home.			
9. Comply with federal 2004 IDEA parameters (can accommodate IEPs and work with assistive technologies).			
10. Be designed to "increased student motivation" related to math.			
11. Be platform neutral and delivered via the Internet for school and home use. Vendors are encouraged to offer alternatives for providing digital activities and resources utilizing the student laptop to meet the needs of students not having home access to the Internet.			
12. Provide engaging and interactive experiences for students (allow for all learning styles) which will include but not limited to:			
a. visual (color, motion, graphics)			
b. auditory			
c. aesthetic appeal			
d. intuitive navigation			
e. reading level			
f. use of gaming strategies			
Desirable but not required			
1. Provide alignment to the National Math Curriculum Focus (NMCF), (http://www.nctm.org/focalpoints/news_cfpnctm.asp).			
2. Provide for parental involvement with the ability to monitor learning and progress both electronically and in alternative formats.			
3. Provide for a student "help desk" on-line for technical issues throughout the duration of the pilot.			

Requirements	Yes	No*	*Explanation
4. Provide for a free student "math homework hotline" a minimum of 2 hr per "evening".			
5. Provide a collaborative student platform.			
Professional Development Requirements			
The Professional Development Must:			
1. Provide evidence that all professional development is aligned:			
a. Arizona Professional Teaching Standards http://www.ade.state.az.us/certification/downloads/Teacherstandards.pdf			
b. National Staff Development Council Standards http://www.nsdc.org/standards/index.cfm.			
c. National Educational Technology Standards for Teachers http://cnets.iste.org/teachers/t_stands.html			
2. Provide both initial and ongoing professional development for teachers and their administrator that:			
a. Ensures effective use of the acquired digital content, assessments and equipment.			
b. Uses appropriate strategies and techniques to successfully integrate technological and digital resources into the daily work of students.			
c. Accommodates unscheduled teacher replacements during the school year.			
d. Offers a variety of formats, e.g. face-to-face, mentoring/coaching teachers in the classroom, workshops, peer-to-peer monitoring, web-based and/or other.			
e. Ensures that teachers can use real-time data to differentiate instruction based on the ability to analyze data and adjust learning as needed.			
f. Increases student motivation and success related to achieving Arizona Math standards.			
3. Provide training syllabi with teacher time commitment for maximum results.			
4. Provide digital records of registration, course or class completion and other units of professional development to the Arizona Department of Education for monitoring and recertification purposes.			
5. Provide evidence that all professional development provided by the prime vendor is conducted by personnel with proven classroom experience (resume required).			
Desirable but not required			
1. Provide on-line and/or toll-free phone teacher support during the normal school week hours (8-5) for the academic year.			
2.Provide mentoring and coaching of teachers as follow-up for the duration of the project.			

ATTACHMENT 6.8
Self-Assessment of Proposed Program Design and Deliverables
SOLICITATION NO. ED08-0020

Requirements	Yes	No*	*Explanation
3. Provide materials and content for the schools to utilize for informing and communicating with parents/guardians of participating students.			
4. Provide incentives for the teacher participation in the program.			
STUDENT ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS			
The Student Assessment Component Must:			
1. Provide items aligned with the Arizona Mathematic Standard (at the concept and performance objective), and formatted consistent with the Arizona's Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS).			
2. Provide formative and summative assessments that:			
a. Utilize computer adaptive testing[2]			
b. Are embedded instruction			
c. Provide reliable and valid assessment results at the individual student level			
d. Provide real-time feedback for both student and class			
e. Produce vertical growth scale (over 3 years)			
f. Provide scale scores across all the grades included in this pilot.[3]			
g. Produces two types of mastery scores (end of unit and state standard proficiency)			
h. Provides three year longitudinal data collection over the course of the pilot			
i. Establishes baseline data			
j. Provide for analysis of results and provide teachers with recommendation for re-teaching			
k. Provide appropriate feedback to students with additional content review as needed.			
l. Allow for aggregation of longitudinal data by student, class, grade, school and state levels.			
m. Provide visual interpretation of degrees of mastery of the content			
3. Provide examples of all reports specified in this RFP.			
Technical Requirements			
Platform Requirements			
Teachers and students in the pilot will be provided a laptop with wireless capability and a carrying case for the duration of the project. Participating schools will be allowed to select either a PC or Mac laptop and wireless cards based on their district's policy and practice.			
2. The minimum requirements for laptops are:			

