MEETING AGENDA

**Technical Panel
of the
Nebraska Information Technology Commission**

Tuesday, December 11, 2012
9:00 a.m.
Varner Hall - Board Room
3835 Holdrege St., Lincoln, Nebraska

AGENDA

Meeting Documents (24 pages)
Meeting Documents with Full Text of ESUCC Project (64 pages)

1. Roll Call, Meeting Notice & Open Meetings Act Information

2. Public Comment

3. Approval of Minutes* - October 9, 2012

4. Enterprise Projects

   - Project Closure*
     - Administrative Services - LINK-Human Capital Management - Dovi Mueller and Andy Russell
   - Project Status Dashboard - Andy Weekly

5. Project Reviews

   - Technical Review: ESUCC - Nebraska's BlendEd eLearning System* (Summary | Full Text) - Matt Blomstedt
   - Informational: Department of Education - State Wide Longitudinal Data System - Brent Gaswick

6. Standards and Guidelines

   - Resource Document*
     - NITC 7-RD-01: Telecommunications Facilities and Services (Revised)
   - Set for 30-Day Comment Period*
     - NITC 7-104: Web Domain Name Standard (New)
     - NITC 8-101: Information Security Policy (Amendment)

7. Election - Technical Panel Chair for 2013*

8. Regular Informational Items and Work Group Updates (as needed)

   - Accessibility of Information Technology Work Group - Christy Horn
   - Learning Management System Standards Work Group - Kirk Langer
   - Security Architecture Work Group - Chris Hobbs
   - Intergovernmental Data Communications Work Group - Tim Cao

9. Other Business

10. Adjourn (Next Meeting - February 12, 2013)

* Denotes Action Item

(The Technical Panel will attempt to adhere to the sequence of the published agenda, but reserves the right to adjust the order of items if necessary and may elect to take action on any of the items listed.)

Meeting notice was posted to the NITC website and Nebraska Public Meeting Calendar on November 20, 2012. The agenda was posted to the NITC website on December 7, 2012.

Technical Panel
of the
Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Tuesday, October 9, 2012, 9:00 a.m.
Varner Hall - Board Room
3835 Holdrege St., Lincoln, Nebraska
MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:
Walter Weir, CIO, University of Nebraska, Chair
Christy Horn, University of Nebraska
Brenda Decker, CIO, State of Nebraska
Kirk Langer, Lincoln Public Schools
Michael Winkle, NET

ROLL CALL, MEETING NOTICE & OPEN MEETINGS ACT INFORMATION

Mr. Weir called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. There were four members present at the time of roll call. A quorum existed to conduct official business. Meeting notice was posted to the NITC website and Nebraska Public Meeting Calendar on September 5, 2012. The agenda was posted to the NITC website on October 5, 2012. The Open Meetings Act was posted on the South wall.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

APPROVAL OF AUGUST 14, 2012 MINUTES*

Ms. Decker moved to approve the August 14, 2012 minutes as presented. Mr. Langer seconded. Decker-Yes, Langer-Yes, Weir-Yes and Winkle-Yes. Results: Yes-4, No-0, Abstained-0. Motion carried.

ENTERPRISE PROJECTS

Project Status Dashboard - Andy Weekly

The Fusion Center project had requested that the project be designated as completed and closed. Due to the project not signing off on the vendor's contract because of one outstanding requirement that had not been met yet, the Technical Panel did not recommend closure of the project.

LINK Human Capital Management Project is completed and was implemented on May 9, 2012. The project will need to provide a final report to the Technical Panel.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

Requests for Waiver - Nebraska State Patrol - Request for Waiver from the requirements of NITC 5-101- Enterprise Content Management System for State Agencies*

The Nebraska State Patrol has requirements for accreditation. The document management solution available through the State (ECM) does not offer the specialized features necessary to ensure compliance and thus successful accreditation. The Nebraska State Patrol would like to purchase a compliance software application which contains the Accreditation criteria. The Office of the CIO's ECM staff recommended approval.

Ms. Decker moved to approve the request for waiver. The waiver will remain in effect for the duration of the contract. Mr. Langer seconded. Roll call vote: Winkle-Yes, Weir-Yes, Langer-Yes, and Decker-Yes. Results: Yes-4, No-0, Abstained-0. Motion carried.

PROJECT PROPOSALS - 2013-2015 BIENNIAL BUDGET - RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE NITC[*]

Reviewer Assignments and New Reviewers[*]

Rick Becker went over the reviewer assignments and indicated that there were two new reviewers added to the pool.

Mr. Langer moved to approved Anne Byers and Tom Rolfes as new reviewers. Mr. Winkle seconded. Roll call vote: Decker-Abstained, Langer-Yes, Weir-Yes and Winkle-Yes. Results: Yes-3, No-0, Abstained-1. Motion carried.

Ms. Horn arrived to the meeting but had to leave prior to vote on the I.T. project proposals.

Project summary sheets (64 pages)/**Full text of the projects** (381 pages)

The members reviewed each of the projects. The following individuals were available to discuss their agency's projects: Josh Daws, Secretary of State; Tom Jensen, Department of Agriculture; Eric Henrichsen, DHHS; and Michael Winkle, NET.

Through discussion and by consensus, the panel made the following comments on the projects:

Project	Q1	Q2	Q3	Comment
09-01	✓	✓	Unk	- Timeframe is a concern because there are multiple agencies involved. - Budget appears sufficient but there are variables which could negatively impact the budget.
09-02	✓	✓	✓	
09-03	✓	✓	✓	- Dependent upon the City of Lincoln making planned changes to the backend database for the system.
18-01	✓	✓	✓	- Planning for change management and training are needed.
22-01	Unk	Unk	Unk	- Until a decision is made on the direction of this project, many aspects of the project cannot be evaluated.
23-01	✓	✓	✓	
23-02	✓	✓	✓	
25-01	Unk	Unk	Unk	- Until a decision is made on the State's Health Insurance Exchange, many aspects of this project cannot be evaluated.
25-02	✓	✓	✓	- Detailed plan needed, but the Agency has mitigated many of the risks.
25-03	✓	Unk	Unk	- Unknown until the RFP process is completed.
25-04				- No technical elements to evaluate.
25-05	✓	Unk	Unk	- Unknown until the RFP process is completed.
25-06	✓	✓	✓	- Detailed plan needed, but the Agency has mitigated many of the risks.
25-07	✓	Unk	Unk	- Unknown until the RFP process is completed.
47-02	✓	✓	✓	
47-03	✓	✓	✓	
47-04	✓	✓	✓	
47-05	✓	✓	✓	
47-06	✓	✓	✓	
78-01	✓	✓	Unk	- Unknown funding reliability.

