

but if schools don't have modems or routers, it will be useless. Even if schools are provided with routers and modems, if they only have Apple IIs or other outdated equipment, it is still useless. Reality is that this is the situation of many high schools.

Channel 1 ended up providing the feed, the equipment and even the TV monitors in every classroom. It was the only way that anyone could find their service useful. In a similar way, the only way Universal Access can be of use is if schools have the equipment. Most do not.

I have taught in several schools, both public and federal. I hope that these stark truths can promote a better way for us to help schools gain access to technology rather than develop "pie in the sky" concepts which have no functionality, will cost the individual consumers and will not promote any sort of real universal access in schools or libraries.

Discussions about how to divide UA, how to distribute it, etc. are not helping schools. I wanted to be a part of a discussion that would help schools; unfortunately we're discussing the wrong things.

jayne

-
- **Next message: Sally Hawkes: "Re: State approved technology plans"**
 - **Previous message: Preuss. Paul: "Mandated Plans"**

Mandated Plans

Preuss, Paul (PPREUSS@Herkimer-BOCES.moric.org)

Tue, 17 Sep 1996 09:49:55 +5 EST

- **Messages sorted by:** [date || thread || subject || author]
 - **Next message:** Jayne & Scott Hoffman: "(no subject)"
 - **Previous message:** Tom Buckley: "State's Responsibility for Technology Provisioning"
 - **Next in thread:** Cheryl Lemke: "Re: Mandated Plans"
-

Sorry - I just couldn't resist responding to the recent comments on the requirement (mandate) for school technology plans. IMO both sides have made valid points. The decision rests upon what method will result in the least waste.

Peer review of plans is a great idea. How will it be organized? Who will be the peers? What group shall we endorse as the gate keeper to the Internet and what is their agenda?

Who will check to see if the plan is implemented once approved? So a school gets its plan through the gate - perhaps by copying a plan already approved - now what?

It seems to me that whatever route is taken - the responsible implementation of Internet connectivity rests in the hands of leaders at the building, or perhaps district, level.

I would rather risk a certain number of ill conceived ventures - which even if they had an approved plan would probably be incorrectly implemented - then spending the \$, time and energy to require everyone to submit a required plan.

If one is really into plans - why stop at a technology plan? The tech plan is useless if it is not tied to the school's strategic plan or school improvement plan. Ultimately the tech plan must be tied into the documented improvement of student achievement - otherwise why do it? A technology plan in and of itself is not sufficient because it is an isolated artifact not related to the "system" of learning.

Again - while the advocates for a technology plan have made many valid points - when I weigh the overall benefits compared with the cost in \$, time and human energy - I must favor a system which does not require mandated tech plans and a system of approvals and checks.

How heavy does the superstructure of a ship have to be before it tips over of its own weight? I think that is what we are discussing.

Paul Preuss
PPreuss@Herkimer-BOCES.moric.org
Phone: 315 867 2007 FAX: 315 867 2024

- **Next message:** Jayne & Scott Hoffman: "(no subject)"
- **Previous message:** Tom Buckley: "State's Responsibility for Technology Provisioning"
- **Next in thread:** Cheryl Lemke: "Re: Mandated Plans"

Re: State approved technology plans

Sally Hawkes (shawkes@comp.uark.edu)

Tue, 17 Sep 1996 09:10:50 -0500 (CDT)

- Messages sorted by: [date] [thread] [subject] [author]
 - Next message: Kevin Conde: "Re: Week Four Assignments"
 - Previous message: ;
 - In reply to: Jan Bolluyt: "State approved technology plans"
-

As a participant and liaison in a state-wide cooperative plan, I'd like to add a few items. Our academic and public school connectivity was designed by the same man, the Dept of Computer Services and the Arkansas State Library are working with them to have public library system be compatible as well. There is also several community based LAN projects going on that are compatible to the others systems.

The bottom line is--we can't afford not to cooperate, because we don't have a large pool of money to draw from or an inexhaustible supply. The cooperative efforts--a state-wide technology plan--keeps us from wasting money of project that won't mesh. Some coordinated plan between the schools, library, state agencies, and the academic community will help in countless ways. Sharing funds instead of competing against each other, best use the expertise of technology personnel and ways of devising the best use to the community.