Specifications	Windows PC	Apple Mac			
Operating System	Windows XP Professional SP2 Media Center Edition 2005	Mac OS 10.4 or better			
Productivity Tools	Microsoft Office 2003/2007 or equivalent	MS Office for Mc 2004/2008 or equivalent			
Processor Speed	Core Duo (no Celeron)	1.83 GZ			
Memory	1 GB RAM	1 GB RAM			

ATTACHMENT 6.8
Self-Assessment of Proposed Program Design and Deliverables
SOLICITATION NO. ED08-0020

Requirements			Yes	No*	*Explanation
Hard Drive	60 GB	60 GB			
Graphics Card	Integrated card	Integrated Card			
Warranty	3 year parts and labor (on-site strongly recommended)	3 year parts and labor Applecare			
Browser	As appropriate for digital content	Firefox/Mozilla			
Insurance	Comprehensive breakage, theft, hazard (strongly recommended)				
Virus and Spyware Protection Software	Appropriate virus and spyware protection software				
3. The proposed laptops' operating system must be compatible with digital math content requested under Section B – Digital Content Req.					
Technical System Must Be:					
1. Based on widely-accepted principles and open architectures, supported by open- and/or pervasive-industry standards and best practices as defined by Arizona's statewide IT P700 series of policies and S700 standards addressing Network, Platform, Software, and Data/information Architectures.					
2. Interoperable, portable, scalable, adaptive and comply with the ADE's technical guidelines for initiatives and strategies.					
3. Compatible and interoperable with ADE's IDEAL project. (http://www.ideal.azed.gov)					
Security System Must:					
1. Securely and economically protect all districts and schools business/system functions and its data/information as defined by Arizona's statewide IT P800 Security Policy and S800 series of security standards. This shall include district, teacher, and student access to appropriate levels of information and resources pertaining to district/school reporting, academic reporting, coursework and assessments, and student scores.					
2. Comply with existing Federal and State statues on confidentiality, privacy, accessibility, availability, and integrity. All access to data must be in compliance with FERPA, Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act. (http://www.ed.gov/offices/OM/fpco/index.html)					
3. Be certified to have 99% real-time reliability for users. Successful bidders will post bond or provide proof of insurance to cover any costs incurred as a result of "loss of use" during the pilot.					
Management and Reporting System Must:					
1. Be user friendly and require minimal training to operate effectively. The system must have the capacity for remote monitoring and support.					
2. Include a complete explanation of the operation of the management system, from set-up and testing to final implementation.					
3. Provide a strategy to do ongoing system analysis of the pilot project itself and implement improvements.					

ATTACHMENT 6.8
Self-Assessment of Proposed Program Design and Deliverables
SOLICITATION NO. ED08-0020

Requirements	Yes	No*	*Explanation
4. Provide samples of appropriate monthly reports on system performance.			
5. Provide capacity for ad hoc queries on student usage and performance.			
6. Provide a tech support strategy including a help desk function that will ensure the highest level of operational capacity and maximum instructional usage.			
Data Standards Must Be:			
1. SIF compliant (http://www.sifinfo.org)			
2. Capable of importing data to and exporting data from any student information system meeting Arizona's Student Accountability Information System (SAIS) requirements.			
3. Compliant with Arizona educational data standards and systems to facilitate data transfer and reporting to the school/district student information system and to the state's data warehouse system.			
Site Infrastructure Evaluation and Remote Management Must:			
1. Be able to assess the participating school's wireless and network infrastructure, Internet bandwidth capacity and identify any deficiencies that would impact system performance.			
2. Be able to remotely monitor and analyze participating schools' wireless and network infrastructure, Internet bandwidth capacity and make systems improvements as required. (The pilot schools will assure that site infrastructure meets or exceeds the requirements of the vendor's system.)			
3. Ensure that at least one on-site individual be trained to be able to log students off when computers freeze or tampering has occurred (or the ability to do this remotely with toll-free access or email with 10 min response time during the academic day.)			

ATTACHMENT 6.9
PERIPHERAL EQUIPMENT SPECIFICATIONS
SOLICITATION NO. ED08-0020

ATTACHMENT 6.10
OFFEROR'S CHECKLIST
SOLICITATION NO. ED08-0020

Instructions: Offerors must submit the items listed below. In the column titled "Offeror's Page #", the Offeror must enter the appropriate page number(s) from its Proposal where the ADE evaluators may find the Offeror's response to that requirement.