Q1: Is the project technically feasible?
Q2: Is the proposed technology appropriate for the project?
Q3: Can the technical elements be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget?
✓=Yes; ✗=No; Unk=Unknown

Mr. Langer moved to forward the Technical Panel's review and comments on the project proposals to the NITC. Mr. Winkle seconded. Roll call vote: Decker-Yes, Langer-Yes, Weir-Yes, and Winkle-Yes. Results: Yes-4, No-0, Abstained-0. Motion carried.

REGULAR INFORMATIONAL ITEMS AND WORK GROUP UPDATES (as needed)

No information updates were provided.

OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

MEETING ADJOURNMENT

With no further business, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 11:42 a.m.

Meeting minutes were taken by Lori Lopez Urdiales and reviewed by Rick Becker of the Office of the CIO.

Project:	**LINK – Human Capital Management** (formerly Talent Management System)			Contact:		**Dovi Mueller**	
Start Date	6/1/2009	Orig. Completion Date		7/1/2012	Completion Date		5/09/2012

	December	October	August	June	May	April
Overall Status	⚪	⚪	⚪	🟢	⚪	🟢
Schedule	⚪	⚪	⚪	🟢	⚪	🟢
Budget	⚪	⚪	⚪	🟢	⚪	🟢
Scope	⚪	⚪	⚪	🟢	⚪	🟢

Comments

October update:
Implemented the Human Capital Management portion of LINK on May 9, 2012. Request to close out the project.

Project:	**LINK – Procurement**			Contact:		**Steve Sulek**	
Start Date	6/1/2009	Orig. Completion Date		7/1/2012	Revised Completion Date		TBD

	December	October	August	June	May	April
Overall Status	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪
Schedule	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪
Budget	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪
Scope	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪

Comments

December update:
No report for December.

October update:
Steve Sulek will be reporting as the project manager on the Procurement portion of LINK.

The focus has been on the Employee Work Center up to this point. The expectation is that for the November reporting period the Procurement implementation will have started again.

Project:	**Network Nebraska Education**			Contact:		**Tom Rolfes**	
Start Date	05/01/2006	Orig. Completion Date		06/30/2012	Revised Completion Date		7/01/2013

	December	October	August	June	May	April
Overall Status	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢
Schedule	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟡	🟡	🟡
Budget	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢
Scope	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢

Comments

December update:
Five remaining circuits in northeast Nebraska left over from the Summer 2012 network upgrade have been updated to 100Mbps. RFP4180Z1 was released on November 15 and bids will be opened on December 21. This procurement affects

approximately 50 WAN circuits, most of which are in south central Nebraska. At least one private college and one private school may join Network Nebraska in summer 2013 if the bid prices are cost effective.

October Update:
Since 8/1/2012, all 150 K-12 WAN circuits came up on time, and were tested and accepted EXCEPT for one provider in northeast Nebraska. This provider has a combination of late equipment ordering, central office facility upgrades, and inability to provide service above 40Mbps for approximately 8 sites. Additionally, one Northeast Community College 100Mbps circuit from West Point to Norfolk with the same provider was temporarily being limited at 40Mbps until the provider upgrades its central office Ethernet ports.

Additional Comments/Concerns:
The Network Nebraska-Education Participation Fee fund account has received UNCSN's 1st quarter project invoice. Software Maintenance of the iSupport Helpdesk system has exceeded the Participation Fee budget for that line item. UNCSN's 2nd quarter project invoice should arrive in early February.

Project:	Nebraska Statewide Radio System (formerly Public Safety Wireless)		Contact:		Mike Jeffres	
	December	October	August	June	May	April
Overall Status	🟢	🟢	🟢	⚪	⚪	⚪
Schedule	🟢	🟢	🟢	⚪	⚪	⚪
Budget	🟢	🟢	🟢	⚪	⚪	⚪
Scope	🟢	🟢	🟢	⚪	⚪	⚪
Comments						

December update:
System life cycle planning in process.

October update:
System acceptance testing is in planning with coverage testing started on September 17. System life cycle planning is in process.

Additional Comments/Concerns:
Discussions with Motorola on system acceptance, life cycle planning, and project closeout.

Project:	Fusion Center			Contact:		Kevin Knorr	
Start Date	04/13/2010	Orig. Completion Date	06/11/2011	Revised Completion Date			06/22/2012
	December	October	August	June	May		April
Overall Status	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢		🟢
Schedule	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟡	🟡		🟡
Budget	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢		🟢
Scope	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢		🟢
Comments							

December Update:
The dual layer authentication is fixed and in final testing before we deploy our training.

We are still moving forward on this project. We continue to provide training and are in the process of full deployment. The vendor and all stakeholders have been working towards a solution to the NCJIS user authentication.

October Update:
Nebraska State Patrol requests to close the project for NITC reporting. The system is now in production.
They have not signed-off on the contract with the vendor due to one outstanding requirement that has yet to be met.

Project:	**Nebraska State Accountability (NeSA) – Year 2012-13** (formerly Statewide Online Assessment)		Contact:		**John Moon**	
Start Date	07/01/2010	Orig. Completion Date 06/30/2011		Revised Completion Date		~~06/30/2013~~ 12/06/2013
	December	October	August	June	May	April
Overall Status	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	⚪
Schedule	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	⚪
Budget	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	⚪
Scope	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	⚪
Comments						

December update:
The completion date was changed from June 30, 2013 to December 6, 2013.