An example of what happens when groups go different routes in networking happened with the libraries already. We've had trouble here convincing administrators that school libraries library holdings need to be in MARC formats for networking--the ANSI standard. All public libraries and academic libraries are in a shared national database but to have the school included they'll need to spend additions funds to meet the standards already set.

This is what can happen if each group decides to go in a different direction. A lack of compatibility in systems occurs, as happened in early PC days when schools were MAC based and public libraries were IBM based. As a result of no compatibility, more money will need to be spent to correct problems later on. We have 29 phone companies in this state so think what would happen if each of those phone companies devised a different plan for their communities?

Sally Hawkes
Coordinator of Library Network Services
Arkansas State Library

501-682-6052
501-682-1531 fax
shawkes@comp.uark.edu

On Sun, 15 Sep 1996, Jan Bolluyt wrote:

- > I disagree with Ken Hammer on one point, the state approved technology plans.
- >
- > The plan is not for the state, but for the library or district. Many of us
- > do not have the expertise to know what is available, and will naturally look
- > at other plans to copy, but is that so bad? This idea is bad only if the
- > state imposes its expectations on the plan and makes us clone "the best".
- >

> A mandated plan is a necessity to get everyone thinking about the goals that
> this universal service can help us meet. If we are unable, or do feel the
> time is well spent, then perhaps universal service is not needed at this time.
>
> Jan
>

-
- **Next message:** Kevin Conde: "Re: Week Four Assignments"
 - **Previous message:** :""
 - **In reply to:** Jan Bolluyt: "State approved technology plans"

State's Responsibility for Technology Provisioning

Tom Buckley (tbuckley@voyager.snetnsa.com)
Tue, 17 Sep 1996 12:45:42 -0400

- **Messages sorted by:** [date] [thread] [subject] [author]
 - **Next message:** Preuss, Paul: "Mandated Plans"
 - **Previous message:** Betty Dawn Hamilton: "Re: Week Four Assignments"
 - **Next in thread:** Link Shadley: "Re: State's Responsibility for Technology Provisioning"
-

This is my first posting, but i have been following along since the beginning - I have not seen any postings re the role of the state dept of ed (SDE) or any other state agency with regard to technology provisioning in school systems.

Here in CT, the SDE has offered infrastructure grants to help schools equip their buildings with wiring so they can deploy technology in a planned efficient fashion. One of the requirements is a board approved technology plan. Most of the schools have now completed such a plan following guidelines established at the state level. The grant provides a portion of the money necessary to deploy updated wiring and infrastructure, but the schools must allocate additional funds to complete the job.

In another example, 14 municipalities were granted funds from the dept of economic development to create an areawide network for Internet access - that project is now being deployed and schools/libraries/municipal buildings can be brought online. The network provides a minimum access rate of 56kbps and has dual broad bandwidth connections to the Internet.

I am an advocate of the states creating statewide networks which can provide reliable high speed Internet access on an equitable basis. In addition, a statewide network promotes efficiencies which may not available to individual schools or systems. Reliability and maintenance can be supported at regional levels, and educator organizations could band together to offer supporting training and guidance.

With regard to the Universal Service Fund discussion, I would hope that each state has the opportunity to define solutions which best meet their residents' needs. I am concerned when we speak of educational rates for advanced telecommunication services when the definition of advanced telecommunication services seems to be constantly changing. I agree with a previous discussion regarding the need for schools to contribute to (or buy-in) the services being provided. I have managed grant programs for a few years and have found that schools value services and opportunities much more if they "own" some of it.

Finally, i could not end without echoing what many have already voiced - there is no FREE lunch - somebody pays the bill. As a consumer of telecommunications services, I want to be sure that any contribution included in my bill is used effectively and provides services to schools in my area - might be selfish, but all schools need access to these services and I would not want to subsidize other areas at the expense of schools in our state.

tom buckley

- **Next message:** Preuss, Paul: "Mandated Plans"
- **Previous message:** Betty Dawn Hamilton: "Re: Week Four Assignments"
- **Next in thread:** Link Shadley: "Re: State's Responsibility for Technology Provisioning"

Re: Week Four Assignments

Kevin Conde (KevinC@sutter.k12.ca.us)

Tue, 17 Sep 1996 10:47:15 -0700

- **Messages sorted by:** [date | thread | subject | author]
 - **Next message:** Steve Kohn: "Bona Fide Request?"
 - **Previous message:** Sally Hawkes: "Re: State approved technology plans"
 - **Maybe in reply to:** Kevin Conde: "Week Four Assignments"
-

Betty:

You're dead correct. Establishing datacomm connections is not for beginners. Our county solved the problem by hiring a technology coordinator, me, to server all the small districts that can't afford the expertise. Now they only have to pay for me when they need me.