Required Item	**Solicitation Reference:**	**Offeror's Proposal Page #:**
1. Offer and Award Form Signed	Page 1	
2. Contract Administration	Section 2. ¶¶ 20.A & 20.D	
3. Offeror's Prices	Attachment 6.1	
4. Offeror's References	Attachment 6.2	
5. Offeror's Organization	Attachment 6.3	
6. Offeror's Personnel Qualifications	Attachment 6.4	
7. Offeror's Financial Disclosure	Attachment 6.5	
8. Sole Proprietor Certificate Waiver (if necessary)	Attachment 6.6	
9. Digital Content, Professional Development & Delivery Narrative	Attachment 6.7	
10. Self-Assessment of Proposed Program Design and Deliverables	Attachment 6.8	
11. Peripheral Equipment Specifications (if necessary)	Attachment 6.9	
12. Offeror’s Checklist	Attachment 6.10	

EXHIBIT 7.1

CERTIFICATE OF INSURANCE

CONTRACT NO. ED05-

VENDOR:

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
PROCUREMENT SECTION
1535 WEST JEFFERSON, Bin 37
PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85007
(602) 364-2517

Prior to commencing services under this Contract, the Contractor must furnish the State, certification from insurer(s) for coverages in the minimum amounts as stated below. The coverages shall be maintained in full force and effect during the term of this Contract and shall not serve to limit any liabilities or any other Contractor obligations.

Name and Address of Insurance Agency::	**Company Letter**	**Companies Affording Coverage:**
	A	
	B	
Name and Address of Insured:	**C**	
	D	

LIMITS OF LIABILITY MINIMUM – EACH OCCURRENCE		**COMPANY LETTER**	**TYPE OF INSURANCE**	**POLICY NUMBER**	**DATE POLICY EXPIRES**
Bodily Injury Per Person Each Occurrence Property Damage **OR** Bodily Injury and Property Damage Combined			Comprehensive General Liability Form Premises Operations Contractual Independent Contractors Products/Completed Operations Hazard Personal Injury Broad Form Property Damage Explosion & Collapse (If Applicable) Underground Hazard (If Applicable)		
Same as Above			Comprehensive Auto Liability Including Non-Owned (If Applicable)		
Necessary if underlying is not above minimum			Umbrella Liability		
Statutory Limits			Workmen's Compensation and Employer's Liability		
			Other		

State of Arizona and the Department named above are added as additional insureds as required by statute, contract, purchase order, or otherwise requested. It is agreed that any insurance available to the named insured shall be primary of other sources that may be available.	It is further agreed that no policy shall expire, be canceled or materially changed to affect the coverage available to the State without thirty (30) days written notice to the State. This Certificate is not valid unless countersigned by an authorized representative of the insurance company.
Name and Address of Certificate Holder:	Date Issued: _____ Authorized Representative

Appendix A - Timeline and Design Considerations for the e-Learning Pilot Project

Student Cohorts 1 & 2 will have a 3 year experience. Cohorts 3 & 5 will have a 2 year experience. Cohorts 4 & 6 will have a 1 year experience
All teachers will have a 3 year experience

Grade level	Year 1-(2007)			Year 2-(2008)				Year 3-(2009)				Year 4-(2010)		Year 5-(2011)
			SY 07/08			SY 08/09			SY 09/10			SY 10/11		
	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer
	PIJ	Plan	Push Beginning PD to Summer 08											
	RFI/RFP	Evaluate/award	School selection	Plan	PD	Initiate pilot		ANNUAL			ANNUAL			FINAL
6						Cohort 1	XXXXXX	eval/report	Cohort 5	YYYYYY	eval/report	Cohort 6	OOOOOO	eval/report
7						Cohort 2	ZZZZZZ	eval/report	Cohort 1	XXXXXX	eval/report	Cohort 5	YYYYYY	eval/report
8						Cohort 3	OOOO0	eval/report	Cohort 2	ZZZZZZ	eval/report	XXXXXXXX	XXXXXXXX	eval/report
9						Cohort 4	YYYYYY	eval/report	Cohort 3	OOOOO	eval/report	Cohort 2	ZZZZZZZZ	eval/report

