Meeting was called to order at 12:07 pm

In attendance:
- E. Borkowski, M. Parlett-Sweeney, F. Davis, A. Morris, S. Cotter (proxy for A. Ramasubramanian), A. Major ’12

Absent:
- R. Koopmann, K. George, T. McFadden

1. Review and approval of Minutes from 1/05/2011

2. Introduction of Shane Cotter who is filling in for Ashok Ramasubramanian until the end of the academic year while Ashok is on sabbatical.

3. Student representative Tayyab Shaikh ’11 is not enrolled this term and has asked to be removed from the committee. Ellen said that she will contact the Student Forum and see what the process will be to get another student representative.

   Felmon solicited comments on the synopsis of the *Analysis of Student Printing*. The intention of the synopsis is to offer a condensed version of the arguments and proposals laid out in the *Analysis*.

   Mary reported on the current problems in determining whether the Dutchmen Dollars system could be utilized to enable students to charge printing. The provider of the Dutchman Dollars system, *Off-Campus Solutions*, maintains its software cannot interface with print management software. This is an important obstacle as the print-for-pay card system is a centerpiece of the *Analysis's* proposals. The Copy Center has decided to proceed with the copier RFP (which currently includes the Pharos software in use for the current print management solution) even though it is not clear as to the likelihood of the Dutchman Dollars solution.

   No significant problems were detected in the *Synopsis* and once it is finalized, it was agreed it could be distributed to the members of the Chairs and Directors Group and more broadly to the faculty and staff.
Andy Morris asked why there was concern about possible pushback from the department chairs. Mary explained that there are several departments, primarily within Divisions III and IV, which provide free printing to students in departmental labs. There may be reluctance to remove that benefit from students. Shane Cotter (Division IV) concurred with that opinion and asked whether there was the ability (within print management solutions) to implement pay-for-print and still allow departments to keep the free access currently provided. Mary said that there would be a way to do this.

5. Alternatives to Zarca Survey Tool
Mary reported that although Zarca has lowered its licensing fee, it makes sense to consider alternatives as it is not clear that the features Zarca offers, and that we are paying for, are being utilized on campus; in that case, still less expensive software may satisfy our needs.

Mary proposes carrying out an evaluation of Zarca's usage and of its competitors' features. Since Division II and perhaps Psychology in Division III are the most likely users of survey instruments, Andy Morris volunteered to help gather faculty for an evaluation team.

6. Central Calendar
Felmon solicited suggestions for improving the write-up of publicity for the Central Calendar. The write-up is based upon a text composed by Jill Hungsberg and supplied to the committee by Ken George. While Ken was unable to attend today’s meeting, Felmon reported that before the meeting Ken had approved of it in the main and had offered some suggestions.

Felmon believes the write-up can be finalized fairly quickly. Ajay asked the committee their opinion as to who was the primary audience of the publicity; everyone generally agreed that the primary audience was the faculty and administrative staff. Based upon that, the sentiment at the meeting was that student newspaper (Concordiensis) is not an appropriate medium of publication as faculty and staff read it less. Ajay also noted that student events already have to be posted to the Central Calendar.

It was considered best to distribute to the campus by email and via the Chronicle as well as at other venues such as the planned Open Forums.

The Committee considered the idea of holding 'Town Hall Meetings' or 'Open Forums' at which faculty and staff could voice their opinions and ask questions about information technology at Union. The meetings should be held in various buildings throughout
campus. These would also be an occasion to provide brief explanations of the printing
*Analysis* proposals and the advantages of the Central Calendar as well as an introduction
of Ellen as new CIO. They can serve to heighten awareness among faculty and staff of
ways to communicate concerns and ideas to ITS such as the CIO's Dropbox. General
consensus was that the meetings should be considered more as an ‘Open Forum’ than a
meeting.

Ellen and Mary will work together to pick dates between now and the end of the
academic year for at least one Forum within each Division.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:01 pm

Reminder: LCACT website: [http://minerva.union.edu/accsc](http://minerva.union.edu/accsc)