

Illinois Century Network

Policy Committee Meeting Agenda

September 18, 2006
1:00 p.m.



ILLINOIS CENTURY NETWORK

MARCH 6, 2006 POLICY COMMITTEE MINUTES

Jay Carlson called the meeting to order.

Members present: Jay Carlson, Charter Communications; Todd Jorns, Illinois Community College Board; Scott Norton, Illinois State Board of Education; Bonnie Styles, Illinois State Museum; Lynn Murphy, Illinois Board of Higher Education; Anne Craig, Illinois State Library; Carolyn Brown Hodge, Office of the Lieutenant Governor; Mike Dickson, Western Illinois University; Tony Daniels, Central Management Services; Chet Olson, City of Rochelle.

Springfield guests: Rich Fetter, Central Management Services; Lori Sorenson, Central Management Services; Cindy Daniele, Central Management Services; Tom Oseland, Central Management Services; Ross Hodel, Illinois State University; Virginia McMillan; Kathleen Kelly; Kathleen Bloomberg, Illinois State Library; Alex Arechiga, Western Illinois University

Chicago guests: Beth O'Mahoney, Central Management Services

Announcements and Remarks

Jay thanked everyone for attending and confirmed that 10 of the 11 members were present and that constituted a quorum.

He started his remarks by saying that it is critical to sell the value of the ICN to ensure its continued success. Based on comments from the last meeting, it is clear that the ICN is going to face significant challenges in FY07. Some major issues include appropriations, the ability to sell value to the schools, and keeping larger institutions excited and engaged. He asked members to keep this in mind during the meeting and to realize the power members have to be ambassadors of the ICN to their constituents. It is very important for school districts and institutions that rely on the ICN to continue to have access.

Lori echoed Jay's comments. It is very important to keep Policy Committee members engaged in the ICN. The ICN needs members to serve as advocates. Later in the meeting there will be an update on the Advanced Engineering Task Force's effort to rewrite the vision of the ICN. The consultants who are working on the project will discuss how to engage the committee's support in that project and to share their progress.

Lori also mentioned that the ICN had a booth at the recent Illinois Technology Conference for Educators (ILTCE). The ICN tries to exhibit at different K-12 technology conferences and those

for other constituent groups. Due to limited resources, the ICN exhibits mainly at statewide conferences. If there any upcoming events members would like the ICN to exhibit, let Lori know and it can be added to the schedule.

Minutes

Jay announced that the first item on the agenda is the review and approval of the minutes from the December 7, 2005 meeting. He asked if there were any changes. Hearing none he asked for a motion to approve the minutes.

Motion: Bonnie Styles moved; Todd Jorns seconded, that the minutes be approved. Motion carried.

Budget Report

Lori presented the budget item. The report expenditures and revenues are on track based on projections. E-rate funding continues to come in based on Tom Oseland's effort to pursue outstanding money. Tom will provide a more detailed report during the next agenda item. There is just over \$1 million in E-rate funds yet to be received this fiscal year.

Cost recovery funds are projected to reach the \$2.5 million typically received each fiscal year. Expenditures, the telecommunications item, is at \$10 million so far. This is the line item where capital purchases are made at the end of the fiscal year. The State does not have a capital budget, so recapitalization of hardware is based on what funding is available at the end of the year as a result of cost recovery and e-rate funds. Some purchases already have been made with the renewal of software licenses and purchases of generators for POP sites.

Jay asked if there were any concerns with current expenditure pressures from OMB. Lori responded that with the current fiscal year-end budget there are no surprises. Expenditures should match revenues. Next fiscal year the ICN is anticipating an \$18.6 million budget appropriation, but the final budget has not been approved yet. That is down 4% from the current fiscal year.

The ICN does not expect to receive any e-rate money next year based on the previous applications that were denied. E-rate has been about \$2.5 million of the budget, so next year that could add some budget pressure. Paul Romiti and Cindi Hitchcock in the fiscal area are aware and are planning accordingly. The revenue from the addition of state agencies onto the network should help to protect the operations of the network in the next fiscal year.

E-rate Update

Tom Oseland gave the E-rate update. The E-rate figure as of January 31st, \$1,469,000, is the same as the last meeting; however there is approved funding from Year 4 totaling \$1,097,244 that should be arriving anytime now.

The Year 9 application was recently submitted. The total funds applied for, \$2,763,432, is a significant decrease from years past. This is due to additional savings on network costs and also the increase in state agency traffic, which is not eligible for reimbursement. The Year 7 and 8 funding applications are still under appeal with the FCC and there is a chance those will be remanded back to USAC and the SLD for review.

Lori asked Tom to discuss the recent rule change proposals. Tom replied that after the last Policy Committee meeting, the Letter of Agency (LOA) issue came to light with the FCC. The FCC decided that the SLD and USAC have overstepped their authority to make policy in the way they defined this document. Going forward the process for reviewing applications has been changed. USAC will no longer be able to make decisions in such a way that caused our denial; however, they are unable to reverse the previous denial under appeal with the FCC. Until the FCC remands the applications back to them, the denial is a moot point. The document for Year 9 and beyond is with them and there shouldn't be any more issues with the LOA.

Lori said the ICN is encouraged by recent developments. Initially all indications were that the denials were going to stand and the money would be lost. Based on the actions that have occurred since the last meeting, it is looking much more favorable. They have put into written rules that the language used in the Letter of Agency is acceptable. We are encouraged that the FCC will lead us in a direction resulting in the ICN receiving the money. The issue is that the FCC has two years or more to take action. Tom added that there has been an effort to fast track the appeals, but there have not been any visible results yet.

Jay asked if the Year 4 funding under appeal was also in jeopardy. Tom responded that he was not as familiar with the issues relating to Year 4, but he has researched it and it is likely the funding will not come through.

Lori explained that the Year 4 application was a separate situation than Year 7 and 8. At the time that the application was submitted, the State master contract for network services was scheduled to expire during the upcoming fiscal year. When filing the application, an educated guess was as to what actions would take place regarding the contract. The application was filed with the intention that six months of service would be covered under that contract and the remaining six, once that contract expired, would revert to tariff due to transition language in the contract. CMS ended up renewing the contract, so USAC approved the first six months of services. The remaining six months filed under the tariff were rejected.

Jay asked Tom if there were any other changes planned for the program. Tom replied that he didn't think so. Overall, the E-rate environment is becoming more applicant-friendly again. The SLD and USAC are showing more leeway on how the rules are viewed and in the appeals process.

Jay asked if any of the changes were the result of pressures from senators and state constituencies. Lori responded that she thought it made a difference. In the past, USAC and SLD were more cooperative and worked with the applicant to make sure they understood the rules. There was more guidance and assistance. After all of the news headlines about fraud and abuse with the E-rate program surfaced, there was a backlash from Congress and USAC became

very rigid. Instead of addressing the fraud and abuse, they took the strictest interpretation of a rule and expected everyone to follow. It wasn't necessarily that people were breaking the rules it was all about interpretation. As a result, a lot of schools and several large state networks who have always run clean audits and applications ended up getting denied. The Illinois congressional delegation got involved and made some contacts and Missouri did the same. The recent news is encouraging and with the amount of money at stake it is well worth seeing it through.

Advanced Engineering Task Force Update- Membership

Lori requested that the AET membership update be discussed before the Next Century Network item. Jay agreed.

Lori referenced pages 25-27 discussing the AET membership. The Policy Committee determines the membership of the Advanced Engineering Task Force and in the past the Committee has identified individuals from their respective constituency groups to serve for one, two, or three year terms. The AET meets four times a year and members tend to be technical directors and hands-on staff. The membership terms coincide with the fiscal year so the item is an update on members whose terms are expiring at the end of FY06, individuals who have been unable to commit the time to attend at least two of the meetings, as well as a few resignations due to job changes.

On Page 26, the first bulleted item identifies individuals whose terms are expiring at the end of this fiscal year. Lori indicated that she would send an updated AET member attendance sheet after the meeting.

Lori identified each member whose term was expiring. Charlie Campbell has been consistently participating in the meetings; either himself or through a delegate. Jim Dispensa from Chicago Public Schools has not attended in the last three years. Last year, a decision was made for those who are not attending to extend them one more year. Letters were sent and phone calls were made to encourage them to participate.