Notes:
1. Eligible schools have to have at least 2 sequential grade levels of the 4 eligible (6th-9th)
2. Cohort 4 & 6 would consist of students with no prior or subsequent experience in program
3. Color indicates computer migration. 4 initial grade level allocations and two reallocations from 9th to 6th grade classes.
4. Number indicates student Cohort group
5. Cohort 2, 3, and 4 (75% of computers if distributed equally among Cohorts) would have to be assigned to a district that has junior highs with 9th grade included (Mesa)

3 years experience for teachers at all grade levels
All computer resources procured and placed in service year 1
Lessons learned allow teachers to modify and adjust for success

CHALLENGES

Limited number of districts with 9th grade as part of a junior high campus but in this model 75% of the computers would be assigned to a Cohort moving to 9th grade.
Computers from Cohort 4 would move from a 9th grade to a 6th grade class which would be logistical problem if they weren't both at the same site.
Ditto for computers use by Cohort 3.
Varied amount of student data. One third would have 3 years, one third would have 2 years and one third would have 1 year of data
Departmentalized nature of Junior hi classes, i.e. 7th, 8th, and 9th. Do we allow mixed classes? Only Math teachers involved!?
Implementation and ongoing instructional support over 4 grade levels would be a significant increase over just one grade level

Appendix E: Draft School Application for Middle School Math Pilot Project

State of Arizona
Arizona Department of Education

ANNOUNCEMENT: MIDDLE SCHOOL MATH PILOT

In conjunction with eLearning Task force

DIRECTIONS & APPLICATION

FOR 07-08 SCHOOL YEAR
COMPETITIVE AWARD
SCHOOLS WITH GRADE 6 - 9
In

– DEADLINE –
Submission of Applications

5:00 pm Friday,

NOTE: Due to the potential state budget cuts, pending legislative and gubernatorial decision, these monies may be reduced or eliminated during the 2008 Legislative session. We are proceeding as though the funding will be available based on AZ 15-901-04, which passed during the 2007 Legislative session.

DRAFT

SUBMISSION:

Original and three (3) copies of the letter and related documents must be submitted on _____, 2008 ***by*** the deadline of ***5:00 p.m.*** The proposal package must be submitted in electronic form to cathy.poplin@azed.gov. The three (3) copies will be made available to ADE Technical Reviewers. Applications will be available to download from the ADE website on

Narrative sections must **be type written, 1 ½ line space** and the font used must be **12 point.** There must be **one inch side, top, and bottom margins.** Charts, graphs, and tables may be single spaced with type no smaller than **10 point.** The application, **not including** the Appendices and required forms, shall not exceed **20 pages *not* including charts and appendices.**

Released:
Mandatory Webinars:
Due:

DRAFT

Application to Participate – eLearning Pilot SB1512
Middle School Math Project
Background

This eLearning pilot program was authorized by the State legislature with SB 1512 **(**Legislative session 46**)** and will provide selected school sites with digital math curriculum with assessments for grades 6 through 9 and laptop computers for participating students and teachers. Professional development and student motivation are critical components of the project and will be included in the design and implementation of the program. For purposes of this project, eLearning is defined as*: The use of electronic technologies or Information, Communication, Technology (ICT)'s in education. eLearning may occur both in distance and conventional education and may involve electronic media that do not use online delivery*.

The goal of the legislation is to implement a three-year eLearning pilot program to help schools achieve academic and motivational gains based on state and national standards. The scope of the pilot will be limited to three full academic years for up to a maximum of 10 sites and up to 10,000 students.

The eLearning pilot program is administered by the eLearning Task Force established by the legislature. The eLearning Task Force will conduct a middle school math pilot that will reflect, as closely as possible, the student demographics of the state so that relevant recommendations may be made at the conclusion of the pilot program in accordance with the authorizing legislation.

NOTE: At the time of this application announcement the contract for the PRIME VENDOR (digital content provider) has NOT been awarded. . The FORMAL start of the application process will not take place until 1 week AFTER the RFP is awarded so that districts/schools will know what vendor has been selected to provide the digital content and the professional development. The hardware (laptops) that will be provided will match the specifications of the district/school(s) selected for the pilot .

Goal 1 Improve student math achievement through a Middle School Digital Math instructional technology systems pilot.

Goal 2 Increase student motivation to achieve academic success through innovative strategies and content delivery.