Having solved that problems still leaves us up against the bigger one. The cost of adequate bandwidth is too high. In some cases, even if the school could afford the digital data line, PacBell can't provide it. Pacific Bell has a program where they will provide one free year of 128k ISDN service and free installation to a school. That looks like a good deal on the surface. However, we've run into several problems, problems that several of our schools have avoided because the county had a tech person to advise them, and that tech person has the experience/scars to know that the ISDN deal was not with out traps.

#1 - ISDN is cheap and fast if the two locations being connected are served by the same phone company switch. If there are multiple switches involved you have to pay packet charges once your free year of service is up, and those charges will eat you alive.

#2 - ISDN is not reliable in our area. It goes up and down, which makes my life miserable.

#3 - At least one of our school districts, Browns, can't get ISDN. They're too far away from the nearest phone company switch, and the wire servicing them is too small. The phone company is not required to upgrade that wire, and since the cost to do so is in excess of \$100,000.00 the phone company has declined to do so. They'd never recoup their investment.

This leads to the heart of the discussion.

The legislation must mandate that a minimum level of data comm service be provided regardless of geographic location.

That service must be at a cost that is affordable for all school districts regardless of their size or financial condition.

Competition must be allowed as this will tend to creat more and better services at lower cost.

Kevin Conde

Technology Coordinator

Sutter County Superintendent of Schools Office

916-741-5115, x103

-
- **Next message:** Steve Kohn: "Bona Fide Request?"
 - **Previous message:** Sally Hawkes: "Re: State approved technology plans"
 - **Maybe in reply to:** Kevin Conde: "Week Four Assignments"

Bona Fide Request?

Steve Kohn (*NOTES.SKOHN@A50VM1.trg.nynex.COM*)

17 Sep 1996 15:54:15 GMT

- **Messages sorted by:** [date || thread || subject || author]
 - **Next message:** Eugene Stovall: "Re: Checking in re us-nd"
 - **Previous message:** Kevin Conde: "Re: Week Four Assignments"
-

Dr. Van Dam stated:

> I would strongly argue that ANY request from an educational institution
> should be honored. The tax-exempt qualification is fine, but I don't think
> that is the question being asked by the FCC. They may be more concerned
> with what is a BONA FIDE REQUEST, not who is a BONA FIDE agency to make a
> request. In conversation with FCC representative this past summer, this
> seemed to be their focus, the "content of the request", not the
> "requestor."
>
> If I interpreted correctly, then all requests from educational agencies for
> any type of voice, video or data service should be considered bona fide.
> Any other approach infers a structure at some level, probably a state
> level, to filter and evaluate the requests. I would not endorse that
> approach. State agencies have enough to do without checking local
> educational requests for electronic services.

I think there are two issues here; 1) a bona fide request; and 2) from a bona fide school. I think if a request comes from a bona fide school, it should automatically be considered a bona fide request. But I don't think we can have a very loose definition of a bona fide school. A list of bona fide schools should be developed by the appropriate agency in the state and forwarded to all the telecommunication providers so they know they are getting a request from a bona fide school.

My only concern about "verifying" bona fide requests would be if the E-rate ended up being - free. Then I'd be concerned about abuse of the system with schools ordering services they were not ready to use.