Jim Flanagan participates on a regular basis. Abe Loveless has left the Area 5 Learning Technology Center, but he has been unable to participate during the last two years. Joel Mambretti has been participating this past year. Steve Philbrick participates on a regular basis. Jessica Theodor was a new appointment this year and she has been participating. Gary Wenger has been participating as chair for the past three years. He is retiring from the College of DuPage in December and this is his last term on the AET. He will continue to serve through the summer in order to complete the vision document. There will need to be a replacement for him as well as a new chair. Linda Winkler with Argonne has not participated.

For the next group of members, Diann Jabush and Jim Peterson's terms are not expiring; however, they have been unable to participate. Diann Jabush represented the Technology Subcommittee for the Community College President's Council. She recommended that membership on the AET belong to the person who holds that position as opposed to a named individual. She feels it is important that the chair or their delegate of that committee participate in the AET.

The final two members are Ken Spelke and T.J. Lusher, who have had changes in their jobs leaving them unable to continue to participate in the AET.

At this time membership is not an action item, however the Committee needs to consider how the candidates for the open positions would be brought forth for confirmation. Before the next meeting, candidates will need to be nominated and notified to confirm their interest in serving on the committee. Lori asked members for their thoughts on how to proceed.

Jay confirmed that there were seven vacancies on the task force at the end of FY06. Lori said that it was actually eight.

Jay asked if the Policy Committee is compelled to eliminate members that do not meet the attendance requirement or if it is discretionary. Lori said that it is discretionary, but the requirement to attend a minimum of two meetings was set forth by the Policy Committee. Two meetings a year is less than half of a year's participation in the Committee. The past year, members have been encouraged to send a delegate if they are unable to attend. Several members have taken advantage of this option and it has worked out well.

Carolyn asked if videoconferencing is offered for the meetings. Lori replied that video is not utilized. This is not because the group does not want to use technology, but because the meetings take place only three to four times a year and it is a four-hour meeting with a working lunch. The meetings can be very interactive and often members will use their laptops to show network diagrams or demonstrate new programs. The meetings also incorporate brainstorming and working sessions that can be difficult to achieve over video. Some new members have requested video, but after attending a few meetings they realize the importance of the face-to-face dialogue.

Anne asked if members are also identified by geographic region as well as constituent groups. Lori responded that geography is taken into consideration. There are individuals from all areas of the state on the committee.

Anne followed up by asking where the meetings are held. Lori replied that they are held in Bloomington, which is a midway point and seems to work well for members. The ICN reimburses for travel and also lodging for those who come the night before. At the beginning of every fiscal year, the membership decides meeting location, dates, and the format for meeting.

Lynn asked if the AET members have been asked to nominate colleagues who might be able to fill some of the available spots. Lori responded that they have not done this yet. She wanted to get feedback from the Policy Committee first.

Anne asked about the optimum number of representatives. The matrix has 6 slots allotted for each constituent group. Lori replied that four from each group is optimal. There have never been any hard and fast rules as to a minimum or maximum from a single constituent group. The Committee has also never set a member limit. There are normally 17 to 20 members in attendance at any given meeting. This is a good size and if the group gets much larger there is a chance that some of the dialogue and discussion could be lost.

Chet asked if there is the option to renew the terms of some of the members or if all new people are required. Lori replied that terms can be renewed and it is up to the Policy Committee to make that decision. Several of the members whose terms are expiring are regular attendees who are interested in serving again.

Carolyn asked which members on the list would be interested in renewing their terms. Lori responded that Charlie Campbell, Jim Flanagan, Joel Mambretti, and Steve Philbrick have all expressed interest in continuing to serve on the task force. Jessica Theodor also might.

Bonnie said that Jessica is leaving the Illinois State Museum, but they can recommend another person to serve on the task force.

Lori stated that existing AET members can be asked to recommend individuals they think might be good representatives. Often they know of people that are early adopters of technology and vocal about needs, emerging technologies and key issues that need to be addressed. These suggestions can be passed on to the appropriate Policy Committee member representing their constituency to get their thoughts before presenting a slate for approval.

Anne asked if it would be appropriate to email Lori the names or if she wanted them now. Lori said email would be fine. Members could email her recommendations prior to the next meeting, and also indicate whether she needs to reach out to them about the Committee.

Carolyn asked if there was a mission statement for the AET that could be used in recruiting members. Lori replied that there is a mission statement and that she would have it sent out. Beth reminded members that the ICN web site has all of the AET's previous reports, a membership list and the mission. The link to the AET is on the home page. Lori said she would send out the link to members along with last year's report in which they restated their mission and focus and also listed their top issues and priorities for this year.

Lynn stated that she thought it would be a good idea to expand the pool of nominees, but also remind them that it is still a selection process. Just because a person is nominated it does not mean they are automatically on the task force. Lori agreed. Some of the candidates last year were not approved because of balancing geographic areas and numbers.

Jay asked about the protocol to get a slate of candidates in advance of the next meeting. Lori responded that the slate of candidates can be provided by mid-May and those individuals will be contacted to verify their interest. The final list will be brought forward at the next meeting.

Jay asked members to forward their nominations to Lori. He also requested to place on the agenda whether or not to terminate the positions held by Diann and Jim Peterson. Lori agreed.

Jay said that he thinks it is important when there is a transition situation where people have participated and represented their institution well to request that institution to try to find candidates for replacement. He gave the example of Gary Wenger. The College of DuPage

obviously has been a friendly institution that allows Gary to participate and it makes sense to give them an opportunity to put forward another candidate to represent them.

Lori said that she would add that issue to the next agenda. She also brought up the position of AET chair. With Gary's pending resignation, someone will need to be identified to serve as chair. Lori indicated that she asked Gary for recommendations for his successor and he nominated Jim Flanagan from Maine Township. Jim has been an active member of this Committee for many years. He is currently serving as co-chair with Gary on the sub-committee working on the vision rewrite. Jim has not been contacted yet to see if he would be interested.

Jay asked if Gary could write a letter of recommendation. Gary knows the committee and could provide a strong endorsement for the right candidate. Lori said she would ask Gary to provide a recommendation for the next meeting.

Before moving onto the next item Lori asked if the group wanted her to ask current members to submit nominations for new members. Carolyn agreed and said the more people to choose from the better. The rest of the group also agreed.

Jay also reminded Lori to reach out to those institutions that have folks who might be dropped so representation is not lost. There might be others at the institution who could participate. Lori agreed.

Advanced Engineering Task Force Update- Illinois: The Next Century Network

Lori reviewed the initiative by the AET to update the original vision document that was used to create and fund the Illinois Century Network. The original document was written in 1997 with funding procured in the FY00 budget. Given the age and the changing needs of constituents, the Committee had long been discussing the need to revisit the vision.

There seems to be a real need to educate stakeholders in Illinois about what the Illinois Century Network is and why it is needed. When the network first began, success was measured in how many T1's were connected. Since then, the ICN has made significant progress in connecting libraries and K-12 schools with T1's. In-roads have also been made in connecting higher education institutions with DS3s. Municipalities and hospitals have joined and now state agencies have been added to the mix. The question now is what the future of the network, the technology and constituents holds.

The Vision Committee revisited the original vision document with the goal of coming back with a new white paper. This is more than a vision. A vision is usually a few sentences and this is a 13-14 page document that will look at how far the ICN has come since the original vision. The tagline for the report is "Illinois, the Next Century Network." The title is trying to imply "What is next," "Where do we need to set the goals," and "How will we measure our successes along the way."

To assist the group in collecting the information, outside consultants have been engaged in a limited scope. They will organize the effort of conducting interviews and focus groups to get

feedback from constituents. The consultants are in attendance to further discuss the project and answer questions. The AET is working through Mike Dickson's group at Western Illinois University, the Center for the Application of Information Technologies.

The consultants working on the project are Ross Hodel, former Deputy Director with the Illinois Board of Higher Education, Virginia McMillan, former Deputy Director of the Illinois Community College Board and Kathleen Kelley, former Deputy Director with the Board of Higher Education. Ross was involved with the creation of the original vision.