Goal 3 Ensure every student becomes technologically literate by the 8th grade

Goal 4 Move toward establishing a for a one to one computing environment into a K-8 setting, referencing the Partnership for a 21st Century's guidelines **Framework for 21st Century Learning** (http://www.21stcenturyskills.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=254&Itemid=120)

Goal 5 Participate in the collaborative professional development system that includes scientifically-based impact model and peer coaching components (NCSD Standards as adopted by ADE) that is part of the pilot.

Unique Features of this Pilot Project:

- The awarded vendor will supply laptops, digital content and professional development to the selected sites per the RFP. There is no additional funding provided to the schools for infrastructure upgrades or other costs associated with the implementation.
- Schools must commit to meeting the necessary infrastructure requirements by July 1, 2008 to be eligible (but the specifications for that infrastructure will not be known until the RFP is awarded.)
- The Pilot Schools will have at least 2 consecutive grades 6-9 of math and will have expectations

DRAFT

placed on them for scheduling of students and teachers and equipment maximization.

- The pilot may create pockets of "haves and have not's" for classrooms and students within the school
- There are expectations that may require policy and regulation changes at the district level
- The sustainability and/or expansion of the pilot after three years should be an active topic of discussion before applying.
- Student motivation was a major component of the legislation. Schools will be investing time and effort in supporting and collecting data for this component.
- The entire school must acknowledging that participation in this pilot will require change for everyone on site (even those classrooms not in the pilot) and that flexibility and commitment is essential for selection and success.

ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

(Failure to comply with any one renders the school ineligible):
The selected school or charter must:

- Be a school at AZ LEARNS Performing status or above
- Have at least two consecutive grade levels (6, 7, 8, and 9) on a campus
- Have a current technology plan on file with ADE that reflects how technology is supporting student improvement
- Have by the start of SY 08/09 adequate bandwidth and infrastructure to meet the requirements of the program (final level to be determined with award of contract, but anticipate a minimum of a dedicated T-1 to the applying site) and a wireless network capable of supporting 30 simultaneous Internet connections per participating classroom(s). This also includes electrical outlets and capacity to facilitate charging of laptop batteries.
- Commit to:
- Having administration and teachers participate for the duration of the three year project.
- Adjusting student schedules to ensure that they stay as a cohort group in math for up to the three year term of the pilot
- Providing a common "prep" time for teachers assigned for all three years
- Providing incentives for the additional professional training time required.
- Providing documentation that the teachers selected are highly qualified and appropriately certified and that they are willing participate in professional development prior to implementation (starting in spring, 2008 or fall semester of 2008).
- Participating in on-going evaluations at the site and district level into all aspects of the three-year pilot project.
- Allowing a student take-home-computer program including a parental involvement process (must have insurance for loss or damage) by July 1, 2008
- Providing oversight and management of the project resources which include but not limited to "inventory control" (tracking and reporting) and managing the availability and access to spare equipment.
- Utilizing spare equipment for "instant" replacement of equipment if necessary with no or minimal interruption of service to students.
- Administration of the Teacher Technology Proficient Assessment to all participating teachers in the pilot and schools administrators prior to July 1, 2008. This is a free online instrument, created by the Florida DOE. Specific information is available from ADE.
- Administration of the Technology Literacy Assessment (Learning.com) for all participating students (funding from ADE) as pre-post instrument.

DRAFT

Compliance Checklist

Directions: The Compliance Check List is included in your Packet so that school/charter personnel are informed of actions they are required to take ***prior*** to having an application is reviewed and scored by Technical Reviewers who represent the Arizona Department of Education (ADE). Members of the school/charter leadership team preparing the application should use the Compliance Check List as a tool to ensure that all eligibility requirements have been met before the application is submitted to the ADE. You will receive a receipt from the ADE acknowledging compliance when the application is submitted.

Applicant school/charter Name_____

All statements will be verified by ADE staff.

- ☐ The Applicant school/charter has at least one representative participate in one of the webinars. Proposal Preparation Training provided on the following dates to be eligible to apply. You must register on-line for the webinar of your choice at the ADE Calendar of Events: **http://www.azed.gov/onlineregistration/calendar/RenderCalendar.asp** Details will be emailed to you.

  Webinar 1 2 weeks after the award of the RFP
  Webinar 2 2 weeks after the award of the RFP
  Webinar 3 2 weeks after the award of the RFP

- ☐ The Applicant school/charter has an AZ LEARNS label of "Performing or Performing +" level or above.