NDE reviewed the NeSA online and paper/pencil test administration manuals and materials for reading, math, science, and writing for the 2013 assessments.   NDE provided student information file for NeSA writing to DRC on December 6th. Nebraska students have practiced the online assessment systems for NeSA assessments. Some issues were identified and resolved by DRC/CAL. Millard Public Schools will be testing the LCS on January 4th.

During December NDE will review and approve WebEx presentations for NeSA-Writing for training sessions to be delivered on January 8-9, 2013. The online management tools for NeSA writing will be available on January 9th. The window for the writing assessment begins on January 21 and closes on February 8, 2013. Handscoring of online test responses will begin on February 13th. Scoring of paper/pencil responses will begin on February 19th.

October update:
The State of the Schools Report (SOSR) with results from NeSA assessments will be released in November 2012.

The NeSA enrollment window for reading, math, science, and writing will be open October 8th through 19th. Districts will order paper/pencil copies of the assessments using the enrollment system.

The Check 4 Learning system update will be released on October 30 -31. The updates have addressed issues reported from districts in 2011-12.

A preliminary PreID file will be sent to our vendor DRC on November 1, 2012. Training for updates to the NeSA online system will be made on November 6-8, 2012. After the updated system opens on November 12, NDE has encouraged districts to have students complete the practice tests online to ascertain the local tech system will work with the updated NeSA online system.

Additional Comments/Concerns:
Nebraska State Accountability (NeSA) is a statewide assessment system mandated by Nebraska Statute. Nebraska Department of Education has contracted with Data Recognition Corporation (DRC) to continue the development of the assessment system including management, development, delivery, administration, scanning/imaging, scoring, analysis, reporting, and standard setting for the online and pencil/paper reading, science, and mathematics tests for July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013.   DRC will facilitate the delivery, administration, scanning/imaging, scoring, analysis, and reporting for the alternate pencil/paper reading, science, and mathematics tests during the same assessment window.   Online writing assessment will be added to the NeSA system in 2012 for grades 8 and 11.

Student data will be transferred from the Nebraska Student Staff Record System (NSSRS) to DRC's student data assessment system. The online subcontractor Computerized Assessments & Learning (CAL) for the online components of the assessment system will upload the student data from DRC. Schools will install CAL's software on local computers and software updates will be automatically uploaded when students log onto the assessment system. The student responses are cached on the local computer and sent to CAL. Each district has used CAL's school capacity process to evaluate online requirements for NeSA testing. The student responses for secure online assessments will be collected by CAL and transferred to DRC for analysis and reporting. During spring 2012, NDE is estimating that over 150,000 students will participate in the Reading, Science, and Mathematics operational testing while about 40,000 students will complete the writing assessment online. Whereas the NeSA reading/science/math test window is from March 25 through May 3, 2013, the NeSA writing test window is January 21 through February 8, 2013. Test administrators will be able to monitor testing during the test window and review test results immediately after test administration (raw scores only).   DRC's comprehensive corrections system will permit NDE to correct student records for duplicates, incorrect school assignment, etc during the month of May for writing and June for the reading, math, and science. Complete reporting of student results to districts, schools, and parents from DRC will be completed in August 2013 and reported in the State of the Schools Report in October 2013.

Project:	**Nebraska Regional Interoperability Network (NRIN)**		Contact:		**Bob Wilhelm**	
Start Date	10/01/2010	Orig. Completion Date	06/01/2013	Revised Completion Date		09/30/2013
	December	October	August	June	May	April
Overall Status	🟡	🟡	🟡	🟡	🟡	🟡
Schedule	🟡	🟡	🟡	🟡	🟡	🟡
Budget	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢
Scope	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢
Comments						

NEMA is struggling with issues of governance and maintenance of the network. Governance would be needed at the local jurisdiction and not at the state agency (there is no state agency is heading the project, it's all run at the local jurisdiction). There is no formal governance heading the project.

December update:
The contractor is moving forward with installations and the ordering of equipment. Information for EHP submissions has slowed but this has been discussed with the contractor and they state they will provide more information soon. Contractor has met with the N/E, E/C and S/E regions to discuss the process and information that CSI needs to move forward and with identifying usable tower sites, etc. Has begun to install equipment in the S/W region. Governor signed new Executive Order creating the Nebraska Public Safety Communications Council (NPSCC) and eliminated the previous Executive Orders that established NCOR and NWIN.

October update:
The contractor is moving forward with installations and the ordering of equipment. The contractor is also providing the information necessary for the Environmental and Historic Preservation (EHP) reviews and assessing the viability of some of the proposed sites and prioritizing the EHP direction to those areas where construction may occur in a timelier manner based on infrastructure. All PSIC funds were paid out for this project by September 30, 2012 (end of grant) and we have moved on to using State Homeland Security Grant funds as the primary source of funding for this project.

Additional Comments/Concerns:
It's possible that upcoming target dates might be missed. Based on the uncertainty of the infrastructure needed for the project and the time involved in obtaining the environmental approvals to proceed with the project, any target dates are fluid. In addition there has been a delay in completing, testing and accepting the Pilot Ring primarily due to the difficulty in locating adequate tower sites and negotiating leasing agreements and/or MOU's. Continuing in December of 2012.

Project:	**MMIS**			Contact:		
Start Date	N/A	Orig. Completion Date	N/A	Revised Completion Date		N/A
	October	August	June	May	April	March
Overall Status	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪
Schedule	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪
Budget	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪
Scope	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪
Comments						

Project On Hold until renewed

Project:	**Adjudication Re-engineering**		Contact:	**Randy Cecrle**		
Start Date	09/01/2011	Orig. Completion Date	06/30/2012	Revised Completion Date		12/31/2012 03/31/2013
	December	October	August	June	May	April
Overall Status	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	⚪	⚪
Schedule	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟡	⚪	⚪
Budget	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	⚪	⚪
Scope	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	⚪	⚪
Comments						

December update:
Development has reached the point where internal Adjudication testing has begun.

