24 Church Hill Road

 Walthamstow

 London

 E17 9RX

23rd August, 2007

Dear Ann,

 I am writing you concerning my summer work.

I have been aggrieved about the purchase of a VLE (the Semantise project, from Dr. Oggy East), as I find myself in a position, where I am regarded within the school as an IT expert, and yet, on a major IT project I was not consulted, or even informed until after the purchase was made. I was told on numerous occasions that I would not be involved in the project, and yet the project would have been a complete failure without my input, on several occasions! The latest occurred today, when after discovering the Semantise server had failed, Helen ordered me to abandon the work that I was doing for Nathan, and make the Semantise server the priority. At no time did she consult with me what work I was doing for Nathan, or the implications of abandoning this work, merely stating the she was Nathan’s boss. I find this whole affair with Semantise disturbing, and a personal affront to my professional abilities.

As a result of this, the work I was supposed to do is now likely to be incomplete. Nathan suggested that I could make up more of my hours by working next week, but I have already made plans to return to Norway, where I have spent most of my summer.

I had already informed Nathan that I would require approximately two weeks uninterupted time to complete this project, and was told I would be protected for the final week of term, and I would have time in the summer. In my own estimation I will have spent six days working on this. I cannot and will not be held responsible for the failure of either of these projects.

I am redoubled in belief that the proposal I drafted in July is needed now more that ever; Had it been in place, I doubt that the situation I find us in would have occurred. I cannot, and will not accept any responsibility for the situation that has occured; it has happend because the people managing me have failed to protect my time, and failed to engage me fully in Trinity’s IT policy.

Nathan stated to me that one of the reasons that my proposal was turned down, was because of the situation regarding the lower site wireless network. What has not been considered is that I actually recommended the competitors system, which was turned down because it was more expensive. When it came to resolving the issues, the engineer that performed the quote for the competing system, actually found my post to the Windows Server chat rooms, and provided me with an answer, faster than the company paid to perform this service!

Overall, I must reiterate my belief that Trinity’s IT policy is deeply flawed; we (the technicians) are merely reactive to problems that occur with the Network. We are never proactive. The school constantly reiterates scarcity of money, but has little interest in making smart purchasing decisions (at least, regarding IT), and plunges money it into projects of limited value. There are many schools with far better IT provisions, with similar costs to Trinity. Many of my friends, working in other businesses, and other schools, simply cannot believe the money that we spend on printers and printing, especially in an age, where the new driving force is the green economy!

 There has been no drive to teach teachers how to properly use IT within the school, and many teachers are left shouting help, when a particular piece of equipment (usually a projector) fails. And with all equipment being held by departments, and jealously guarded, when a certain piece of equipment fails there is no central pool on which to draw, and teachers are left without important equipment, whilst other simply gather dust in cupboards. It seems completely insane to me. Additionally, with the adoption of KS3 IT, and a compulsory short course IT GCSE, it seems insane not to expand the IT facilities in the school.