Kathleen thanked the group for their time and distributed a handout with the most recent project plan. She said that they were there to get the Policy Committee's guidance and secondly to ask for assistance. The project will unfold in two phases. The first phase is the collection of information. This involves meeting with constituents in focus groups and perhaps selected interviews in the next two months.

Carolyn interjected that CMS Director Campbell recently presented her with a list of schools that were not connected to the ICN and asked her to have two Paul Simon fellows call to find out why they weren't connected to the ICN. The results are preliminary, but the information could be shared. One of the things repeated over and over again is that cost is the main reason schools are not able to take advantage of what the ICN offers. She emphasized the need for the ICN to do a better job of selling what they offer above and beyond what a local provider gives them. Constituents don't see the value of the other benefits.

Lori agreed. The AET has discussed extensively the need to differentiate between the ICN and commercial providers and also emphasize the content that is available on the ICN. Previously, constituents were primarily using the ICN for Internet and they were taking advantage of the reliability and the technical support. Now content is being developed and offered as well.

Mike Dickson added that one thing that the ICN can do is to reach out to constituents and find out what they can do that that commercial providers will not. The ICN was always intended to be a network for constituents and therefore should be a reflection of their needs. There are services that could be provided to make the constituent's jobs easier and commercial providers are not going to bother with.

Jay asked if there was a way to find out what schools are getting if they think the ICN is too costly. Maybe there is a possibility of offering different levels of service for price sensitive constituents. Rather than losing constituents to other providers, this could be another alternative.

Mike added that that Jim Flanagan has suggested attaching a cost to the ICN. That is difficult to do, but when people pay for something they perceive value in it. They know when they are paying for filtering or other services, but not for their bandwidth or support. It would be helpful to the schools to know what they are really getting. In some cases no matter what the ICN does, they will not join. Some school districts get free local access. It is hard to beat free.

Carolyn noted that a number of the schools indicated that they received their service for free. Mike replied that the ICN might still be able to provide them certain services on top of that. That is something else to look at as well.

Carolyn said that approximately a third of the districts are not connected. Lori explained that at its peak the ICN connected 85% of the school districts. Over the last couple years, that number has decreased.

Jay asked what the ICN could do for those districts receiving their Internet service for free. They are losing out on shared content. He asked if there were any plans to include a section on the virtual hosting of content in the report.

Lori mentioned that the Illinois Channel might have some content the ICN could offer. The schools would get access to a news stream. The ICN has had conversations and is open to working with them, but they have struggled to find funding. If they are archiving any of their content, it could be hosted on a server and made available.

Jay said that there has to be a whole host of services available. It may make sense to look to the larger colleges and universities to provide hosting services for smaller school districts using the ICN network as transport. He used the example that the school district where he lives is in desperate need of web hosting and they are paying huge amounts to connect to their hosting provider. The hosting prices are astronomical because they are not getting economies of scale.

Mike said that this is something that has been discussed at the AET level. Looking into the future, there are a lot of plans by the State Board of Education as far as data and electronic connections to schools and where some of those services might reside. These will need to be taken into consideration with the planning for the next generation of the ICN.

Scott stated that Mike was correct that ISBE has relied on the ICN to provide the backbone and local access to the Internet for schools accessing their services. He expressed interest in hearing more about the Lt. Governor's I-Connect initiative. Part of that bill includes money to upgrade infrastructure at the selected schools. Their plans don't go beyond delivering programs through the Internet at this time. Mike said that it is not too early to start thinking about what those other possibilities might be.

Scott said that he has had discussions with people in the districts and they all have to procure filtering, virus protection, and etc. Those value-added services might be something that the ICN could provide for them as part of the connection. Hosting might also be an attractive offering.

Mike said that when you read the original vision: New Dimensions for Education in Illinois the goal was a T-1 to every school. At that time a T-1 was really quick. Now, even though constituents are more efficient with that bandwidth, they need more. Many schools have hit that allocation of a T1 and they are stuck. Maybe it is time for the Network to set a higher standard for last mile of connectivity. The standard 1.5 MB allocation needs to be examined. That was always an artificial number because it didn't make any sense to meter it any less and that

happened to be the increment that the phone companies delivered. It wasn't really reflective of the activity going on in the schools.

There is a need for the network to reinvent itself. In education there is constant talk of rethinking the way things are done. It is time to re-evaluate and rethink the Network, what it means to be part of the Network, and what services and features the schools want. At a time when the Internet is more and more important, this is not the time for the ICN to disappear or lose its vision.

Jay echoed what Mike said. The ICN needs to step back and look at what is being brought to the table. He mentioned several projects at universities and the work coming from the Lieutenant Governor's office in its pursuit of tackling the digital divide. Jay asked Lori about the status of School to Home and if it had been added to the list of services provided to constituents.

Lori indicated that School to Home has had very little interest. It was her understanding that the main reason was that schools saw it as one piece of the puzzle and they are looking for more of a total solution for their school management, records, and data needs. This was one of the concerns when the project began. It sounded like a great deliverable, but it wasn't solving the big picture. School to Home offered the grade book and attendance piece, but records management is a whole bigger piece. While School to Home is inter-operable with existing school administration packages, many schools want a single solution from one vendor. Their technical resources are strapped and they want an all-in-one system that is easy to manage. In many cases they are looking for hosted-type services where a vendor manages the entire application.

Mike said that his group gets at least one request a month for hosted services and unless there are economies of scale, it is not cost effective. This could be something that the ICN could do and probably be very effective at it.

Jay asked Lori and Mike what they see as the next steps for the Policy Committee. Mike responded that the first thing is to take a hard, close look at the constituency, both those that are part of the ICN and those that are not. Another step is to look at what others are doing around the United States, both in terms of services and in terms of funding levels. This will lead the ICN to where it needs to be.

The timing is right for this for a lot of reasons. In the past the ICN mainly focused on K-12, higher education, and libraries. There has been a very strong movement over the last year or so in Illinois with Community Technology Centers. That is a natural constituency group that the ICN hasn't touched upon. Municipalities are another. There are plenty of areas of growth and opportunity, but it is providing the right services, rather than dictating what the services are. The constituency needs to dictate what they need and the ICN needs to be agile and flexible enough to embrace ideas and not be dismissive.

Todd added that ICCB has a Course Management System Task Force made up of universities and community colleges. One of the ideas floating around is whether the ICN could host either a Blackboard or WebCT server for smaller schools and community colleges in particular, that can't afford it. A university could host it, but the ICN was also mentioned.

Mike pointed out that you no longer have to choose between Blackboard or WebCT since they are one company now. The ICN is a natural for hosting because of the distributed model that is already in place with facilities and hosting.

Lori said that the ICN has received these types of requests from the hospitals. She has had several meetings with Brian Foster and his staff on tele-health initiatives. There is certainly the need to host or exchange content for them.

Mike mentioned that there is a large pool of potential constituents to mine that includes hospitals, municipalities, and etc. In the future the ICN may become much more diverse and that is a good thing.

Jay asked what support is needed from the Policy Committee. Mike replied that the consultants will be contacting most of the members in some way to discuss the needs of their constituencies.

Ross stated that the one thing that they really need from each of the Policy Committee members is the names of four or five people to serve on the planning leadership team. Broad leadership is needed from around the state: school superintendents, community college presidents, museum directors, head librarians, and etc. It is important to get their buy-in on the report and its findings. All of the people submitted will not be chosen for the team, but we want to select geographic balance and put together a solid committee, to help steer this forward.

Jay asked about municipality representation. Ross said they will be involved.

Ross also mentioned the School to Home Communication Study that he worked on with the ICN a couple of years ago. Within the last couple of weeks, the State of Kentucky contacted them and asked for background materials on the study, the surveys, and how the planning was done. The governor's office in Kentucky is mounting a very similar campaign and is calling it, "No Child Left Offline."

Carolyn said she attended the conference in Kentucky where the campaign was unveiled. Part of the initiative is to provide students with computers. That is what gave the Lieutenant Governor the incentive to go forward with his I-Connect Program.

Ross explained that they have been in contact with other states. California is using a very similar survey. It is interesting to look back nine years and see the changes that have taken place. There is a new generation of activity on the planning front and it is wise and visionary to move forward with the strategic plan.

Kathleen reiterated that the cooperation and support of the Policy Committee is critical in the success of the project. You know the people that we need to be talking with.