---------Project Description

Adjudication Re-engineering is a multi-phase project that will span a number of years to incorporate e-filing, electronic docket files, public web access to docket status, e-documents creation and judges e-signing of decisions and orders, and other performance improvement changes.

Project 1a - Release of Liability E-Filing is focusing on the development of one pleading type to complete the full end-to-end set of e-filing functions and limited changes to Clerks Review to process the submitted e-documents in the same manner as performed today with paper.

Project 1b - Semi-automated Docket / RFJA Setup, Electronic Docket File, and possibly Centralized Scanning will follow up immediately after 1a is completed. A rough time frame for completion is first half of calendar year 2013.

Because of the tight integration of judicial data and functions with non-judicial data and functions, (such as Vocational Rehabilitation), WCC systems, including e-filing, are separate from the rest of the courts in the state.

Because of the court's limited jurisdiction, our e-filing system is being designed to provide web-based drafting of pleading documents by outside attorneys, which utilize internal WCC electronic docket information. PDFs are generated for printing and "wet signatures" and the submittal with the "/s/" signature format as is the current rule and practice by the other courts in the state.

Tentatively, Project 2 will focus on adding the remainder of the pleading types to e-filing with a rough target completion date end-of-calendar year 2013.

Other adjudication functions to be addressed following Project 2 include:
- Scheduling and Calendar management,
- Public access to case status and case documents,
- Judge's Decisions and Orders management,
- Automated notification to other sections of the court of court case changes,
- Electronic transmission of documents to the Court of Appeals,
- Electronic Exhibit management.

There has not been any identification of additional out-of-pocket costs following Project 2, other than the knowledge that electronic storage costs will grow as more e-documents are added to the Electronic Docket Files.

October update:
The draft of the e-filing rules was completed in June, 2012. Internal review meetings with the Judges were held on June 27 and 28, 2012. A Rule Hearing is scheduled for August 29, 2012.

Phase 1a has the following functional areas of the system defined:
1. Account Setup
2. E-filing Drafting
3. E-filing System Help
4. Permissions
5. Drafting
6. Signature
7. Submittal
8. Clerk Review and Notification
9. ACH
10. Management Functions

Analysis (process, screen/views, and data attributes) has been completed on the above functions. The Analysis was completed ahead of schedule from what was previously planned in early July. Analysis documentation is in the process of being updated. Design through mock-ups and proto-types are in progress. Database schema (tables and relationships) design and creation has been started.

In addition, the following data quality projects are in progress:
1. Parties / Entity Types Definition and Update – The court's "Parties" table needs to be enhanced to add entity types such as Employee, Employer, etc. so that the types can be used in the Drafting and Signature functions.
2. Attorneys Bar Number Cleanup – The Attorney's Bar Numbers are being reviewed and updated where necessary. Also in the second half of the year the WCC will begin working with the Supreme Court on a data feed from the Nebraska Bar Association to keep our "Attorneys" table updated programmatically.
3. Current Internal System Enhancements. A number of minor enhancements need to be put in place, such as adding an additional address line to the Parties table.

Please note: The project listed below is reporting voluntarily and is not considered as an Enterprise Project by the NITC.

Project:	**Law Enforcement Message Switch Replacement (V)**		Contact:		**Suzy Fredrickson**	
Start Date	08/01/2011	Orig. Completion Date	05/15/2012	Revised Completion Date		11/30/2012
	December	October	August	June	May	April
Overall Status	🟢	🟢	⚪	🟢	🟢	🟢
Schedule	🟡	🟡	⚪	🟡	🟡	🟢
Budget	🟢	🟢	⚪	🟢	🟢	🟢
Scope	🟢	🟢	⚪	🟢	🟢	🟢
Comments						

December update:
Production Cut Over – Testing metro hosts. Datamaxx will be onsite the week of December 10. Go live will be scheduled at that time. If all tests go well, cutover will be 12/13/2012. If issues arise, go live will be postponed until January 7 due to the holidays.

Project milestones:
1. Establishing a Project Schedule - Complete
2. Development of Design Specifications - Complete
3. Receipt of Software Licensing - Complete
4. Server Installs - Compete
5. Implementation of Interfaces – Datamaxx developing interfaces for DMV, VTR, PO - Complete
6. Regression Testing - Complete
7. User Testing - Complete
8. Training - Complete
9. Documentation - Complete
10. Production Cut Over – In progress

October update:
Production Cut Over – Troubleshooting connectivity to metro hosts. Datamaxx will be onsite the week of October 22-26. Go live will be scheduled following that time.

On-Going Issues:

Application	Issue	Report Date	Comment
Student Information System	ADA Compliance	June, 2012	None.

Color Legend		
	Red	**Project has significant risk to baseline cost, schedule, or project deliverables.** **Current status requires immediate escalation and management involvement.** Probable that item will **NOT** meet dates with acceptable quality without changes to schedule, resources, and/or scope.
	Yellow	**Project has a current or potential risk to baseline cost, schedule, or project deliverables.** **Project Manager will manage risks based on risk mitigation planning.** Good probability item will meet dates and acceptable quality. Schedule, resource, or scope changes may be needed.
	Green	**Project has no significant risk to baseline cost, schedule, or project deliverables.** Strong probability project will meet dates and acceptable quality.
	Gray	**No report for the reporting period or the project has not yet been activated.**

Project #	Agency	Project Title
ESUCC-01*	ESUCC	Nebraska's BlendEd eLearning System

*A voluntary review requested by the submitting entity. Not submitted as an agency budget request.

