Meeting was called to order at 12:54 pm

In attendance:
- D. Cossey, M. Parlett-Sweeney, F. Orellana, M. Walker (proxy for S. Sargent), R. Koopmann, T. McFadden, A. Major ’12, T. Shaikh ’11

Absent:
- V. Barr, F. Davis, Web Office Representative (either J. Hungsberg or A. Carne)

1) Minutes from 1/20/09 and 2/3/09 were reviewed and approved. As a follow-up on the 2/3 discussion about Facebook, Tom McFadden announced that Schaffer Library’s Facebook site was “unveiled” today.

2) Discussion of the 2/3/09 meeting with Admissions and Committee on Teaching
There appears to be no technology-related action items for ITS that came out of the 2/3/09 meeting. It was agreed that prospective students will draw conclusions about the College based upon their experience with things like the website. Fernando thought that it would be interesting to have Admissions send out a survey to the students they contact to see what technologies they were looking for at an institution. Some of this information might actually be found in the results of the Student Survey since there were a series of questions specifically for first year students.

Mark felt it would be beneficial for ITS to routinely look at the information that is provided to the “Gatekeepers” and be sure that it is up-to-date and correct with respect to technology information. Ajay said that he was a Gatekeeper. He confirmed that they do have a manual and suggests that we get a copy and update it.

Mary suggested that the topic of student learning styles would be a good session to be jointly sponsored by CACT and COT. This needs to be followed up on.

3) Listserv Policy
Dave Cossey explained that there was a need for ITS to develop a listserv policy because of an issue with objectionable material having been sent to a listserv. Currently, there are 177 listservs in existence. All lists have an “owner” although a large percentage of the listservs have Shawn Shopmyer (who manages the listserv software) as the “owner”. Membership in a listserv can be handled in one of three ways:
   1. Open – anyone can subscribe to it
   2. Open+Confirm – anyone can subscribe but they will receive an automated confirming email message that needs to be responded to before subscription actually occurs. This is designed to prevent things like “netbots” from joining a list and then flooding it with emails
   3. Closed – subscription needs to be approved by list owner
Some lists are created automatically – examples of this would be lists such as faculty@union.edu or Minerva House list.

Mark asked whether or not people can subscribe to a list with a non-Union email address and the answer is “Yes”. Tom and Mark brought up questions about moderation/approval of content posted to lists. Some lists (but not many) are set up so that all messages to the list have to be approved before they are sent.

Tom said that part of the problem is how to define content as “objectionable”. Policies that currently exist such as the Computing Rights and Responsibilities Policy, Code of Conduct (faculty, administrator, or student), and Biased Speech Policy should be used to identify “objectionable” and should also pertain to listserv use.

Dave informed the committee that the current Web Guidelines (developed by the Web Policy Board) stipulate that all personal websites (faculty and student) need to have a disclaimer that the content on the site is not reflective or representative of the College. Additionally, all web pages are supposed to have a Contact link. More information about the Web Guidelines can be found at:
http://www.union.edu/Resources/Technology/Web/guidelines.php

Dave and Mary will come up with a draft of a listserv policy and bring it to the Committee at a future date.

4) Email Archiving
Dave notified the committee that ITS has been told that they need to implement an email archiving system for faculty and staff. This is an issue that is being spearheaded by Chuck Assini, the College’s attorney and has to do with the need to produce email messages/electronic communications in the event of a legal case being brought against the College. Dave gave a brief overview of email archiving including the concepts of “e-discovery” and “litigation hold”. “E-discovery” occurs when there is a legal request to produce electronic communications such as email. “Litigation hold” is when electronic materials need to be retained in anticipation of possible legal action. Some issues that need to be addressed are how to achieve email archiving, what gets archived, and how long items are archived. Archiving of email would only be done for faculty and staff accounts; student email would not be archived.

Discussion and questions centered on various scenarios – examples include: users who have their email forwarded, email sent to non-Union accounts, email from a non-Union account to a non-Union account.

Mark asked if there was a possibility of using email archiving as a way to get users to reduce their existing mailboxes since a policy could be set that no email could be retained past the email archive date.

Dave said that there would be a webinar on a product from Postini (which is owned by Google) on Wednesday 2/18/09 at 2pm. Committee members were invited to attend if they had time.
5) Media Equipment Loan Project (formerly Media Services Discussion)

Fernando provided a list of equipment that would be nice for Media Services to have available to loan out to students. Equipment ranged in price from fairly inexpensive to several thousand dollars. The question really is not whether or not Media Services can loan this equipment but how to develop policies about loaning equipment. Issues related to equipment loan include:

- how to track what’s been loaned
- notifying people when equipment is overdue
- overdue fines (if needed)
- handling theft or breakage
- insurance

Dave suggested that, since the library already has a system for loan and tracking, it would make sense to see if there were ways to work with that. Mary will contact Cara Molyneaux in the library to see about setting up a meeting with her, Fernando, and Ginny Solomon (Media Services)

6) Student Survey – 592 students responded. 2181 invitations to participate in the survey were sent out. 31% were opened but only 27% of students actually did the survey. Becca Fiveland in Academic Computing is beginning to distill and analyze the data.

7) New Business:

- **Communications issues relating to problems in the electronic classrooms** – Becky brought to the committee’s attention the fact that at least two faculty members in Division 3 had encountered problems with the electronic classrooms at the start of the Winter term. While both understood that problems do occur, the fact that they were not kept informed about the status of the situation was more distressing to them. It was decided that questions relating to communications about classroom problems should be included in the User Support survey scheduled for Spring term.

- Mark Walker requested that a discussion of electronic classrooms be added to next meeting’s agenda. There has been discussion among the faculty about FYP and SRS classes; apparently a blanket statement that “there are not enough electronic classrooms” has been made. Mary said that she had been asked by David Hayes and Tom McFadden about the number of electronic classrooms on campus; she will prepare some information about the types and numbers of electronic classrooms for the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:05 pm.

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