Carolyn said she would like to revisit the hospitals part as it applies to tele-health. In the southern part of Illinois many residents have to travel to other states in order to get medical care. Nine states have already passed a law that allows doctors in other states, as long as they are in good standing and carry a license in that state, to be used for tele-health. Right now doctors

across state borders cannot use tele-health unless they have a standing license in Illinois. Eventually there will be Federal legislation that will address this, but that may take time. Legislation brought forth so far has received opposition from the medical groups.

Once the Federal law does pass, Illinois will probably come out better than other states because of the number of specialists in the Chicago area. Illinois is not keeping up with the possibilities of tele-health. Mike agreed and he believes it is just a matter of time until this is passed on a Federal level.

Jay asked why Illinois has not been more progressive in adopting legislation since there is so much to gain. Carolyn responded that the issue is fairly new. Technology has changed so fast and nobody is moving forward. She indicated that they would push again for the legislation next year if the administration remains in office. It is a serious issue for rural areas.

Mike added that the big issue is medical liability. As laws become more similar among the states, some of those issues may break down. Once Illinois figures out that they can be a winner in this, the medical association will likely come to the same conclusions. This is a bill that was a little bit ahead of its time.

Jay thanked Mike for his insight into the issue.

Lori reminded members to email her the names of four to five individuals to serve on the leadership committee. The individuals should be executives or leaders and the committee will be respectful of their time. The AET sub-committee is identifying individuals to participate in the focus groups.

Jay had a suggestion as the meeting draws to a close. He has been thinking about what the focus of the Policy Committee should be going forward. A lot of changes have occurred in the last few years with the ICN as it has transformed from a stand-alone entity to a part of CMS. The Policy Committee has also changed. He would like to propose for the next meeting to come up with a common vision. Not the vision that the Advanced Engineering Task Force is working on, but a vision for the Board and what the focus should be for the next fiscal year. From conversation and debate today, it really needs to be focused on reinvention and finding a way to continue to bring value to the constituency and more importantly expand participation.

Jay proposed that for the next board meeting each member prepare a short, concise vision statement of who we see as our customers, where we need to provide solutions for those customers, and set an expectation that we are going to re-invent ourselves. He reiterated that the group needs to get away from the discussion of the Network. There is a short window, probably 12 to 18 months to make changes before it is too late.

Mike agreed. The Board needs to look beyond what has been done in the past and embrace change. In the end, it is all about serving the constituents and helping them realize the potential. This has been brewing for the last year, but getting the Committee involved at all levels is crucial.

Jay proposed an agenda item for the next Board meeting about the need to lead the re-invention of the ICN. Each of the Board members should come with their ideas. These recommendations can be boiled down to a concise vision to rally around and take back to constituents. Jay asked Lori what has been done in the past as far as setting a formal course for the next fiscal year.

Lori responded that the course has been fairly loose and mostly network focused. This would be a good next step for the ICN. As stated previously, the Network itself is stable and in an operating mode. This is a great opportunity for the Policy Committee to focus on being more strategic and visionary.

Jay said that the vision could be a standing agenda item for each meeting. The actions from each meeting could be summarized and distributed to the Governor, the Lieutenant Governor and legislators to keep the ICN in front of them and in their consciousness.

Ross commented that they would be doing a lot of the same things in the focus groups with constituencies and also with the Planning Committee and Advanced Engineering Taskforce. He offered to report at the next meeting on their activities so that everyone stays on the same page.

He had suggested four questions the group could focus on.

1. Is your main emphasis going to be lowest cost, i.e. providing reasonable service at the lowest possible cost?
2. Is it going to provide cutting edge research networks at all schools and universities even U of I and others, leading edge networks needing the highest bandwidth possible?
3. Is it going to be user-demand driven so whomever out there needs something from the Network, is that what is going to drive your future?
4. Is it equity to make sure that the smallest schools in Illinois get the same services that the University of Illinois Chicago does?

Jay said that there is a need to take it one step further and abandon the concept that this Policy Board is about a Network. It should be less about the Network and more about information exchange. The Network is just a tool, an enabler. There is the opportunity to detach from that physical layer discussion and get into more information content exchange.

There were no further comments so Jay asked Lori to set up a formal discussion for the next Board meeting on the process and next steps in setting a plan for FY07.

Meeting Schedule

Lori stated that the next meeting is currently scheduled for June 21. Jay has requested that the standard meeting time be revisited.

Jay stated that he is 200% committed to making sure the ICN provides for and continues to grow. He proposed moving the meetings from Wednesday to Friday or Monday so that he could insure that he would be able to attend in person or via videoconferencing. On dates where meetings

would fall on a Monday holiday, the next logical date would be that Tuesday. He asked if there was any resistance or concerns with moving the meeting.

Carolyn said that she has weekly staff meetings on Monday mornings and would prefer not to miss them unless no other suitable time can be found.

Jay reiterated that if the consensus is to keep the meetings where they are at he will work with it, but he wants to make sure that any new date and time works for everyone. He asked about the possibility of Monday afternoon and asked everyone at the table to give their opinion.

Todd said he was flexible.

Anne said she would prefer either Monday afternoon or Friday because occasionally there are Monday morning staff meetings with managers.

Chet said Mondays and Fridays are fine with him.

Scott and Bonnie both said that either time was fine.

Jay asked for a motion for the meetings to be moved to the third Monday of the month.

Motion: Carolyn Brown Hodge moved; Mike Dickson seconded that future meetings be held on the third Monday of the month (with the exception of holidays) from 1:00 – 3:00 pm. Motion carried

Jay thanked the group for agreeing to the change. The Monday afternoon time will work out well for those traveling and hopefully will help with attendance.

Lori stated that the next meeting would be Monday June 19, 2006 from 1:00 – 3:00 pm.

Closing

Jay ended the meeting by saying he was excited and very pleased to have this group as peers on what he thinks is a very important Policy Board. The next meeting promises to be real engaging. Everyone will be able to look back and say that they were part of taking the ICN to the next level. He asked for any comments from members before adjourning.

Carolyn thanked Jay for his leadership and said he was doing a great job.

Jay said he appreciated the compliment. The ICN has a strong presence and phenomenal staff. The people managing the network really make it possible for us be focused on making the network so much more. This year is going to be a huge opportunity. It is time to get excited and make it happen. There were no other comments so Jay asked for a motion to adjourn.

Motion: Mike Dickson moved; Chet Olson seconded that the meeting adjourn. Motion carried.

ILLINOIS CENTURY NETWORK

BUDGET UPDATE

Submitted for: Information

Summary: This item provides a final (unaudited) update of the fiscal year 2006 budget.

Action Requested: None.

ILLINOIS CENTURY NETWORK

BUDGET UPDATE
FISCAL YEAR 2006 BUDGET UPDATE – FINAL (UNAUDITED)
E-RATE PROGRAM UPDATE

This item presents the Policy Committee with a fiscal year 2006 update and an E-rate program update.

FY06 revenues were above projections. The 2% Reserve of the General Revenue Fund (GRF) appropriation (\$ 387,876) was released, allowing us to procure additional critical equipment upgrades. E-Rate receipts were related to Funding Years 4, 5 and 6. As noted in the E-Rate update, Funding Years 7 & 8 remain under appeal. Cost recovery receipts were almost \$241,000 higher than originally anticipated for FY06.

Expenditures for FY06 were also on target. Reduced telecommunication costs due to lower negotiated rates and the network consolidation allowed us to use less of the ICN/Communications Revolving Fund (CRF) appropriation than projected when the budget was created. The Personnel line (Actual) reflects that we did not reach the fully funded headcount of 66 staff persons during FY06 (please note that the Proposed Personnel line was decreased earlier in the year). As stated in a prior report, the Travel line was reduced, as travel reimbursements were shifted to the CMS CRF fund in FY06.

The FY07 GRF appropriation is \$ 18,152,600. Pursuant to Public Act 094-0798/Section 55, the GRF lump sum appropriation will be deposited into the Communications Revolving Fund for the purpose of Education Technology. We are on a schedule of moving \$3 million each month from July through December 2006. An additional \$1,000,000 was appropriated from the General Revenue Fund to CMS for costs associated with a pilot program to increase access to broadband services in rural areas. No E-rate dollars have been projected to be received in FY07.