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2013-15/index.html]

The goal of Nebraska's BlendEd eLearning System is to implement instructional and content technologies to enhance teaching and learning to support all modes of blended instruction. Blended education has been promoted by educational researchers as a one of the most promising recent innovations in education because it calls for making strategic choices about when face-to-face (synchronous) instruction is needed and when and how online (asynchronous) instruction can be best used to provide elements of student control over time, place, path and pace and provide more equity, efficiency and flexibility. Heather Staker and Michael B. Horn of the Innosight Institute offer this definition of Blended Learning-

> "Blended learning is any time a student learns at least in part at a supervised brick-and-mortar location away from home and at least in part through online delivery with some element of student control over time, place, path, and/or pace."- http://www.innosightinstitute.org

Full text of the proposal: http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2013-15/ppf/ESUCC-01.pdf

FUNDING SUMMARY

	Estimated Prior Expended	Request for FY2013-14 (Year 1)	Request for FY2014-15 (Year 2)	Request for FY2015-16 (Year 3)	Request for FY2016-17 (Year 4)	Future	Total
1. Personnel Costs		$ 255,000.00	$ 155,000.00	$ 50,000.00	$ 50,000.00	$ 50,000.00	$ 560,000.00
2. Contractual Services							
2.1 Design							$ -
2.2 Programming							$ -
2.3 Project Management							$ -
2.4 Other		$ 40,000.00	$ 10,000.00				$ 50,000.00
3. Supplies and Materials							$ -
4. Telecommunications							$ -
5. Training							$ -
6. Travel							$ -
7. Other Operating Costs							$ -
8. Capital Expenditures							
8.1 Hardware		$ 430,000.00	$ 225,000.00	$ 120,000.00	$ 95,000.00	$ 75,000.00	$ 945,000.00
8.2 Software		$ 645,000.00	$ 875,000.00	$ 1,140,000.00	$ 1,420,000.00	$ 1,500,000.00	$ 5,580,000.00
8.3 Network							$ -
8.4 Other							$ -
TOTAL COSTS	$ -	$ 1,370,000.00	$ 1,265,000.00	$ 1,310,000.00	$ 1,565,000.00	$ 1,625,000.00	$ 7,135,000.00
General Funds							$ -
Cash Funds							$ -
Federal Funds							$ -
Revolving Funds							$ -
Other Funds							$ -
TOTAL FUNDS	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Review er 1	Review er 2	Review er 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	12	14	11	12	15
Project Justification / Business Case	25	23	21	23	25
Technical Impact	20	19	16	18	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	8	9	8	8	10
Risk Assessment	8	10	8	9	10
Financial Analysis and Budget	15	18	16	16	20
			TOTAL	**87**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- The project concept is clearly articulated and the goals are aligned with increasing student achievement. - The stated goals are clear, concise, and challenging but certainly attainable. The core components of the technology needed to support BlendEd are clearly identified and are proven technologies used by educators for several years in the on-line community. The goal of providing face-to-face and on-line instruction to districts facing the challenge of certified teachers especially in the STEM subjects seems an effort deserving support. - Conceptually the right thing to do.	- The scope of the project is very broad and ambitious. The adoption of key components of the approach, including the unique identifier for the statewide directory and incentives for use of the Learning Content Repository, are premised upon conditions that either don't exist or may be very difficult to sustain. - Limited Scope: Objectives 2 & 3 pg 6 of 34. Consider including higher education entities from the start on the LMS and LDAP implementations or at the very least consult with higher ed when selecting of tools.
Project Justification / Business Case	- The project outcomes are aligned with statewide and P-16 efforts to meet the needs associated with increasing student diversity, declining budgets, limited access to instructors in rural locations and increasing demand for technology-centric methods to engage learners. - The tangible benefits listed on pages 11 & 12 would certainly help the small districts and those that have not made investment in LMS and content management systems to provide learning opportunities of the same quality and rigor statewide. The initiative would utilize the recent investment of high-bandwidth network provided by Network Nebraska, facilitate learning opportunities with Higher Education in Academy and dual-credit classes, and share educational content and expertise of technology champions that currently exist in many districts throughout Nebraska. The intangible are equally important such as student success, sharing resources and experience of educators, improved student engagement, and utilizing proven technologies.	- The project vulnerability is the high degree of cooperation required of very geographically disparate K12 entities. The desired outcomes are clear and the methods to achieve them are appropriate. The same could be said for the development of Network Nebraska. In the end it was the cost-effectiveness of Network Nebraska that resulted in its broad adoption. The same will need to be true here. - Cost Effectiveness: Can we show a break-even analysis to add impact to the proposal?
Technical Impact	- The technology components are aligned with and support the articulated outcomes. As stated there are many exemplars of this approach in other states. The approach combines IT best	- This is a very strong proposal from a conceptual perspective but there are a vast number of details that need to be addressed for the project to be successful. Among the possible impediments is

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
	practices with adherence to NITC standards and a clear focus on the usability of the components. - The technologies required of the BlendEd proposal are clearly identified and proven technologies that have been used by larger districts and higher education for a number of years. Single sign-on, reliability and availability, virtualization, disaster recovery, servers, software, integrating existing technologies owned and supported through the state to a statewide managed service, security, scalability, NITC standards, etc., all seem to be addressed. The proposal does not seem to require at this point one particular LMS system or content repository/database, but it would be worthy of consideration for maximizing investment and efficiencies down the road.	funding. - Service and Support: Will service levels be improved to provide desired levels while classes are in session? Will extended hours and weekend support be available for the LMS to support online learning?
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Project timelines and milestones are clearly articulated and responsible parties are identified. - Many of the stakeholders identified are already working together to better serve the students and educators throughout the state. The timelines and deliverables are complete and feasible. The training, staffing investment, and management commitment are integral to the success of the proposal.	- The coordination of a project with this many moving technical parts and variety of entities involved is enormous. It is not clear that ESUCC has the project management resources and governance to provide the level of coordination required. - The statement, "However, it is acknowledged that there will necessarily be some new, additional support resources required." should be stronger! - Staffing for system administration, maintenance and ongoing training appears to be limited. In year 3+ there is only $50k allocated. Depending on number of entities involved this may be inadequate.
Risk Assessment	- The proposal identifies key risk factors including cooperation of disparate entities and overall project coordination. The success of "local" efforts and, more importantly, the commitment of those that lead those efforts is significant in mitigating these risks. - I agree totally with the statement "The greatest risk for Nebraska education is to do nothing." The cost of each school and district going their own way will be much greater for the taxpayers of Nebraska than the BlendEd proposal of a statewide eLearning system. Building and growing trust and developing effective channels of communication as noted must be addressed. - Project Leadership	- There will need to be a financial incentive for entities to abandon local efforts to which they are already dedicated. Cost savings are possible, but an investment of capital will be required for the success of the project. - Limited scope: Should consider including higher ed with LMS and LDAP offering.
Financial Analysis and Budget	- The project budget indicates the significant investment required in hardware and software. It also recognizes that additional personnel costs will be incurred. - Budget numbers and plan seem reasonable and clear. It would have been nice to compare individual school investment in the same technologies as compared to the Statewide plan.	- There is insufficient information to tie expenditures directly to hardware/software components. Personnel costs decline over time and it is not clear how the project will be sustained without personnel over and above what is currently available. - The savings/cost avoidance indicated seems logical and I believe is real. It would have been a good exercise to calculate the cost of provisioning the identified technologies for a single school and extrapolate cost to show potential savings of a Statewide approach as presented. - Staffing levels appear to be inadequate to support systems administration, maintenance and upgrades as well as extended hours support needed for online learning.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist	Yes	No	Unknown	Comments
1. The project is technically feasible?				
2. The proposed technology is appropriate for the project?				
3. The technical elements can be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget?				