Steve Kohn

- **Next message:** Eugene Stovall: "Re: Checking in re us-nd"
- **Previous message:** Kevin Conde: "Re: Week Four Assignments"

Re: Checking in re us-nd

Eugene Stovall (estovall@ousd.k12.ca.us)

Tue, 17 Sep 96 18:21 PDT

- **Messages sorted by:** [date] [thread] [subject] [author]
- **Next message:** Betty Dawn Hamilton: "Re: Checking in re us-nd"
- **Previous message:** Steve Kohn: "Bona Fide Request?"
- **Next in thread:** Betty Dawn Hamilton: "Re: Checking in re us-nd"

Greetings:

Jerry's comments are absolutely on target. He directs our attention to the fact that discounts supported by the universal fund means asking consumers to accept additional rate increases. Currently, the California Public Utilities Commission is considering a 25% school discount which will be funded through a mandated rate increase. The incumbent telco, Pacific Bell, will be given another secure source of revenue without any competitive concern.

In addition, local telcos, LECs, are planning to use the Act to eliminate CCLs, Common Carrier Line charges and increase SLCs (subscriber line charges) to make up for the lost revenue. These rate increases will be used to fund the local telco's entry into the long distance market. Such a move will further deny new entrants the ability to compete and bring new technologies into the marketplace.

The Telecommunications Act of 1996 is designed to stimulate competition and innovation. Discussions of educational discounts should examine how to avoid subsidizing these discounts by passing the costs directly to the universal fund. We run the risk that the public will blame insignificant school discounts for the massive rate increases currently planned by the telcos.

Eugene Stovall

>>To:Laurie Maak <laurie@info-ren.pitt.edu>

>>From:jls@sdp2.philsch.k12.pa.us (Jerry Snyder)

>>Subject:Re: Checking in re us-nd

>>

>>Laurie,

>>

>>I recently sat thru a 2 day seminar entitled, the Telecommunications Act of
>>1996: What It Means to Local Governments, sponsored by the National League of
>>Cities. I was frankly hoping that this online seminar would have revealed
>>efforts of schools/districts, IU's, etc to put our case before the FCC and the
>>states' PUC's. Discussions of wireless or pilots or small grants don't cut it
>>when the Act was to impact the entire K-12 infrastructure. As was pointed out
>>at the NLC seminar, you can bet that every RBOC, as well as every other
>>carrier (common and otherwise) is appearing before these regulatory
>>commissions putting forth their case that K-12 ought to get some minor
>>discounted rate while they reap enormous profits from deregulation.

>>

>>Unless we get our act together, the promise of the "Act" will only come to
>>those who's PACs and lobbyists have sold the regulators with their one-sided
>>story.

>>

>>Jerry

>
>Jerrold L. Snyder
>School District of Philadelphia
>Network Systems and Telecommunications
>734 Schuylkill Ave.
>Philadelphia, PA 19146
>
>PH (215)875-3789
>FAX (215)875-3787

- **Next message:** Betty Dawn Hamilton: "Re: Checking in re us-nd"
- **Previous message:** Steve Kohn: "Bona Fide Request?"
- **Next in thread:** Betty Dawn Hamilton: "Re: Checking in re us-nd"

Re: Checking in re us-nd

Betty Dawn Hamilton (bhamilt@tenet.edu)

Wed, 18 Sep 1996 05:38:52 -0500 (CDT)

- **Messages sorted by:** [date || thread || subject || author]
 - **Next message:** John Rademan: "Re: Required technology plans?"
 - **Previous message:** Eugene Stovall: "Re: Checking in re us-nd"
 - **In reply to:** Eugene Stovall: "Re: Checking in re us-nd"
-

On Tue, 17 Sep 1996, Eugene Stovall wrote:

>

> innovation. Discussions of educational discounts should examine how to avoid
> subsidizing these discounts by passing the costs directly to the universal
> fund. We run the risk that the public will blame insignificant school
> discounts for the massive rate increases currently planned by the telcos.

Well, for what it's worth, in Texas our TIF (Technology Infrastructure Fund) receives my monthly "donation" each time I pay our cellular phone bill. It's clearly stated right there on the bill. The TIF money will be paid out via grants to schools needing hardware and software -- I'm not sure about staff development, but probably that, too.

Betty

Betty Dawn Hamilton * bhamilt@tenet.edu * 806.637.4523
Learning Resources Specialist * Tenet Master Trainer * Brownfield High School
701 Cub Drive * Brownfield, TX 79316

- **Next message:** John Rademan: "Re: Required technology plans?"
- **Previous message:** Eugene Stovall: "Re: Checking in re us-nd"
- **In reply to:** Eugene Stovall: "Re: Checking in re us-nd"

Re: Required technology plans?