Due to the deposit of GRF monies into the CRF, and as we move towards the integration of all processes into a single Communications Fund, financial and budget reporting will appear in a different format in FY07. We are in the process of refining the format so that it will continue to provide the Policy Committee with relevant and timely information.

ILLINOIS CENTURY NETWORK

Fiscal Year 2006

August 31, 2006

FINAL

Unaudited

REVENUE SOURCES:	Proposed	Actual at August 31, 2006
ICN GRF Appropriation:	19,393,800	19,393,800
Less Reserve:	-387,876	-0-
ICN CRF Appropriation:	11,787,000	11,787,000
E-Rate Reimbursement:	2,566,550	2,566,550
Cost Recovery Funds:	2,500,000	2,740,627
TOTAL REVENUE:	35,859,474	36,487,977
EXPENDITURES:		
Personnel (Salary & FICA):	3,397,196	3,391,471
Personnel (Retirement):	57,204	57,365
Facilities Management Payment:	222,577	215,087
Contractual:	1,139,383	1,018,906
Travel:	7,146	7,146
Commodities:	33,000	36,342
Printing:	5,000	1,249
Equipment:	140,182	149,611
EDP Equipment:	86,279	71,853
Telecommunications:	26,001,833	24,277,465
Operation of Auto:	5,000	3,125
Prompt Payment Interest:	59,000	50,702
Permanent Improvements:	-0-	-0-
Refunds:	27,000	25,897
TOTAL EXPENDITURES:	31,180,800	29,306,219

ILLINOIS CENTURY NETWORK

E-RATE UPDATE

Submitted for: Information

Summary: This item provides an update regarding the E-rate program.

Action Requested: None

ILLINOIS CENTURY NETWORK

E-RATE UPDATE

As of August 31, 2006, the Illinois Century Network/CMS has received E-Rate funds totaling \$2,566,550 during fiscal year 2006. This figure represents a combination of funds received from Program Years 4, 5 and 6.

There is currently no *approved* funding that has not yet been received. The probability of receiving the Year 4 Funds “under appeal” is minimal.

This table summarizes the most recent E-Rate activity:

E-Rate Activity

Program Year	Received	Approved – Not yet received	Applied for Not yet approved	Under Appeal
Year 3 (2000)	\$2,137,765	-0-	-0-	N/A
Year 4 (2001)	\$2,179,728	-0-	-0-	\$2,274,232
Year 5 (2002)	\$4,996,227	-0-	-0-	N/A
Year 6 (2003)	\$4,644,171	-0-	-0-	N/A
Year 7 (2004)	-0-	N/A	-0-	\$5,474,865 ¹
Year 8 (2005)	-0-	N/A	-0-	\$ 7,464,940 ²
Year 9 (2006)	-0-	N/A	\$2,563,432	N/A
Totals	\$13,957,891	-0-	\$2,563,432	\$15,214,037

¹ This funding request denial remains under appeal with the FCC. A decision by USAC, made after the FCC determined that USAC had misinterpreted rules surrounding required content of the Letter of Agency, has led to the status of the Year 8 funding request appeal to change. See note #2.

² After the FCC’s determination noted above, the ICN received an “Administrator’s Notification of Reconsideration Letter” from USAC. The letter states that Year 8 funding request denials would enter a re-evaluation process to determine if the E-rate program rules were administered appropriately. Once this process is complete, a decision will be made regarding the Year 8 funding requests. Due to internal USAC procedures, the Year 7 denial is not affected by the reconsideration even though the basis for denial is identical.

As previously reported, the E-rate Funding Year 9 application was filed on February 15th, 2006. The total funding request for telecommunication and Internet access services is \$2,563,431.88. This is a significant decrease from prior funding years. This decrease can be attributed almost entirely to greatly reduced costs across the network, as well as the integration of state agency traffic (which lowered ICN's E-rate eligible bandwidth percentage). This application remains at the initial review status.

Recent FCC appeal decisions indicate that the administration of the E-rate program may begin to move in a more applicant-friendly direction. During the last two weeks of May 2006, two major FCC appeal decisions were released, remanding over 200 applications back to USAC for further review. In addition, the FCC ordered USAC to implement changes in their review process that will result in fewer denials by giving applicants the opportunity to correct minor filing errors. They were also instructed to develop a more targeted outreach program to educate applicants on the various application process requirements to help reduce these types of errors.

Shortly after, the FCC rendered decisions on appeals in favor of two large state networks (North Dakota and South Carolina) similar to the ICN. Citing reasons of funding denials causing undue hardship to a large number of applicants or connected entities, the FCC demonstrated leniency in determining that by granting these appeals the public interest will be served. It is very likely that the ICN funding denials currently under appeal will be included in upcoming FCC appeal decisions that favor the applicant. The ICN applications will then be sent back to USAC for completion of the review process.

ILLINOIS CENTURY NETWORK

**ADVANCED ENGINEERING TASKFORCE:
MEMBERSHIP APPOINTMENTS**

Submitted for: Action

Summary: This item seeks confirmation of new members, the renewal of those appointments that expire in 2006 and the removal of members who have not met the attendance requirements.

Action Requested: That the Policy Committee approves the confirmation of new members, renewal of those appointments that expire in 2006 and the removal of members who have not met the attendance requirements.

Recommended Motions: *The Policy Committee approves the confirmation of the new members, renewal of those appointments that expire in 2006 and the removal of members who have not met the attendance requirement.*

The Policy Committee appoints Jim Flanagan to a 2 year term as chair of the Advanced Engineering Taskforce.

ILLINOIS CENTURY NETWORK

**ADVANCED ENGINEERING TASKFORCE:
MEMBERSHIP APPOINTMENTS**

During the past year, four members resigned from the Advanced Engineering Taskforce (AET). TJ Lusher resigned from the committee due to a change in her position that did not allow her to continue to participate with the group. Abe Loveless left the Learning Technology Center 5 and resigned from the group. Gary Wenger, who has served as chair for the past 3 years, is retiring from the College of DuPage. Steve Philbrick left his position at the City of Chicago and moved out of state.

The graph on the next page shows a representation of the current AET membership as of the end of this fiscal year.

The AET is seeking re-confirmation of the following AET members whose terms expire in 2006. The new three year terms would extend through 2009.

- Jim Flanagan, Maine Township Schools
- Joel Mambretti, Northwestern University
- IL State Museum Representative to be named

The following members have terms that are expiring. Chicago Public Schools has identified two possible candidates to serve on the AET if it is the desire of the Policy Committee.. Staff recommends appointing one position for a representative of Chicago Public Schools and no action on the expiring term for Linda Winkler.

- Jim Dispensa, Chicago Public Schools to be replaced with an alternative representative of Chicago Public Schools
- Linda Winkler, Argonne – no replacement recommended

Two years ago the Policy Committee approved a membership requirement for the AET to insure that all constituent groups have representation at each meeting. Members must attend at least two of the four scheduled meetings each year. Diann Jabusch was recommended to the AET due to her position as Chair of the Technology Subcommittee for the Community College President's Council. Her term as Chair has expired and she has recommended her AET position be reserved for the Technology Subcommittee Chair or their designee. Two members are requested to be dropped due to non-attendance. Neither attended any meetings or sent representatives during the past year. Staff recommends appointing a position to the Community College Presidents council as described above and withdrawing the membership of Jim Peterson due to lack of participation.

- Diann Jabusch – renew the position for the Chair of the Community College President’s Council Technology Subcommittee Chair or his/her designee
- Jim Peterson – withdraw appointment due to lack of participation

The following names were brought forth by Policy Committee and AET members to fill vacant spots and to replace members who have resigned. Each fills a need within the respective constituent groups.

Community Colleges

- Scott Armstrong, Kishwaukee College (New member)
- Rich Kulig, COD (New member to replace Gary Wenger’s position)

Universities

- Mike Shelton, SIU (New member to replace Charlie Campbell’s position)
- Herb Kuryliw, NIU (New member)

Libraries (Recommend choosing two to maintain balance)

- Ed Thompson, Aurora Public Library (New member)
- Rob Zschernitz, North Suburban Library System (New member)
- Brandon Grant, Consortium of Academic and Research Libraries (New member)
- Steve Look, Monticello Micro (consults w/libraries) (New member)
- Jenny Levine, Metropolitan Library System (New member)

Museums

- No names have been submitted. Recommend appointing a minimum of one additional member to represent museums.