- ☐ The school/charter has submitted the ADE Technology survey, http://www10.ade.az.gov/selectsurveynet/TakeSurvey.aspx?SurveyID=n6KK9l8 prior to completion of the application.

- ☐ A current Technology Plan is on file with ADE.

- ☐ Narrative sections are **typed. 1 ½ line space** and the font used is **12 point.** There is a **one inch side, top, and bottom margins.** Charts, graphs, and tables may be single spaced with type no smaller than **10 point.** The application**, not including the Appendices and required forms**, shall not exceed 20 **pages.**

- ☐ The Application was submitted in electronic form cathy.poplin@azed.gov and one (1) Original and three (3) copies delivered by 5 pm. Failure to submit the application electronically and ensure arrival at the ADE of an Original and 3 copies of your Application by the deadline constitutes non compliance and is grounds for excluding your Application from the Technical Review process. **(Please review mailing and hand-delivery options provided on the last page of this Application Packet.)**

- ☐ The Applicant school/charter has satisfied any and all apparent violations of ADE procedures regarding required progress or completion reports or other requisite reporting in keeping with its responsibilities for receipt of federal and state funding. NOTE: School/charter that are unable to resolve their having been placed on programmatic "hold" and/or having been found to be currently ineligible to receive state or federal funding are **not** eligible to apply for this grant

DRAFT

MIDDLE SCHOOL MATH PILOT
PHASE I LETTER OF INTENT

1. Include completed Part I Demographics
2. Letter of Intent, which should address:
    a. Desire of school to participate
    b. Willingness to meet goals of the pilot project
    c. Specific needs of school that pilot can fulfill
    d. Explanation of an active planning team
3. Attach signed and completed Eligibility Assessment
4. Attach letters of support from administration, teachers, students and parents/community

Send an electronic version of letter of intent and attachments to cathy.poplin@azed.gov. In addition, send hard copy of letter of intent and attachments to:

Cathy Poplin
Deputy Associate Superintendent of Educational Technology
Arizona Department of Education
1535 West Jefferson, Bin 8
Phoenix, AZ 85007

DRAFT

MIDDLE SCHOOL MATH PILOT

COVER SHEET: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Applying School:
Address:
City:
Telephone:
Fax:

Applying Principal:
Email:
Telephone:

District:
Address:
City:
Telephone:

Fax:
Superintendent Name:
E-mail:
Phone:

Director of Technology:
Email:
Phone:

Educational Technology Director or Trainer
Email:
Phone:

Number of Teachers to be Served Directly:
Number of Students to be Served:

Grades Served:
AZ Learns "ranking" for 2005-06 and 06/07:

Infrastructure:
What bandwidth do you have to the internet from your school site (data only)?
Who is your Internet Service Provider?
Do you have a wireless network on your campus? If so, when was it installed?
Hardware:
What is the platform of choice for your site, PC or Mac?
What operating system is used on your computers?
How many computers are on your campus that has an internet connection?
Do you have laptops on your campus? If yes, how many? Average age:
Do you have computer labs on your site? If yes, how many labs? How many computers per lab?
Do you have a tech support person on site?

Certification by Authorized or Institutional Official:

The applicant certifies that to the best of his/her knowledge the information in this application is correct; that the filing of this application is duly authorized by the governing body of this organization, or institution, and that the applicant will comply with the general statement of assurances.

_____ _____
Typed/Printed Name of Authorized Official Title

_____ _____
Signature of Authorized Official **(Blue Ink)** Date

DRAFT

Eligibility Requirements
Describe your school's evidence for meeting each requirement.

Statement:	**Evidence (short narrative, reference/links to online support or attachments following this section cross reference by number to the statement)**
It is our acknowledgement that or agreement that we are/have: A school at AZ LEARNS Performing status or above	
At least two consecutive grade levels (6, 7, 8, and 9) on a campus	
a current technology plan on file with ADE that reflects how technology is supporting student improvement	
by the start of SY 08/09, adequate bandwidth and infrastructure to meet the requirements of the program (final level to be determined with award of contract, but anticipate a minimum of a dedicated T-1 to the applying site) and a wireless network capable of supporting 30 simultaneous Internet connections per participating classroom(s). This also includes electrical outlets and capacity to facilitate charging of laptop batteries.	
Committed to: Having administration and teachers participate for the duration of the three year project.	
Adjusting student schedules to ensure that they stay as a cohort group in math for up to the three year term of the pilot	
Providing a common "prep" time for teachers assigned for all three years	
Providing incentives for the additional professional training time required.	
Providing documentation that the teachers selected are highly qualified and appropriately certified and that they are willing participate in professional development prior to implementation (starting in spring, 2008 or fall semester of 2008).	
Participating in on-going evaluations at the site and district level into all aspects of the three-year pilot project.	
Allowing a student take-home-computer program including a parental involvement	