John Rademan (cradema@libby.litchpkeld.k12.az.us)

Wed, 18 Sep 1996 05:51:46 +0000

- **Messages sorted by:** [date || thread || subject || author]
 - **Next message:** Sylvia Nespoli: "Re: us-nd-digest V4 #1"
 - **Previous message:** Betty Dawn Hamilton: "Re: Checking in re us-nd"
 - **Next in thread:** Robert H. Terry: "Re: Required technology plans?"
-

Dennis Small said:

> Perhaps a "checklist" or
> list of "milestones" could be developed to have an "approved plan"
> (whether by the state or some other entity) that kept paperwork to a
> minimum while ensuring that the important issues that are needed for
> successful use of telecommunications have been addressed.

Perhaps a technology plan needs to be a "function framework" which would be technology neutral? Essentially, the school district must have an idea of the way its technology should work, once installed. But each building or district is a separate case, which may require one or another of several possible technologies to be "plugged in" to function as needed. Training and technical support are the connections that make all the separate technologies work together. The plan allows the school or library to put the whole thing out to bid & let competition among suppliers determine the optimum technology for a particular function.

- **Next message:** Sylvia Nespoli: "Re: us-nd-digest V4 #1"
- **Previous message:** Betty Dawn Hamilton: "Re: Checking in re us-nd"
- **Next in thread:** Robert H. Terry: "Re: Required technology plans?"

Re: us-nd-digest V4 #1

Sylvia Nespoli (sylvia_nespoli@ridleysd.k12.pa.us)
18 Sep 1996 07:43:01 -0400

- **Messages sorted by:** [date || thread || subject || author]
 - **Next message:** John Rademan: "Re: new survey on allocation of Universal Service subsidies"
 - **Previous message:** John Rademan: "Re: Required technology plans?"
-

Reply to: RE>us-nd-digest V4 #1

It is seen more and more that the implementation of the tech program is hindered by the cost that the Board of School Directors must budget for the following school years.

The following commitment to keeping the tech program up and in place is causing many school board members to veto the initial allocation for funding.

Again, the students are the ones who are not participating because there is that "bottom line" to be considered.

Sylvia

- **Next message:** John Rademan: "Re: new survey on allocation of Universal Service subsidies"
- **Previous message:** John Rademan: "Re: Required technology plans?"

Re: new survey on allocation of Universal Service subsidies

John Rademan (cradema@libby.litchpkeld.k12.az.us)
Wed, 18 Sep 1996 06:27:59 +0000

- **Messages sorted by:** [date || thread || subject || author]
 - **Next message:** Robert H. Terry: "Re: Required technology plans?"
 - **Previous message:** Sylvia Nespoli: "Re: us-nd-digest V4 #1"
 - **Maybe in reply to:** Bob Carlitz: "new survey on allocation of Universal Service subsidies"
 - **Next in thread:** Rex Buddenberg: "Re: new survey on allocation of Universal Service subsidies"
-

Richard Buro said:

> Until the most remote rural group has access, the provisions
> for Universal Service will not be realized. Priority should be given to
> unserved populations first, underserved populations second, and then to
> suburban and urban areas where services are more widespread.

How were the original telco's encouraged to reach the remote areas when the first legislation was proposed in the '30s? Is there some way to prioritize w/o bankrupting the new "mom & pop" network businesses starting off on a shoestring?

This challenge is too great for infant companies to survive, so somehow a mechanism to reach the remote areas needs to divide the costs among all the competitors. We need to encourage healthy competition, not enable powerful large corporations to extend their dominance.

- **Next message:** Robert H. Terry: "Re: Required technology plans?"
- **Previous message:** Sylvia Nespoli: "Re: us-nd-digest V4 #1"
- **Maybe in reply to:** Bob Carlitz: "new survey on allocation of Universal Service subsidies"
- **Next in thread:** Rex Buddenberg: "Re: new survey on allocation of Universal Service subsidies"

Re: Required technology plans?

