Meeting was called to order at 1:00 pm

In attendance:
- D. Cossey, M. Parlett-Sweeney, S. Sargent, R. Koopmann, A. Ramasubramanian, T. McFadden, A. Major ’12, T. Shaikh ’11

Absent:
- F. Davis, K. George

1) Minutes from 9/22/09 were reviewed and approved.

2) Dave Cossey gave the committee an update on the network problems that began at the start of the term. A number of changes have been made to the network, both hardware and software, and it was thought that the problems had been resolved. IPLogic (a local company) is being hired to do an audit of the network. Ashok asked whether the problem has decreased in severity. Dave’s response was that it has and buildings/departments are more functional. Mary asked the student representatives whether or not they felt the situation had improved (from the student perspective). Ajay said that it had improved in some buildings but not in others.

Dave talked about some of the things that are impacting the network and adding to the network traffic; for example, large file downloads (terabyte downloads have been seen), and Security’s video cameras (top “talkers” on the network). One of the expected outcomes of the network audit will be the identification of “Best Practices”.

Becky Koopmann asked if the network audit will take into consideration the Wold building’s impact on the network. Dave said that it would look at that and help Union to identify what capability will need to be “backfilled” because of the additional network infrastructure from Wold.

3) PC Vendor Evaluation – Dave announced that ITS will begin an evaluation of vendors for the PC hardware purchased by ITS. This includes desktops, laptops, netbooks, and tablet computers. We will be sending out a Request for Information (RFI) to the three primary vendors that sell both desktops and laptops. The three vendors are: Dell, Lenovo, and HP (selling both HP and Compaq).

Tom McFadden asked why we weren’t strictly looking at laptops since it is a growing percentage of the equipment used. Mary responded that while the number of faculty members choosing a laptop is increasing, a larger percentage still chooses a desktop as their primary office computer. The faculty representatives on the committee agreed with the assessment that there was still a strong need for a desktop option.
Steve Sargent asked whether there was a possibility of going strictly to a dual-boot Macintosh configuration. Mary said that, while ITS is using that type of configuration in the electronic classrooms and expects to increase the number of rooms that use this configuration, it is still not necessarily the best solution for faculty office computers. There is a growing number of faculty who are selecting a Macintosh laptop option and having it configured with Windows but we are not seeing that same increase for faculty who need a desktop configuration.

Ashok Ramasubramanian said that Division 4 faculty members who feel that they are being pigeonholed into vendor choices that don’t meet their needs have raised concerns about the ITS purchasing process. They feel that, especially with computers used in research/research labs, there should be more flexibility in buying what they want not what ITS supports. The lack of ITS support for a specific vendor could be handled by purchasing a customer service warranty.

4) Discussion of Agenda Items – Reviewing the list of agenda items remaining from the 2008-2009 academic year.
   
   • Outsourcing Student Email – Update the committee on an informational basis only. ITS hopes to begin implementation in January.
   • Policies (LMS course retention, consolidation of equipment policies) – ITS will work on and bring policies to committee for approval.
   • User Support Survey – Becky and Ashok volunteered to work with Mary on developing the survey.
   • Backup options for faculty – remove from consideration. ITS is now providing external hard drives to faculty.
   • Value of a campus portal – remove from consideration; this should be something that the web office should be considering. There could be questions on the user support survey about this.
   • Faculty needs with respect to data mining – remove from consideration; ITS is responsible for implementing after business offices determine what data needs to be made available. This should be addressed elsewhere.
   • Central Events Calendar – remove from consideration; this will be addressed by the web office as part of the web “reboot”
   • Learning Management System (LMS) alternatives – Evaluation beginning in ITS; update the committee on an informational basis; provide descriptions and features to committee as part of process.

5) New Business
   
   • Add student printing to informational items for committee. Mary has been tasked with seeing if a student can be added to the “Study Group on Student Printing” tasked by Planning & Priorities to look at the issue of student printing.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:57 pm

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