Units of Local Government

- Ken Terrinoni, Boone County (New member)
- Glen Trommels, City of Rockford (New member)

State Agencies

- Kevin Rademacher, Dept. of Public Health (New member)

Advanced Engineering Taskforce Member Matrix

K-12 Schools	Community Colleges	Universities	Libraries	Museums	Other Institutions	Units of Local Government	State Agencies	Staff
Jim Dispensa Chicago Public Schools (2006)	Diann Jabusch Spoon River College (2007)	Charlie Campbell SIU (2006)	Andrew Bullen Illinois State Library (2007)	Jessica Theodor, Illinois State Museum (2006)	Todd Cooper IL Critical Access Hospital Network (2008)	Sam Ferguson City of Schaumburg (2007)	Abe Loveless ISBE LTC 5 (2006)	Dirk French CMS
Jim Flanagan Maine Township Schools (2006)	Alan Pfeifer Sauk Valley Community College (2008)	Mike Dickson, WIU (2007)	TJ Lusher NIU Founders Library (2006)	Cheryl Obermeyer, Chicago Historical Society (2008)	Linda Winkler Argonne/ I-Wire (2006)	Steve Philbrick City of Chicago (2006)		Beth O'Mahoney CMS
Dennis Gallo O'Fallon CCSD 90 (2007)	Gary Wenger COD (2006)	Charles Kline UIUC (2008)	Karim Adib Chicago Public Library (2008)	Robert Dulski Brookfield Zoo (2008)				Lori Sorenson CMS
Jim Peterson Bloomington Public Schools (2008)		Joel Mambretti Northwestern University (2006)	Troy Brown Shawnee Library System (2008)					Frank Walters CMS
		Ken Spelke UIUC (2007)						Rich Fetter CMS
		Greg DeYoung EIU (2008)						

☐ Term expires at the end of FY06

☐ Members who have not met the 2 meeting per year commitment

☐ Members who have resigned

The AET also needs to appoint a new chair. Gary Wenger, who has served as chair for the last 3 years, is retiring from the College of DuPage in December and therefore has resigned from the AET. Gary has recommended Jim Flanagan as a candidate for the chair position. Please see the recommendation letter.

The staff recommends adoption of the following resolutions:

The Policy Committee approves the confirmation of the new members, renewal of those appointments that expire in 2006 and the removal of members who have not met the attendance requirement.

The Policy Committee appoints Jim Flanagan to a 2 year term as chair of the Advanced Engineering Taskforce.

ILLINOIS CENTURY NETWORK

**ADVANCED ENGINEERING TASKFORCE:
ILLINOIS: THE NEXT CENTURY NETWORK**

Submitted for: Information

Summary:

Action Requested:

**Recommended
Motions:**

Item to be provided at the meeting.

ILLINOIS CENTURY NETWORK
**ADVANCED ENGINEERING TASKFORCE:
2006 REPORT**

Submitted for: Information

Summary: The Advanced Engineering Taskforce has recently completed and submitted the 2006 report. This item provides the Policy Committee with a brief summary of the recommendations included in the report.

Action Requested: None.

ILLINOIS CENTURY NETWORK
**ADVANCED ENGINEERING TASKFORCE:
2006 REPORT**

The Advanced Engineering Taskforce has recently submitted the 2006 report along with areas in which they will be making specific recommendations.

A few of the accomplishments of the Advanced Engineering Taskforce this fiscal year were the establishment of a contract for anti-virus services, renewal of the Cisco agreement for another 2 years and the implementation of a pilot project for collocation to encourage sharing of content. The AET also convened a subcommittee on the future direction of the ICN called Illinois: The Next Century Network.

The focus areas of the 2006 report include:

- Vision, Mission and Strategic Planning
- Core Technology Infrastructure
- Network Operations Center (NOC)
- Equipment Replacement Strategy
- Network Security
- Content Providers
- Quality Service Financial Model
- Wireless Technologies
- Statewide Contracts
- Convergence: Voice, Video, Data
- Staffing Levels/Retention/Development
- Disaster Recovery/Business Continuity

As in the past, the ICN management team will evaluate the recommendations in light of the current fiscal and technical environments. The 2006 Report is currently available on the ICN site at www.illinois.net/aet.

ILLINOIS CENTURY NETWORK

COST RECOVERY

Submitted for: Information

Summary: This item outlines changes to the cost recovery model approved by BCCS/CMS management. Changes will take place immediately and continue into fiscal year 2008.

Action Requested: None

ILLINOIS CENTURY NETWORK

COST RECOVERY

In 2002 the ICN implemented cost recovery to ensure the availability of reliable bandwidth in light of increased utilization and limited financial resources. The policy provides a vehicle for non-primary constituents to purchase bandwidth to connect to the ICN and a financial incentive for larger bandwidth users, primarily higher education, to shape their bandwidth.

Since implementing the cost recovery model, the ICN has made minimal annual changes to the original baseline levels and bandwidth costs. Since fiscal year 2004 there have been no adjustments. As a result, the bandwidth needs of the majority of constituents have exceeded what is provided as a baseline. This is impeding our constituents' ability to achieve greater connectivity and growth.

Keeping with the commitment to notify constituents of changes in bandwidth pricing and/or bandwidth allocation, with enough lead time for institutional planning, this item serves to outline several significant changes to the cost recovery model effective September 1, 2006 and continuing through fiscal year 2008.

Bandwidth Allocation and Pricing

Due in large part to strategic negotiations with vendors and the addition of state agency constituents, baseline bandwidth allocation will increase for primary constituents and pricing for purchasing additional bandwidth will decrease effective immediately. The changes to the cost recovery model were made due to feedback from constituents through focus groups and surveys as part of Illinois: The Next Century Network initiative.

For primary constituents the baseline bandwidth has been raised from a minimum of 1.5 Mbps to 8 Mbps. Based on the institution's FTE, the allocations now rise to a maximum of 45 Mbps (or 48 Mbps with E-rate compliance). The fiscal year 2008 bandwidth allocation for primary constituents is reflected in Table 1. E-rate eligible constituents also have the opportunity to receive an additional 3 Mbps if they elect to file for E-rate through the ICN.

The price to purchase additional bandwidth has decreased. The cost to procure bandwidth is now \$70 - \$170 depending on the amount purchased. The constituent's baseline bandwidth is included in the amount. Detailed information is available in Table 2.

Port charges and pricing for other services will remain unchanged.

The network was created and funded to provide constituents with advanced services such as interactive video and access to educational content from remote sources. The changes to the cost recovery model were put into place to continue to encourage constituents to increase their use of web-based resources in the classroom and in research.

Table 1
Baseline Bandwidth Allocation

Institution(s) Student FTE Headcount	Current Allocation (Mbps)	New Allocation (Mbps)	New Allocation with E-rate
1 - 999 (and entities without FTE)	1.5	8	11
1,001 - 1,999	3	8	11
2,000 - 2,999	4.5	8	11
3,000 - 3,999	6	8	11
4,000 - 4,999	7.5	10	13
5,000 - 5,999	9	12	15
6,000 - 6,999	10.5	14	17
7,000 - 7,999	12	16	19
8,000 - 8,999	13.5	18	21
9,000 - 9,999	15	20	23
10,000 - 10,999	16.5	22	25
11,000 - 11,999	18	24	27
12,000 - 12,999	19.5	26	29
13,000 - 13,999	21	28	31
14,000 - 14,999	22	30	33
15,000 - 15,999	23	32	35
16,000 - 16,999	24	34	37
17,000 - 17,999	25	36	39
18,000 - 18,999	26	38	41
19,000 - 19,999	27	40	43
20,000 - 20,999	28	42	45
21,000 - 21,999	29	44	47
22,000 and above	30	45	48