Robert H. Terry (rhterry@rbse.mountain.net)
Wed, 18 Sep 1996 10:09:20 -0400 (EDT)

- **Messages sorted by:** [date || thread || subject || author]
 - **Next message:** Stephanie Stevenson 904/939-2377/78: "Re: Checking in re us-nd"
 - **Previous message:** John Rademan: "Re: new survey on allocation of Universal Service subsidies"
 - **In reply to:** John Rademan: "Re: Required technology plans?"
-

Agree to both cases, a "problem space" first needs to be completely investigated and defined, then it needs to be mapped to an acceptable "solution space". The issues of milestones, technology neutral, and acceptance testing parts become normal pieces of the life-cycle.

Bob Terry

On Wed, 18 Sep 1996, John Rademan wrote:

```
> Dennis Small said:
> > Perhaps a "checklist" or
> > list of "milestones" could be developed to have an "approved plan"
> > (whether by the state or some other entity) that kept paperwork to a
> > minimum while ensuring that the important issues that are needed for
> > successful use of telecommunications have been addressed.
>
> Perhaps a technology plan needs to be a "function framework" which would
> be technology neutral? Essentially, the school district must have an
> idea of the way its technology should work, once installed. But each
> building or district is a separate case, which may require one or
> another of several possible technologies to be "plugged in" to function
> as needed. Training and technical support are the connections that make
> all the separate technologies work together. The plan allows the school
> or library to put the whole thing out to bid & let competition among
> suppliers determine the optimum technology for a particular function.
>
```

-
- **Next message:** Stephanie Stevenson 904/939-2377/78: "Re: Checking in re us-nd"
 - **Previous message:** John Rademan: "Re: new survey on allocation of Universal Service subsidies"
 - **In reply to:** John Rademan: "Re: Required technology plans?"

Re: Checking in re us-nd

Stephanie Stevenson 904/939-2377/78 (STEVENS@mail.firn.edu)
Wed, 18 Sep 1996 09:45:59 -0400 (EDT)

- **Messages sorted by:** [date || thread || subject || author]
 - **Next message:** Kevin Conde: "Re: Checking in re us-nd"
 - **Previous message:** Robert H. Terry: "Re: Required technology plans?"
-

This is just a thought to ponder, and I know I am preaching to the choir... this thought was put in our teacher boxes by our principal last week...

"If a doctor, lawyer, or dentist, (or telco professional:)) had 25-30 people in his office at one time, all of whom had different needs, an some of whom didn't want to be there and were causing trouble, an the doctor, lawyer, or dentist, without assistance, had to treat them all with professional excellence for nine months, then he might have some conception of the classroom teacher's job." author unknown

This being sure the cost of educational discounts not being passed on to the consumer issue is like so many other issues with respect to educating our future citizens. We want the best for ALL with equity in the most crowded, underpaid, understaffed environment. No one wants to pick up the tab. Schools not only are supposed to teach/train students to be the best in the world to uphold America's stature, but also to nurture them, instill values without bringing spiritual beliefs into the schools, straighten out those who are troubled, intervene in dysfunctional home situations to bring about a wholesome attitude for the student to succeed... but please do not pass on the cost to society for whom we are to provide all these miraculous services.

I love my students, I delight in teaching, finding how to integrate technology and telecommunications into the existing structure has been a wonderful adventure.. but I do get so tired of not enough resources and the attitude that football, sports, recreational activities, material things are more important than investing in our future. Our children are our future. What we put into it is what we will get. A kick back on a cell phone like Betty said is a small investment, in my opinion.

Stephanie
Stephanie Stevenson
stevens@mail.firn.edu
5th Grade Graduation Enhancement
Holley-Navarre Intermediate School
1936 Navarre School Road
Navarre, FL 32561
Phone:904-939-2377 FAX:904-939-0548

> On Tue, 17 Sep 1996, Eugene Stovall wrote:
>
> > innovation. Discussions of educational discounts should examine how to avoid
> > subsidizing these discounts by passing the costs directly to the universal
> > fund. We run the risk that the public will blame insignificant school
> > discounts for the massive rate increases currently planned by the telcos.
>

> Well, for what it's worth, in Texas our TIF (Technology Infrastructure Fund)
> receives my monthly "donation" each time I pay our cellular phone bill.
> It's clearly stated right there on the bill. The TIF money will be paid
> out via grants to schools needing hardware and software -- I'm not sure
> about staff development, but probably that, too.

