Meeting was called to order at 1:35 pm

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

Absent:
- R. Koopmann, T. McFadden

1. Review and approval of Minutes from 3/2/2011

2. Follow-up discussion about Linux

The committee discussed the ideas suggested by Mark Wunderlich for Linux support on campus. Felmon reminded the committee that the ideas had been originally discussed in a Linux Users Group meeting but that he hadn't been at that meeting and didn’t know all the discussion around the suggestions. Thoughts from the committee included:
- a Linux event table may be more a matter for the user group than for ITS
- publicly accessible Linux computers are probably not of much interest to the majority of students. Ajay believes that it is unclear whether students would frequent them
- Ajay believes Linux use is more or less confined to a fairly small group of students; while the annual ITS student survey indicates 2-4% use Linux that would still only be between 40-80 students
- Documentation for Linux should comparable to the documentation provided for other platforms (Windows and Macintosh).

It is unknown if access via ssh would be important to most Linux users or whether current means of access via webdav and VPN suffice for most. Felmon will be testing VPN and talking to the Users group.

It was unclear whether scripting support should be offered as it would not necessarily be comparable to what is offered to users of other platforms since there isn’t much call for scripting with Windows or Mac computers. Felmon provided an example of developing a script to build an email distribution list from email addresses contained in a series of emails and asked what type of support ITS would provide for a Windows user who requested assistance in doing this type of action. Mary explained that a support person would sit with
the user, walk them through the process of creating a distribution list in the email application and show them how to copy an address to the distribution list and make sure they were comfortable doing it themselves. Then they would be left on their own to complete the distribution list. Andy agreed that this was generally the level of support that he would expect.

Felmon urged more study of what would be needed for Linux support on campus. Providing Linux support should not overly burden ITS considering the relatively small percentage of Linux users on campus however more than is currently being done should be done. Felmon will discuss the suggestions again with Mark and the Linux group, see if the “wish list” could be prioritized and report back to the committee. (The Linux group meets this term alternate Fridays in the Humanities Lounge, 2nd Floor of Humanities Bldg.)

3. Moodle Update

Mary reported on the status of the Moodle evaluation. For the spring term there are about 30 faculty using Moodle in about 40 courses. The number of faculty is about the same as during the winter term because it was decided not to increase numbers but to focus on the faculty and the questions they are raising.

To date, faculty seem to be very positive about Moodle. Mary reported that most of the feedback so far has been anecdotal; ITS plans on surveying the faculty to get a more quantitative picture. Student feedback about Moodle has been gathered with students being surveyed at the end of both fall and winter terms. The winter term survey has just ended with a fairly lukewarm response rate compared to fall term; 40% responded to the first survey but only 17% to the second. From the quick review Mary has done it appears that student response to Moodle is fairly positive.

Andy Morris commented on some positive features of Moodle as well as features that require getting used to, coming from Blackboard, or are inferior to Blackboard. He is quite happy with Moodle.

Mary reports the 'branding' of the site as well as other configuration improvements will continue. She also notes that, while it is relatively easy to port content from Blackboard, many people have chosen not to because they generally create a course from “scratch”, uploading content each time they teach a course.

As of now, ITS's position is “it is a go to make the move.” They would plan on running Moodle in tandem with Blackboard for one academic year but it will be important to move everyone to Moodle by September 2012 as the Blackboard license will be up for renewal in September 2012 and ITS does not plan to renew.
4. Exchange 2010 Update

Mary reported that all Exchange 2007 pilot participants have been moved to Exchange 2010 and are happy with the improvements. There has been one problem identified - there is a bug, admitted by Microsoft, which occurs in very special circumstances affecting the ability of a handful of users of Exchange 2003 to see attachments sent from Exchange 2010 clients. This will be a moot point when all users are converted.

Moving users to Exchange 2010 requires touching all the Macs and some Windows computers so it is a fairly labor-intensive process. The plan is to have the transition mostly completed by the end of the summer.

Felmon has received a couple of complaints about user quotas. Mary explained that under Exchange 2003 the limit is 500MB but will be 2GB under Exchange 2010.

One user has pressed the case to Felmon that the sky should be the limit as he and many others use email as 'storage'. Ellen made the point that unlimited storage is not generally considered 'best practices'. Ellen asked how the 2GB limit was decided upon; Mary replied that the limit had arbitrarily been selected based upon the current amount of storage available.

Felmon asked what size limitation there were on emails. Mary stated that on the academic email server, one can send and receive attachments of up to 20MB. She noted that there have been requests for higher limits at various points in time.

5. Zarca Update

In addition to evaluating the current usage of Zarca on campus, Mary has also identified four other survey tools that might be reasonable alternatives. Because of SurveyMonkey’s popularity, Mary looked at pricing plans for it as a comparison. SurveyMonkey would cost between $23,000 to $28,000 for features equivalent to Zarca's, though this is prior to negotiating any special deals with them.

Currently, Zarca’s annual cost is $31,892; Mary has negotiated with Zarca and the current quote is $16,000-$17,000.

SurveyMonkey has the advantages that it is easier to use for simple surveys; there is a fairly steep learning curve with Zarca. It is not clear what kind of support SurveyMonkey would offer; currently support for Zarca is handled by Zarca. It used to be handled by the Web Communications Office but support transitioned to Zarca about a year ago.
The sentiment, however, seems to be to stay with Zarca as many of the heavier users are reluctant to invest in a new bout of training for unclear prospective benefits. Mary will be making a recommendation to Dean McCarty within the next week.

6. Email as a Campus Communication Tool
Ken cited some informal statistics from a colleague about the number of announcements and other messages sent last term and this term so far.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Rough numbers for student email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>202 announcement emails</td>
<td>2 week period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260 event emails</td>
<td>12 announcement emails</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2011 (to date) | 30 event emails |
|               |                 |
| 104 announcement emails |                 |
| 111 event emails   |                 |

Felmon would like to pursue ideas Ellen has brought up about incorporating a digest of emails. This might help stem the flood of emails that people complain about. It would be part of a two-pronged strategy, the Central Calendar on one side, and a different style of email distribution on the other. ITS is currently reviewing various listserv applications – some of these will have the ability to provide a digest of emails.

Andy pointed out that it should be noted that some are not as bothered by the amount of email. Many people prefer to get the email reminder about upcoming events and simply delete those that don’t interest them.

Ellen notes that changing technology, for instance, introducing a digest, does not obviate organizational problems such as who gets to post and the need to establish guidelines. She notes how often corrections to announcements get posted. Felmon agrees in principle but despairs of the degree to which one can limit human fallibility.

Ellen reported that she is in working with Chuck Assini (College counsel) to consider shortening the time email is archived for purposes of 'e-discovery'. The least time permitted by law is best.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:37 pm

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