DRAFT

Statement:	Evidence (short narrative, reference/links to online support or attachments following this section cross reference by number to the statement)
process (must have insurance for loss or damage) by July 1, 2008	
Providing oversight and management of the project resources which include but not limited to "inventory control" (tracking and reporting) and managing the availability and access to spare equipment.	
Utilizing spare equipment for "instant" replacement of equipment if necessary with no or minimal interruption of service to students.	
Administration of the Teacher Technology Proficient Assessment to all participating teachers in the pilot and schools administrators prior to July 1, 2008. This is a free online instrument, created by the Florida DOE. Specific information is available from ADE.	
Administration of the Technology Literacy Assessment (Learning.com) for all participating students (funding from ADE) as pre-post instrument.	

Certification by Authorized or Institutional Official:

The above information to the best of his/her knowledge is correct; that the submission of this form is duly authorized by the governing body of this organization, or institution.

_____ _____

Typed/Printed Name of Authorized Official Title

_____ _____

Signature of Authorized Official **(Blue Ink)** Date

DRAFT

DATA and DEMOGRAPHICS:

AIMS Math raw score number correct of total possible (identified by strand) for grades (aggregated if applicable). Note if grade 5 is not readily available, please note with explanation.

Standard 1 **Number Sense & Operations**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**
6 grade			
7 grade			
8 grade			
9 grade			

Standard 2 **Data Analysis, Probability, & Discrete Mathematics**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**
6 grade			
7 grade			
8 grade			
9 grade			

Standard 3 **Patterns, Algebra, & Functions**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**
6 grade			
7 grade			
8 grade			
9 grade			

Strand 4 **Geometry & Measurement**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**
6 grade			
7 grade			
8 grade			
9 grade			

Strand 5 **Structure & Logic**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**
6 grade			
7 grade			
8 grade			
9 grade			

Identify the grade level(s) –minimum of 2 sequential grades and classes per grade proposed

Grade Level	**# of classes**	**# of students**
6 grade		
7 grade		
8 grade		
9 grade		

Identify the average attendance and discipline referrals (by type) per proposed grade level: put

DRAFT

in a table

For 05/ 06 year	ADA	Attendance rate	Discipline referral	Promotion rate
Grade 6				
Grade 7				
Grade 8				
Grade 9				

For 06/07 year	ADA	Attendance rate	Discipline referral	Promotion rate
Grade 6				
Grade 7				
Grade 8				
Grade 9				

Staffing Analysis.of <u>proposed participating</u> teachers

Teacher: *Verify certification/experience for all classroom teachers. Add rows as needed. NOTE the Teacher Tech Literacy assessment is free.*

Name (initials?)	**Grade**	**Yr(s) at Grade**	**Yr(s) Experience Overall**	**Yr(s) teaching Math**	**Certification & Endorsements**	**Highly Qualified Yes/No**	**% Score from Tech Literacy**

Technical Support Staff *Add rows as needed.*

Name (initials?)	**Position/ Title**	**District/ Site**	**Funding: Contract, volunteer, internal FTE, warranty?**	**% Time on campus**	**Experience with wireless laptops (yes/no)**

DRAFT

Roles and Responsibilities of School/ District Personnel in Implementation of the Pilot
(Add as many rows as needed)

Goal 1	Task/Activities	Timeframe (Begin & End)	Individual Responsible & Role	% of FTE (approximately)

Goal 2	Task/Activities	Timeframe (Begin & End)	Individual Responsible & Role	% of FTE (approximately)

Goal 3	Task/Activities	Timeframe (Begin & End)	Individual Responsible & Role	% of FTE (approximately)

Goal 4	Task/Activities	Timeframe (Begin & End)	Individual Responsible & Role	% of FTE (approximately)

Proposal Summary (<u>not to exceed 5 pages</u>)

Provide a summary of how your proposal will meet the legislative intent and ADE goals for this Pilot project. The summary should include an overview of approach, planned activities that align with and support the project goals, expected outcomes for participating students, teachers and the entire school,, a timeline, what technology infrastructure changes will be needed (if any), an analysis of your technical support needs, a strategy to add the additional professional development requirements into your existing schedule, which research-based model has been selected and how you will measure success. Also, the summary should include indicating support from all stakeholders and what experience the school and staff has had with implementing projects of this magnitude.