>

> Betty

> Betty Dawn Hamilton * bhamilt@tenet.edu * 806.637.4523

> Learning Resources Specialist * Tenet Master Trainer * Brownfield High

> School

>

701 Cub Drive * Brownfield, TX 79316

> -----

>

-
- **Next message:** Kevin Conde: "Re: Checking in re us-nd"
 - **Previous message:** Robert H. Terry: "Re: Required technology plans?"

Re: Checking in re us-nd

Kevin Conde (KevinC@sutter.k12.ca.us)

Wed, 18 Sep 1996 08:22:15 -0700

- **Messages sorted by:** [date || thread || subject || author]
 - **Next message:** Rex Buddenberg: "Re: new survey on allocation of Universal Service subsidies"
 - **Previous message:** Stephanie Stevenson 904/939-2377/78: "Re: Checking in re us-nd"
-

At 06:21 PM 9/17/96 PDT, Eugene Stovall wrote:

>Greetings:

>

>Jerry's comments are absolutely on target. He directs our attention to the
>fact that discounts supported by the universal fund means asking consumers
>to accept additional rate increases. Currently, the California Public
>Utilities Commission is considering a 25% school discount which will be
>funded through a mandated rate increase. The incumbent telco, Pacific Bell,
>will be given another secure source of revenue without any competitive concern.

>

Eugene is also dead on target!

I view one of our biggest problems in California is that we only have one telecomm provider, usually PacBell. Since they don't have to compete, they have on incentive to lower costs, increase efficiency, or offer new and better services.

Kevin Conde

Technology Coordinator

Sutter County Superintendent of Schools Office

916-741-5115, x103

-
- **Next message:** Rex Buddenberg: "Re: new survey on allocation of Universal Service subsidies"
 - **Previous message:** Stephanie Stevenson 904/939-2377/78: "Re: Checking in re us-nd"

Re: new survey on allocation of Universal Service subsidies

Rex Buddenberg (budden@nps.navy.mil)
Wed, 18 Sep 96 09:29:43 -0700

- **Messages sorted by:** [date || thread || subject || author]
 - **Next message:** calvin branche: "week four"
 - **Previous message:** Kevin Conde: "Re: Checking in re us-nd"
 - **In reply to:** John Rademan: "Re: new survey on allocation of Universal Service subsidies"
 - **Next in thread:** Robert Mammel: "Re: new survey on allocation of Universal Service subsidies"
-

> Richard Buro said:

>

> > Until the most remote rural group has access, the provisions
> > for Universal Service will not be realized. Priority should be given to
> > unserved populations first, underserved populations second, and then to
> > suburban and urban areas where services are more widespread.

>

> How were the original telco's encouraged to reach the remote areas when
> the first legislation was proposed in the '30s? Is there some way to
> prioritize w/o bankrupting the new "mom & pop" network businesses
> starting off on a shoestring?

A lot of ISPs are definitely shoestring outfits. While there will certainly be a shakeout, they won't all be swallowed up by the telcos. Indeed, the reverse may be happen in our increasingly horizontally integrated information structure -- the telcos do what they can do best (provide terrestrial connectivity) and the ISPs do what excell in (provide internet services).

Rural telephone connectivity is indeed an interesting case study (CNRI has a series of monographs on infrastructure building, one of which is the telephone system).

The Bell System focussed mostly on the long distance problem and got into the local loop more by buying up the smaller telcos rather than direct investment in infrastructure. This, of course, left the rural areas out. A lot of them bootstrapped themselves by, for example, using the barbed wire fencing for connectivity ... and several neighbors chipping in for the switch and other equipment. There are still a few barbed wire systems around, but cellphone displaced a number and AMSC+Big LEOs should get the rest.

The disconnect that I see here is that the technology to reach rural areas is generally provided by companies that are outside of the regulatory framework. Because they do not have natural monopoly characteristics that would cause the government to regulate them. Given the cross-subsidization prohibitions in the legislation, we can't use the Universal Service subsidies for the technology that is appropriate to the requirement.

Desire to reach rural areas is not a sufficient reason to bring these unregulated companies under regulation. I haven't seen anyone on this list illustrate how we get from here to there...