EDUCATION COUNCIL COMMENTS

- The Education Council recommends this project be categorized as Tier 1.
- If this project is successfully implemented, the Education Council predicts a significant cost savings for the education entities of Nebraska due to better software licensing and aggregated support services.
- The technologies described in the ESUCC project proposal have matured to the point where ongoing support services will be much more assumable than at any previous point in the history of these applications. EDUCAUSE has found that although the software products are improving and becoming more user friendly, more advanced training will be required for faculty and students in order to use the software systems to their fullest potential (e.g. instructional design training, advanced collaborative tools training).
- Nebraska is in a unique position to implement these technologies by virtue of the existence of the NSSRS unique identifier for every teacher, student, and staff member, currently being managed by the Nebraska Department of Education.
- The Education Council recommends that the project team focus on implementation of agreed-upon interoperability standards rather than trying to achieve a single, specific software solution. By remaining vendor agnostic, the entire system will be less vulnerable to the unpredictable changes within the market environment.

APPENDIX: RESPONSE TO REVIEWER COMMENTS

NITC Project Proposal Technical Review Responses
Project: Nebraska's BlendEd eLearning System
NITC Education Council meeting
October 24, 2012

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses	Response
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- The stated goals are clear, concise, and challenging but certainly attainable. The core components of the technology needed to support BlendEd are clearly identified and are proven technologies used by educators for several years in the on-line community. The goal of providing face-to-face and on-line instruction to districts facing the challenge of certified teachers especially in the STEM subjects seems an effort deserving support. - Conceptually the right thing to do.	- Limited Scope: Objectives 2 & 3 pg 6 of 34. Consider including higher education entities from the start on the LMS and LDAP implementations or at the very least consult with higher ed when selecting of tools.	This proposal was submitted by the ESUCC and is therefore K-12 centric. However, as is noted in the proposal, it references and recommends collaboration with Nebraska's institutions of Higher Ed . These institutions can provide assistance in proper instructional design and pedagogical techniques to properly utilize the eLearning tools. K-12 can provide HEd with feedback concerning effectiveness.
Project Justification / Business Case	- The tangible benefits listed on pages 11 & 12 would certainly help the small districts and those that have not made investment in LMS and content management systems to provide learning opportunities of the same quality and rigor statewide. The initiative would utilize the recent investment of high-bandwidth network provided by Network Nebraska, facilitate learning opportunities with Higher Education in Academy and dual-credit classes, and share educational content and expertise of technology champions that currently exist in many districts throughout Nebraska. The intangible are equally important such as student success, sharing resources and experience of educators, improved student engagement, and utilizing proven technologies.	- Cost Effectiveness: Can we show a break-even analysis to add impact to the proposal?	No attempt to develop a cost effective analysis was attempted for a number of reasons. This proposal encompasses a wide variety of functionality, features, services and technical components. There are existing initiatives that offer some of the proposed features and functionality to segments of our K-12 population (e.g. myelearning, NEVA). However, there are no statewide initiatives that offer all of the proposed functionality and features that could be utilized for any meaningful comparisons. It is felt it is undeniable that implementing the array of proposed functionality and services on a statewide basis utilizing an integrated and coordinated approach would provide the highest levels of availability, reliability, consistency, usability, and cost effectiveness possible.

Page 1 of 3

NITC Project Proposal Technical Review Responses
Project: Nebraska's BlendEd eLearning System
NITC Education Council meeting
October 24, 2012

Technical Impact	- The technologies required of the BlendEd proposal are clearly identified and proven technologies that have been used by larger districts and higher education for a number of years. Single sign-on, reliability and availability, virtualization, disaster recovery, servers, software, integrating existing technologies owned and supported through the state to a statewide managed service, security, scalability, NITC standards, etc., all seem to be addressed. The proposal does not seem to require at this point one particular LMS system or content repository/database, but it would be worthy of consideration for maximizing investment and efficiencies down the road.	- Service and Support: Will service levels be improved to provide desired levels while classes are in session? Will extended hours and weekend support be available for the LMS to support online learning?	As the proposal notes the architecture of the statewide BlendEd system must address the issues of availability, reliability, scalability, and extensibility. The proposed architecture/framework addresses these issues.