**Table 2 –Bandwidth Pricing
Cost Recovery Data**

	Current Total	Proposed Total	Proposed Per/Mb	Current Total	Proposed Total	Proposed Per/Mb	Current Total	Proposed Total	Proposed Per/Mb
1	\$ 250.00	\$ 170.00	\$ 170.00	81 \$ 14,175.00	\$ 7,466.37	\$ 92.18	161 \$ 24,150.00	\$ 12,126.87	\$ 75.32
2	\$ 500.00	\$ 340.00	\$ 170.00	82 \$ 14,350.00	\$ 7,533.86	\$ 91.88	162 \$ 24,300.00	\$ 12,177.58	\$ 75.17
3	\$ 750.00	\$ 510.00	\$ 170.00	83 \$ 14,525.00	\$ 7,601.05	\$ 91.58	163 \$ 24,450.00	\$ 12,228.14	\$ 75.02
4	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 663.94	\$ 165.99	84 \$ 14,700.00	\$ 7,667.95	\$ 91.29	164 \$ 24,600.00	\$ 12,278.55	\$ 74.87
5	\$ 1,250.00	\$ 802.55	\$ 160.51	85 \$ 14,875.00	\$ 7,734.55	\$ 90.99	165 \$ 24,750.00	\$ 12,328.81	\$ 74.72
6	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 936.22	\$ 156.04	86 \$ 15,050.00	\$ 7,800.86	\$ 90.71	166 \$ 24,900.00	\$ 12,378.92	\$ 74.57
7	\$ 1,750.00	\$ 1,065.78	\$ 152.25	87 \$ 15,225.00	\$ 7,866.89	\$ 90.42	167 \$ 25,050.00	\$ 12,428.88	\$ 74.42
8	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 1,191.83	\$ 148.98	88 \$ 15,400.00	\$ 7,932.64	\$ 90.14	168 \$ 25,200.00	\$ 12,478.70	\$ 74.28
9	\$ 2,250.00	\$ 1,314.80	\$ 146.09	89 \$ 15,575.00	\$ 7,998.11	\$ 89.87	169 \$ 25,350.00	\$ 12,528.36	\$ 74.13
10	\$ 2,250.00	\$ 1,435.04	\$ 143.50	90 \$ 15,750.00	\$ 8,063.30	\$ 89.59	170 \$ 25,500.00	\$ 12,577.89	\$ 73.99
11	\$ 2,475.00	\$ 1,552.82	\$ 141.17	91 \$ 15,925.00	\$ 8,128.22	\$ 89.32	171 \$ 25,650.00	\$ 12,627.27	\$ 73.84
12	\$ 2,700.00	\$ 1,668.36	\$ 139.03	92 \$ 16,100.00	\$ 8,192.87	\$ 89.05	172 \$ 25,800.00	\$ 12,676.50	\$ 73.70
13	\$ 2,925.00	\$ 1,781.86	\$ 137.07	93 \$ 16,275.00	\$ 8,257.26	\$ 88.79	173 \$ 25,950.00	\$ 12,725.50	\$ 73.56
14	\$ 3,150.00	\$ 1,893.47	\$ 135.25	94 \$ 16,450.00	\$ 8,321.38	\$ 88.53	174 \$ 26,100.00	\$ 12,774.55	\$ 73.42
15	\$ 3,375.00	\$ 2,003.33	\$ 133.56	95 \$ 16,625.00	\$ 8,385.24	\$ 88.27	175 \$ 26,250.00	\$ 12,823.36	\$ 73.28
16	\$ 3,600.00	\$ 2,111.54	\$ 131.97	96 \$ 16,800.00	\$ 8,448.84	\$ 88.01	176 \$ 26,400.00	\$ 12,872.03	\$ 73.14
17	\$ 3,825.00	\$ 2,218.23	\$ 130.48	97 \$ 16,975.00	\$ 8,512.18	\$ 87.75	177 \$ 26,550.00	\$ 12,920.56	\$ 73.00
18	\$ 4,050.00	\$ 2,323.47	\$ 129.08	98 \$ 17,150.00	\$ 8,575.28	\$ 87.50	178 \$ 26,700.00	\$ 12,968.95	\$ 72.86
19	\$ 4,275.00	\$ 2,427.34	\$ 127.75	99 \$ 17,325.00	\$ 8,638.12	\$ 87.25	179 \$ 26,850.00	\$ 13,017.21	\$ 72.72
20	\$ 4,500.00	\$ 2,529.93	\$ 126.50	100 \$ 15,000.00	\$ 8,700.71	\$ 87.01	180 \$ 27,000.00	\$ 13,065.32	\$ 72.59
21	\$ 4,725.00	\$ 2,631.29	\$ 125.30	101 \$ 15,150.00	\$ 8,763.06	\$ 86.76	181 \$ 27,150.00	\$ 13,113.31	\$ 72.45
22	\$ 4,950.00	\$ 2,731.47	\$ 124.16	102 \$ 15,300.00	\$ 8,825.17	\$ 86.52	182 \$ 27,300.00	\$ 13,161.15	\$ 72.31
23	\$ 5,175.00	\$ 2,830.55	\$ 123.07	103 \$ 15,450.00	\$ 8,887.03	\$ 86.28	183 \$ 27,450.00	\$ 13,208.86	\$ 72.18
24	\$ 5,400.00	\$ 2,928.55	\$ 122.02	104 \$ 15,600.00	\$ 8,948.66	\$ 86.04	184 \$ 27,600.00	\$ 13,256.44	\$ 72.05
25	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 3,025.53	\$ 121.02	105 \$ 15,750.00	\$ 9,010.05	\$ 85.81	185 \$ 27,750.00	\$ 13,303.88	\$ 71.91
26	\$ 5,200.00	\$ 3,121.54	\$ 120.06	106 \$ 15,900.00	\$ 9,071.21	\$ 85.58	186 \$ 27,900.00	\$ 13,351.19	\$ 71.77
27	\$ 5,400.00	\$ 3,216.59	\$ 119.13	107 \$ 16,050.00	\$ 9,132.13	\$ 85.35	187 \$ 28,050.00	\$ 13,398.37	\$ 71.65
28	\$ 5,600.00	\$ 3,310.74	\$ 118.24	108 \$ 16,200.00	\$ 9,192.83	\$ 85.12	188 \$ 28,200.00	\$ 13,445.42	\$ 71.52
29	\$ 5,800.00	\$ 3,404.01	\$ 117.38	109 \$ 16,350.00	\$ 9,253.30	\$ 84.89	189 \$ 28,350.00	\$ 13,492.33	\$ 71.39
30	\$ 6,000.00	\$ 3,496.44	\$ 116.55	110 \$ 16,500.00	\$ 9,313.54	\$ 84.67	190 \$ 28,500.00	\$ 13,539.12	\$ 71.26
31	\$ 6,200.00	\$ 3,588.04	\$ 115.74	111 \$ 16,650.00	\$ 9,373.57	\$ 84.45	191 \$ 28,650.00	\$ 13,585.78	\$ 71.13
32	\$ 6,400.00	\$ 3,678.86	\$ 114.96	112 \$ 16,800.00	\$ 9,433.37	\$ 84.23	192 \$ 28,800.00	\$ 13,632.31	\$ 71.00
33	\$ 6,600.00	\$ 3,768.91	\$ 114.21	113 \$ 16,950.00	\$ 9,492.95	\$ 84.01	193 \$ 28,950.00	\$ 13,678.71	\$ 70.87
34	\$ 6,800.00	\$ 3,858.21	\$ 113.48	114 \$ 17,100.00	\$ 9,552.31	\$ 83.79	194 \$ 29,100.00	\$ 13,724.99	\$ 70.75
35	\$ 7,000.00	\$ 3,946.80	\$ 112.77	115 \$ 17,250.00	\$ 9,611.46	\$ 83.58	195 \$ 29,250.00	\$ 13,771.13	\$ 70.62
36	\$ 7,200.00	\$ 4,034.68	\$ 112.07	116 \$ 17,400.00	\$ 9,670.40	\$ 83.37	196 \$ 29,400.00	\$ 13,817.16	\$ 70.50
37	\$ 7,400.00	\$ 4,121.88	\$ 111.40	117 \$ 17,550.00	\$ 9,729.12	\$ 83.15	197 \$ 29,550.00	\$ 13,863.05	\$ 70.37
38	\$ 7,600.00	\$ 4,208.42	\$ 110.75	118 \$ 17,700.00	\$ 9,787.63	\$ 82.95	198 \$ 29,700.00	\$ 13,908.83	\$ 70.25
39	\$ 7,800.00	\$ 4,294.31	\$ 110.11	119 \$ 17,850.00	\$ 9,845.94	\$ 82.74	199 \$ 29,850.00	\$ 13,954.47	\$ 70.12