Rex Buddenberg

- **Next message:** calvin branche: "week four"
- **Previous message:** Kevin Conde: "Re: Checking in re us-nd"
- **In reply to:** John Rademan: "Re: new survey on allocation of Universal Service subsidies"
- **Next in thread:** Robert Mammel: "Re: new survey on allocation of Universal Service subsidies"

week four

calvin branche (cbranche@innet.com)

Wed, 18 Sep 1996 14:34:17 -0400

- **Messages sorted by:** [date || thread || subject || author]
 - **Next message:** Travis Thompson: "Re: Free Email"
 - **Previous message:** Rex Buddenberg: "Re: new survey on allocation of Universal Service subsidies"
-

As I am reading responses to questions I am struck again by the idea that districts and / or regions should have a coordinated plan, and that this plan should include schools, libraries, health agencies, and PEG access operations (assuming that the area has one).

By coordinating objectives, and bearing in mind that state/ federal objectives should also be included, of those groups we might have a better idea of "what is needed" prior to finding out "how" to provide it.

When it comes to the hardware component I think that capacity, training, future funding, future directions, a coordinated and uniform technology (again, note the state/federal plans since there may be application for state-wide networking) should be part of a plan.

I don't think that it is simplistic to take a very large view of telecommunications services and universal funding as plans are being made by the FCC.

And I don't think that the idea of fostering competition under the Act should come before the idea of coordination. No easy advances will be made from the practical point of view if the former is the case.

Competition implies very strongly that the bottom line is money, whereas the idea of coordination implies that "the public interest" is uppermost in the scale of things.

It never ceases to amaze me that the "philosophy" of a cause (in this case, the fair application of Universal Service Funding) winds up being an "also-ran" when the carrot of money is dangled in front of us. Too late someone asks: "Now, what was it we were trying to do ?"

It may be that if there was a commonly accepted philosophy some of the disparate arguments over what kind of system, what kind of equipment, what kind of connection, who deserves what and why, might well be answered more simply if everyone knew just what the objective was.

cal branche
chair, Telecomm. Comm.
Pasco County, Fl.

- **Next message:** Travis Thompson: "Re: Free Email"

- **Previous message: Rex Buddenberg: "Re: new survey on allocation of Universal Service subsidies"**

Re: Free Email

Travis Thompson (*etechojt@juno.com*)
Mon, 16 Sep 1996 12:12:22 EDT

- Messages sorted by: [date || thread || subject || author]
- Next message: Ronda Hauben: "Re: Reality Check"
- Previous message: calvin branche: "week four"

On Mon, 16 Sep 1996 07:38:28 -0400 (EDT) Ronda Hauben
<rh120@columbia.edu> writes:

>
>So people's phone bills are being asked to subsidize
>a business promoting advertising and to invite this advertising
>into public schools and public libraries?
>

I suppose your scepticism is natural, since there is usually a catch somewhere in the small print. Juno has nothing to do with your phone bill. Juno is similar to the free computer and other newspapers that are totally advertiser supported.

Also in regards to advertiser support the most important consideration is probably what advertisers schools should allow to endorse, sponsor and/or contribute to schools. As you are probably aware many school programs and even the presence of computers would not exist if not for corporate contributions made for the free advertising received in return.

>The Internet was developed in a way that strictly limited advertising
>via an Acceptible Use Policy and that helped to make possible
>the important communication resource that was developed.
>

The Internet was developed as a military defense system and is based on individual collaboration and cooperation. Juno is an excellent example of how individuals can continue to control access and development of the Internet by supporting advertisers that sponsor services such as Juno that provide universal access to the majority of us the are not so fortunate to have free academic access to email.

>And there was a reason for this, among which is that there is a
>reason not to use tax money to subsidize advertising for companies.
>

There is no tax money involved in the development or use of Juno.

>It is to abandon the lessons and strength of this history to promote
>advertising and to say that to read email one has to be willing to
>put up with advertising, and then to call this "universal service".
>

All commercial services AOL, Compuserve, and most ISPs advertise and promote something on their networks so most of us are paying for our email and still expose to advertisements. Apparently, you have not tried Juno - if you investigate the service you may come away with a more