DRAFT

General Narrative:

The purpose of the narrative is to give a vivid and compelling picture of the project, process and outcomes anticipated over the three years of the pilot. The narrative may be supported by other documents either in the Appendices or through web links. Applicants are encouraged to involve all stakeholders in the research, planning and design phases of the process of developing the proposal, but may find that one writer/editor is the most logical way to develop the final application. The letters of support and commitment may be referenced throughout the narrative.

Respond to the following KEEPING in mind that the grant is for selected classrooms within a school and the review should see a clear picture of how this "pilot within a school" will work benefiting both the grant recipients and the rest of the school community. (max of 12 pages)

1. What specific math and student motivation gains would you expect to achieve? How does this pilot project support your school or district's goals/strategic plan or school improvement plan? What do you hope to accomplish by participating in this pilot project including short and long term benefits to school and students? What is the motivation of the school leadership to undertake this pilot project? Describe staff commitment to change *Include letters of support from each group in Appendix A both involved in the pilot and their non-participating peers.*

2. What researched-based Professional Development model are you currently using and how will it support or need to be modified to make use of laptops outside the digital math curriculum for a successful pilot.

3. Creating and maintaining the math pilot over three years will undoubtedly require changes. Describe the proposed solution(s) to:

    a. Creating and maintaining the cohort group of students over a three year period
    b. Providing additional time (and common preps) for participating teachers will, undoubtedly require scheduling changes.
    c. Policy/procedure changes to deal with 1-to-1 laptops that are expected to travel with students during the day and outside of school hours (go home).

DRAFT

Appendix A: Support and Commitment Letters

- Minutes of the last district and school Technology Committee meeting
- Individual letters of commitment need to be obtained from the following groups:
    - Governing Board
    - Superintendent
    - LEA/Charter Holder Business Officer or equivalent
    - LEA/Charter Holder Officer or equivalent
    - LEA/Charter Holder Curriculum Director or equivalent
    - LEA/Charter Holder Educational Technology Director or Trainer or equivalent
    - School Principal and other administration
    - Teachers, librarians, academic coaches/advisors
    - Parents and Community
- Letters of Commitment must contain the following information
    - *Their role in the pilot project*
    - *Their commitment to the project activities to achieve goals*
    - *Commitment to matching/in-kind contributions (if applicable)*
    - *Participation in accountability/evaluation activities*

OPTIONAL: Professional Development Planning

Indicate the school's professional development needed each year from your perspective. The vendor will be responsible for delivery, but this section of the proposal is looking for the perspective pilot school's analysis of need. Professional development needs to focus on teams of teachers and individuals over time versus one time training events for the lifetime of the pilot. Include state and national conferences as applicable. Add rows as needed. Reviewers recognize that a three year plan is a "design" not a fixed reality, but are looking for evidence of planning in process. **The use of a research based model, mentoring and peer coaching is expected**

Year 1

Topic	Anticipated Audience	Provider	Duration (i.e. hours, weeks, months)	Incentive provided?	Objective of the Professional Development
What research says about technology and achievement	*All classroom teachers*	*Expert from AzTEA*	*5 months/ 1 hr month*	*Done during contract time. PTO will provide cookies*	*Teachers share insights gained through wiki and webpage notations.*

DRAFT

Year 2

Topic	Anticipated Audience	Provider	Duration (i.e. hours, weeks, months)	Incentive provided?	Objective of the Professional Development

Year 3

Topic	Anticipated Audience	Provider	Duration (i.e. hours, weeks, months)	Incentive provided?	Objective of the Professional Development

OPTIONAL Supporting Board Policy, Regulations, District level Procedures, School level Practices that support this pilot.

Provide copies of all board policy/regulations/procedures identifying the support for "take home" computers for educational purposes. Reviewers will be looking for statements of: purpose, limitations, support, the student and adult AUP (If considering updating please give timeline and general description of changes anticipated**).** Also provide copies of student/parent agreement to participate in the project indicating: what happens over school "breaks" and summer, procedures for damage, loss, failures, moves, disciplinary processes for willful misuse, etc.

DRAFT