Network Nebraska will serve as the backbone/foundation for the BlendEd system deployment and it is a 24x7x365 operation. It is anticipated BlendEd will utilize a similar service and support model and also capitalize on existing support systems. Further detail to service and support would need to be developed. |
| Preliminary Plan for Implementation | - Many of the stakeholders identified are already working together to better serve the students and educators throughout the state. The timelines and deliverables are complete and feasible. The training, staffing investment, and management commitment are integral to the success of the proposal. | - The statement, "However, it is acknowledged that there will necessarily be some new, additional support resources required." should be stronger!
- Staffing for system administration, maintenance and ongoing training appears to be limited. In year 3+ there is only $50k allocated. Depending on number of entities involved this may be inadequate. | The proposal anticipates leveraging existing technical and support resources to the maximum extent possible. It is acknowledged that support and system administration will be challenging. As schools come online they will be able to provide some additional technical expertise. It is also anticipated that given the phased implementation over a period of 4+ years the experience of the early adopters can be leveraged to assist those that adopt later. Therefore, as the number of users increases over time the knowledge base and ability to support should also increase to better meet the required support demands. However, inevitably some additional support staff will be required for any premises based deployment. |

NITC Project Proposal Technical Review Responses
Project: Nebraska's BlendEd eLearning System
NITC Education Council meeting
October 24, 2012

Risk Assessment	- I agree totally with the statement "The greatest risk for Nebraska education is to do nothing." The cost of each school and district going their own way will be much greater for the taxpayers of Nebraska than the BlendEd proposal of a statewide eLearning system. Building and growing trust and developing effective channels of communication as noted must be addressed. - Project Leadership	- Limited scope: Should consider including higher ed with LMS and LDAP offering.	This proposal was submitted by the ESUCC and is therefore K-12 centric. However, as is noted in the proposal, it references and recommends collaboration with Nebraska's institutions of Higher Ed . HEd's experience with LMS and LDAP/authentication will benefit the K-12 community as they deploy the BlendEd system.
Financial Analysis and Budget	- Budget numbers and plan seem reasonable and clear. It would have been nice to compare individual school investment in the same technologies as compared to the Statewide plan.	- The savings/cost avoidance indicated seems logical and I believe is real. It would have been a good exercise to calculate the cost of provisioning the identified technologies for a single school and extrapolate cost to show potential savings of a Statewide approach as presented. - Staffing levels appear to be inadequate to support systems administration, maintenance and upgrades as well as extended hours support needed for online learning.	This proposal is based on the assumption that once the basic hardware and software is in place the centralized nature of the deployment will simplify system maintenance and upgrades compared to that required for a more distributed and differentiated deployment. The proposal anticipates a distributed administrative model in which the individual schools will assume a level of responsibility for direct teacher and student support as they adopt and deploy the eLearning technologies. Finally, it must be acknowledged that effective support and administration will require coordination, cooperation and collaboration on the part of many entities.

NITC 7-RD-01

State of Nebraska
Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Standards and Guidelines

NITC 7-RD-01 (Draft)

Title	Resource Document: Telecommunications Facilities and Services
Category	Network Architecture
Applicability	Applies to all state agencies, boards, and commissions, excluding higher education

1. Purpose

This resource document is intended to provide guidance to agencies on telecommunications facilities and services needed in an ordinary office setting and to provide a suggested allocation of responsibilities between a Lessor, Lessee, and Tenant Agency. Any such work in a state owned building should meet these minimum requirements.

2. Responsibilities of Lessor and Lessee (Tenant Agency)

2.1. Responsibilities of the Tenant Agency

The Tenant Agency will obtain all telecommunication services, except local cable-television or satellite-television services, from the Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO).

The Tenant Agency will pay the monthly charges for said telecommunication services.

The Tenant Agency will pay any charges for local cable-television or satellite-television services. This includes costs to install satellite-television receiving equipment and cabling.

The Tenant Agency will contact the OCIO should any of the items in this document not meet the needs of the agency.

2.2 Responsibilities of the Lessor

The Lessor should insure adequate entrance facilities are provided for the telecommunication services required by the Tenant Agency. This includes all necessary tie cables between the service provider's terminal and/or demarc blocks and all remote wiring-closets/consolidation-points used to attach services to the station cabling serving the telecommunication information outlets. Costs associated with the installation and/or upgrading of existing entrance facilities and/or tie cables should be incurred by the Lessor.

The Lessor shall provide, at a minimum, a telecommunications information outlet at each desk and/or workstation. Each telecommunications information outlet should consist of two modular jack connectors: one telephone (voice) jack and one computer (data) jack.

3. Telecommunications Facilities and Services - Recommended Requirements

3.1. Telecommunications Information Outlet Cabling Requirements

Each telephone cable shall be a solid copper, 24 AWG, 100 Ω balanced twisted-pair (UTP) Category 3 cable with four individually twisted-pairs, which meet or exceed the mechanical and transmission performance specifications as outlined in the most current ANSI TIA-568 Commercial Building Telecommunications Cabling Standard, as of the signing date of the lease agreement.

Each data cable shall be a solid copper, 23 or 24 AWG, 100 Ω balanced twisted-pair (UTP) Category 6 cable with four individually twisted-pairs, which meet or exceed the mechanical and transmission performance specifications as outlined in the most current ANSI TIA-568 Commercial Building Telecommunications Cabling Standard, as of the signing date of the lease

agreement.

3.2. Telecommunications Information Outlet Connector Requirements

Each voice outlet shall be an 8-pin modular, Category 3, unkeyed jack, using the USOC pin/pair assignment.

Each data outlet shall be an 8-pin modular, Category 6, unkeyed jack, using the T568B pin/pair assignment.

3.3. Telecommunications Cabling Installation Requirements

The Lessor shall provide a complete and working telecommunication distribution system. This system shall include, but is not limited to: all station, riser, aerial, and intra-campus cables as required; conduits, raceways, and all associated cable support hardware; telephone and data outlet connectors, face plates, and identification labels; termination blocks and brackets, patch panels and mounting brackets, distribution rings; all cable terminations and testing; and all associated appurtenances as required by the distribution system.

Each telephone and computer jack shall be terminated on separate cables, which shall be terminated on separate connecting blocks/panels at a common central location.

Installation, termination, and testing of telecommunications information outlet components shall be performed by qualified personnel, employed by a company whose primary business is providing telecommunication services. This does not include work normally performed by an electrical contractor.

All work shall be performed in accordance with the equipment manufacturer's requirements.