40	\$ 8,000.00	\$ 4,379.57	\$ 109.49	120 \$ 18,000.00	\$ 9,904.04	\$ 82.53	200 \$ 30,000.00	\$ 14,000.00	\$ 70.00
41	\$ 8,200.00	\$ 4,464.22	\$ 108.88	121 \$ 18,150.00	\$ 9,961.94	\$ 82.33			
42	\$ 8,400.00	\$ 4,548.27	\$ 108.29	122 \$ 18,300.00	\$ 10,019.63	\$ 82.13			
43	\$ 8,600.00	\$ 4,631.74	\$ 107.71	123 \$ 18,450.00	\$ 10,077.12	\$ 81.93			
44	\$ 8,800.00	\$ 4,714.63	\$ 107.15	124 \$ 18,600.00	\$ 10,134.41	\$ 81.73			
45	\$ 7,875.00	\$ 4,796.97	\$ 106.60	125 \$ 18,750.00	\$ 10,191.51	\$ 81.53			
46	\$ 8,050.00	\$ 4,878.76	\$ 106.06	126 \$ 18,900.00	\$ 10,248.40	\$ 81.34			
47	\$ 8,225.00	\$ 4,960.02	\$ 105.53	127 \$ 19,050.00	\$ 10,305.11	\$ 81.14			
48	\$ 8,400.00	\$ 5,040.76	\$ 105.02	128 \$ 19,200.00	\$ 10,361.62	\$ 80.95			
49	\$ 8,575.00	\$ 5,120.99	\$ 104.51	129 \$ 19,350.00	\$ 10,417.94	\$ 80.76			
50	\$ 8,750.00	\$ 5,200.71	\$ 104.01	130 \$ 19,500.00	\$ 10,474.06	\$ 80.57			
51	\$ 8,925.00	\$ 5,279.95	\$ 103.53	131 \$ 19,650.00	\$ 10,530.00	\$ 80.38	FTE Count	Proposed	Current
52	\$ 9,100.00	\$ 5,358.70	\$ 103.05	132 \$ 19,800.00	\$ 10,585.76	\$ 80.20	1 - 999	8	1.5
53	\$ 9,275.00	\$ 5,436.98	\$ 102.58	133 \$ 19,950.00	\$ 10,641.32	\$ 80.01	1000 - 1999	8	3
54	\$ 9,450.00	\$ 5,514.80	\$ 102.13	134 \$ 20,100.00	\$ 10,696.70	\$ 79.83	2000 - 2999	8	4.5
55	\$ 9,625.00	\$ 5,592.16	\$ 101.68	135 \$ 20,250.00	\$ 10,751.90	\$ 79.64	3000 - 3999	8	6
56	\$ 9,800.00	\$ 5,669.08	\$ 101.23	136 \$ 20,400.00	\$ 10,806.92	\$ 79.46	4000 - 4999	10	7.5
57	\$ 9,975.00	\$ 5,745.56	\$ 100.80	137 \$ 20,550.00	\$ 10,861.76	\$ 79.28	5000 - 5999	12	9
58	\$ 10,150.00	\$ 5,821.61	\$ 100.37	138 \$ 20,700.00	\$ 10,916.41	\$ 79.10	6000 - 6999	14	10.5
59	\$ 10,325.00	\$ 5,897.24	\$ 99.95	139 \$ 20,850.00	\$ 10,970.89	\$ 78.93	7000 - 7999	16	12
60	\$ 10,500.00	\$ 5,972.45	\$ 99.54	140 \$ 21,000.00	\$ 11,025.20	\$ 78.75	8000 - 8999	18	13.5
61	\$ 10,675.00	\$ 6,047.25	\$ 99.14	141 \$ 21,150.00	\$ 11,079.33	\$ 78.58	9000 - 9999	20	15
62	\$ 10,850.00	\$ 6,121.65	\$ 98.74	142 \$ 21,300.00	\$ 11,133.28	\$ 78.40	10000 - 10999	22	16.5
63	\$ 11,025.00	\$ 6,195.65	\$ 98.34	143 \$ 21,450.00	\$ 11,187.06	\$ 78.23	11000 - 11999	24	18
64	\$ 11,200.00	\$ 6,269.26	\$ 97.96	144 \$ 21,600.00	\$ 11,240.67	\$ 78.06	12000 - 12999	26	19.5
65	\$ 11,375.00	\$ 6,342.50	\$ 97.58	145 \$ 21,750.00	\$ 11,294.11	\$ 77.89	13000 - 13999	28	21
66	\$ 11,550.00	\$ 6,415.35	\$ 97.20	146 \$ 21,900.00	\$ 11,347.38	\$ 77.72	14000 - 14999	30	22
67	\$ 11,725.00	\$ 6,487.83	\$ 96.83	147 \$ 22,050.00	\$ 11,400.48	\$ 77.55	15000 - 15999	32	23
68	\$ 11,900.00	\$ 6,559.94	\$ 96.47	148 \$ 22,200.00	\$ 11,453.42	\$ 77.39	16000 - 16999	34	24
69	\$ 12,075.00	\$ 6,631.70	\$ 96.11	149 \$ 22,350.00	\$ 11,506.18	\$ 77.22	17000 - 17999	36	25
70	\$ 12,250.00	\$ 6,703.10	\$ 95.76	150 \$ 22,500.00	\$ 11,558.79	\$ 77.06	18000 - 18999	38	26
71	\$ 12,425.00	\$ 6,774.15	\$ 95.41	151 \$ 22,650.00	\$ 11,611.23	\$ 76.90	19000 - 19999	40	27
72	\$ 12,600.00	\$ 6,844.85	\$ 95.07	152 \$ 22,800.00	\$ 11,663.51	\$ 76.73	20000 - 20999	42	28
73	\$ 12,775.00	\$ 6,915.21	\$ 94.73	153 \$ 22,950.00	\$ 11,715.63	\$ 76.57	21000 - 21999	44	29
74	\$ 12,950.00	\$ 6,985.23	\$ 94.40	154 \$ 23,100.00	\$ 11,767.58	\$ 76.41	22000 - +	45	30
75	\$ 13,125.00	\$ 7,054.93	\$ 94.07	155 \$ 23,250.00	\$ 11,819.38	\$ 76.25			
76	\$ 13,300.00	\$ 7,124.30	\$ 93.74	156 \$ 23,400.00	\$ 11,871.02	\$ 76.10			
77	\$ 13,475.00	\$ 7,193.34	\$ 93.42	157 \$ 23,550.00	\$ 11,922.50	\$ 75.94			
78	\$ 13,650.00	\$ 7,262.06	\$ 93.10	158 \$ 23,700.00	\$ 11,973.83	\$ 75.78			
79	\$ 13,825.00	\$ 7,330.48	\$ 92.79	159 \$ 23,850.00	\$ 12,025.00	\$ 75.63			
80	\$ 14,000.00	\$ 7,398.58	\$ 92.48	160 \$ 24,000.00	\$ 12,076.01	\$ 75.48			

ILLINOIS CENTURY NETWORK
POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING SCHEUDLE

Submitted for: Information

Summary: This item seeks to review the meeting schedule for the remainder of the fiscal year

Action Requested: None.

ILLINOIS CENTURY NETWORK
POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING SCHEUDLE

In March 2006, the Policy Committee adopted a meeting schedule for fiscal year 2007. The schedule is based on four meetings per year, occurring on the third Monday of the months of February, June, September and November. If the Monday happens to be a holiday, the meeting will occur on Tuesday. Based on this formula, the schedule for FY2007 was established as follows:

Monday, September 18, 2006
Monday, November 20, 2006
Tuesday, February 20, 2007
Monday, June 18, 2007

All meetings will be held in the conference room of the Illinois Community College Board office at 401 East Capitol Avenue, Springfield, IL and at the James R. Thompson Center in Chicago. A conference bridge is also available for those unable to attend at either location.