Meeting was called to order at 12:57 pm

In attendance:
- M. Parlett-Sweeney, F. Davis, S. Sargent, R. Koopmann, A. Ramasubramanian, T. Shaikh ’11, G. Golderman (proxy for T. McFadden),

Absent:
- D. Cossey, A. Major ’12, K. George

1) Minutes from 2/16/10 were reviewed and approved.

2) LMS Course Retention Policy – After discussion, the policy was approved with one modification. Steve Sargent suggested, and Becky Koopmann agreed, that courses should be retained for 5 years rather than 4 years. This was based upon the possibility that a course would be taught once every 4 years AND the faculty member had a year of sabbatical during that time.

3) Bandwidth Management Policy – Mary distributed a draft of the bandwidth management policy and gave a brief overview of the current network configuration.
   - 2 Internet Service Providers (ISP) – one provides 60 Mbps (Megabits per second) throughput and one provides 80 Mbps throughput.
   - Faculty & staff network traffic goes in and out the 60 Mbps “pipe”. Its usage rarely goes above 30 Mbps.
   - Student traffic goes in and out the 80 Mbps “pipe”; its usage is generally saturated/maxed out. Individual students often have 10-25 Mbps usage – normally this is either streaming video or gaming.

   ITS has the opportunity to increase the 80 Mbps “pipe” (student network) up to 125 Mbps at no additional increase in cost. However, there is a concern that the “pipe” would very quickly be saturated and its usage would be close to 100% almost immediately. In order to be pro-active in managing the bandwidth on the student network, ITS has drafted a bandwidth management policy. The proposed policy prioritizes network traffic, identifies critical usage times, and places a restriction on an individual user’s throughput speed.

   Discussion centered around two primary areas: (1) is there evidence of a need for the policy (in other words, why can’t anyone do what they want on the network), and (2) if there is a need, does the proposed policy make sense.

   Gaming and streaming video take the most bandwidth. Tayyab Shaik said that it is typically the students playing online games who complain to him about the speed of the network. Ashok Ramasubramanian asked if it was possible to see data showing the network usage with and without management in place. Mary said that it should be possible to get data showing the usage although she
was unsure of what timeframes data was available for. Gail Golderman said that, from the library perspective, it was very important that students have ready access to academic resources (library databases, Blackboard, etc.) and that type of network traffic should be given high priority. It was decided that the draft of the policy should be tabled until the first spring term meeting. ITS will gather data with and without bandwidth management during the first week of April (at the start of the spring term) and will present the data at the first meeting of spring term.

4) Student Printing – Discussion of student printing was tabled until spring term meetings

5) Spring term meetings – Tuesdays during the common hour appears to be a good time for meetings. Mary will contact the chair of the FEC to find out when the Faculty meetings will be held. Once she has that information, she will send out a schedule of proposed meetings.

6) Communications – Tayyab did see the article in the Concordy. Felmon will notify the faculty when the minutes of a meeting have been posted to the committee’s website.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:52 pm

Reminder: LCACT website: http://minerva.union.edu/accsc