Meeting was called to order at 1:00 pm

In attendance:

- M. Parlett-Sweeney, F. Davis, S. Sargent, R. Koopmann, A. Ramasubramanian, T. Shaikh ’11, K. George

Absent:

- D. Cossey, A. Major ’12, T. McFadden

1. Minutes from 3/2/10 were reviewed and approved.

2. Bandwidth Management Policy – After evaluating the data from the bandwidth management software, ITS decided to revise the draft of the bandwidth management. All restrictions based upon protocols have been removed. Data indicated that when throughput caps were not in place, individual users would take as much as 25-30 Mbps throughput, generally doing gaming, video streaming, or VOIP applications. Subsequent users got increasingly smaller throughput which slowed their network connection. When the throughput cap was in place, no single user was able to take larger chunks of the throughput and subsequent users were able to have reasonable throughput and speed.

Mary described a student who called to complain that he had gotten up earlier (11am) to play his Xbox and that the network was too slow. The bandwidth management software was beginning to sharply increase around 10am and had almost peaked at 11am.

The committee agreed that the throughput caps were an appropriate measure. Becky Koopmann suggested that it would make sense to drop the cap at 6pm on Friday and then reinstate the cap sometime during Sunday afternoon when students tend to start studying. The other members of the committee agreed to that modification. Mary will bring a final version of the policy to the next meeting.

3. Communications to Campus – Felmon Davis brought up the idea (discussed earlier in the year) of having a summary communication sent to the faculty. Instead of having the faculty co-chair of the committee send out a summary, Felmon proposed that the responsibility for the summary rotate among the faculty members. Faculty members agreed that this rotation made sense.

The question came up as to ways to communicate with students. Tayyab Shaikh agreed that this was very difficult and that there really was no good to get feedback from and information to students. Ashok Ramasubramanian suggested a campus-wide “messaging board” where all kinds of questions could be asked and anyone could answer – sort of a combination between the social@union.edu and the academics@union.edu listservs. Ken George said that, during the logo evaluation process, the Communications office had used the social networking site Ning. Ashok asked Tayyab to poll students and see what they thought about the idea of a message board. Tayyab will report back at the next meeting.

4. Student Survey – Mary announced that the 2010 Student Survey have been distributed to students
on March 26, 2010 with a survey end date of April 12, 2010. Some initial results from the survey:

- 2123 surveys distributed through Zarca
- 664 email messages read (31.3%)
- 543 students responded to the survey (25.6%; or 82% of the “read”)
- With respect to printing:
  a. 71.6% print to a personally-owned printer; 47.2% use the library; 9.2% use ME classrooms; numbers for other areas drop down from there. (Note: total is greater than 100% since respondents could select all that apply.)
  b. 71.3% were either moderately or very interested in a campus-wide pay-for-print system that includes a number of free pages; 38.1% were moderately or very interested in an expansion of the current pay-for-print system.

5. Student Printing – Steve Sargent said that he’s had fewer problems with students telling him that they couldn’t print a paper since he told them that they had to figure out where to print. Steve wondered whether ITS could put together a list of places for printing that could be distributed to students. Mary has a list of facilities based upon ITS information. She will send it out to the four faculty representatives and ask them to update it and use it to identify printing capabilities and availability.

Additionally, Mary has been investigating whether or not it would be possible for students to use their ID card for printing charges in the pay-for-print system. She will be following up with the Bookstore and Dining Services since they are the primary users of the declining balance system.

6. User Support Survey for Faculty – A draft of the proposed survey was reviewed and discussed by the committee. There was some question as to choice of wording for the satisfaction Likert scale being used; after discussion, it was decided that wording would stand. Ashok Ramasubramanian asked whether any questions were mandatory. Originally, none were but after discussion it was decided that the first question (what Division) should be the only mandatory question.

7. New Business – Ken George would like to be put on the agenda for the next meeting in order to discuss the status of the College’s website “reboot”

The meeting was adjourned at 2:03 pm

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