All cable terminations shall be performed at the respective terminal boards, equipment cabinets, and station outlets.

All station cabling shall be "home run" to appropriate distribution frame, block, or equipment cabinet. No splices will be allowed in these lines.

Distribution panels are not to be located in a plenum area or above accessible ceilings.

All cables installed above accessible ceilings shall be neatly bundled utilizing commercially available products and attached to appropriate supports. Cables installed randomly and disorderly will not be allowed.

All cables shall be installed in a fashion not to interfere with the general maintenance of other electrical/mechanical devices, as well as in a manner that other electrical/mechanical devices will not interfere with the operation of the cables intended application.

All installations shall conform to the most current ANSI TIA-568 Commercial Building Telecommunications Cabling Standard, as well as any associated technical systems bulletin, as of the signing date of the lease agreement.

Further information may be obtained by contacting the OCIO (Phone: 402-471-3851).

3.4. Telecommunications Information Outlet Testing Requirements

Each Voice and data cable link shall be tested and conform to the most current ANSI TIA-568 Commercial Building Telecommunications Cabling Standard, as of the signing date of the lease agreement. Testing shall be accomplished using level III or higher field testers.

3.5. Telecommunications Information Outlet Documentation Requirements

Each information outlet faceplate and closet termination point shall be labeled.

The Lessor shall provide a floor plan (paper copy and editable electronic copy) of the occupied space to the Tenant Agency. This floor plan shall indicate the following: outlet locations and labeling scheme; wiring closets and/or station-cabling concentration points; telephone rooms; data server rooms; and, if more than one wiring closet serves the occupied space(s), a visual representation shall indicate the floor area(s) being served by each closet.

The Tenant Agency shall maintain a current copy of the Lessor-provided floor plan, indicating any

moves, adds, or changes to the information outlets which occurred during the period of the lease. At the end of the lease term, the Tenant Agency shall provide the Lessor a copy of this updated and current floor plan.

3.6. Regulatory and Other Requirements

Wiring methods, conductor applications, and insulation materials shall meet all applicable provisions of the National Electrical Code and Federal Communications Commission Rules and Regulations as well as applicable State and Local Codes.

All new cables and wires installed shall be listed by Underwriters Laboratories, Inc.

All cables installed shall meet appropriate fire ratings.

4. Definitions

4.1. Demarc – (demarcation point). The physical point at which separation is made between the telecommunications service provider's cable facilities and those owned by the end user/building owner. The point in which the provider's service is handed off to the user's cable facilities and/or equipment. Multiple demarc locations in one physical structure are common. Tie cables which provide connectivity between entrance facilities and demarc locations are owned by the local service provider.

4.2. Entrance Facilities. An entrance to a building for both public and private network service cables (including antennas) including the entrance point at the building wall and continuing to the entrance room or space. Entrance facilities are often used to house electrical protection equipment and connecting hardware for the transition between outdoor and indoor cable. The Entrance Facility includes overvoltage protection (often referred to as a terminal) and connecting hardware for the transition between outdoor and indoor cable.

4.3. Home Run. Individual cable run installed from a central distribution point to termination point. Each cable run is a continuous length without a splice or intermediate point. Each cable run is a continuous length without a splice or intermediate termination point. Typically referred to as a "Star" topology.

4.4. Telecommunication Facilities. The aggregate of equipment used for various modes of transmission, such as digital data, audio signals, image and video signals. This equipment is provided by the local service provider and the Office of the Chief Information Officer.

4.5. Telecommunication Service. Any service provided by a telecommunication provider and/or by the Office of the Chief Information Officer.

4.6. Telecommunications Information Outlet. User connection facility provided in a Work Area as part of a Structured Cabling System.

4.7. Tie Cable. Cabling facilities used to connect two physical points together. Ex: multi-conductor cable used to extend services from an entrance room or space to a remote wiring closet or station-cabling cross-connect field. Riser cables, used to extend services between floors of a structure, are also considered tie cables. Tie cables can be copper or optical fiber in construction.

State of Nebraska
Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Standards and Guidelines

NITC 7-104 (Draft)

Title	Web Domain Name Standard
Category	Network Architecture
Applicability	Applies to all state agencies, boards, and commissions, excluding higher education

1. Standard

1.1. The official Nebraska government domain is nebraska.gov.

1.2. All public facing domains shall be registered as at least a third-level domain within the nebraska.gov domain. The third level domain name shall uniquely identify the state agency or service. In addition to nebraska.gov, the domain ne.gov may be registered as an alternate domain resolving to the corresponding nebraska.gov domain name.

1.3. All registered nebraska.gov domains shall adhere to all federal .gov domain registration requirements and guidelines.

1.4. Domains other than nebraska.gov may be purchased but cannot serve content or be publicly promoted.

1.5. Nonconforming domains in existence when this standard is adopted will be exempt from the requirements in Section 1.4 until December 31, 2014.

2. Purpose

The purpose of this standard is to provide for consistent domain names for state government websites.

3. References

3.1. Federal .GOV Domain Name Requirements and Guidelines: https://www.dotgov.gov/

AMENDMENT TO NITC 8-101 (Information Security Policy)

1. Section 8, Portable Devices, is amended to read:

Portable Devices

All portable computing devices (notebooks, USB flash drives, PDA's, laptops and mobile phones) and information must be secured to prevent compromise of confidentiality or integrity. No device may store or transmit sensitive information without suitable protective measures that are approved by the agency data owner(s).

Special care must be taken to ensure that information stored on the device is not compromised. Appropriate safeguards must be in place for the physical protection, access control, cryptographic technique, back up, virus protection, and properly connected to the State network. <u>All mobile devices must utilize the screen locking feature on their device when not in use and after a period of inactivity.</u>

Devices storing sensitive and/or critical information must not be left unattended and, where possible, must be physically locked away, or utilize special locks to secure the equipment.

Employees in the possession of portable devices must not check these devices in airline luggage systems. These devices must remain in the possession of the traveler as hand luggage unless restricted by Federal or State authorities.