Meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m.

In attendance:

Absent:
- K. George

1. Welcome Sushane Gupta
   a. A second student did not apply to be a LCACT student representative. We welcome ideas from the committee to obtain another student representative. For example, should we reach out to Computer Science faculty to help with recruitment?

2. Review and approval of Minutes from 10/21/2013
   a. Minutes from 10/21/2013 were approved as submitted.

3. Updates
   a. Updating charter of Liaison Committee regarding representation
      i. As a reminder, the current LCACT charter indicates that the committee must include someone from Web Communications and the suggestion was made in a past LCACT meeting to remove that requirement. There is a faculty meeting in winter term and this item will come up for a vote. In addition, a request has been made to rename “Academic Computing” to “Learning Technologies & Environments” within the charter, to reflect the organizational change that went into effect this past July 1.

   b. Lunch & Learning Technology Innovations–November 7
      i. Four faculty are kicking off the first Big ideas. Small moments. Building Connections. lunch & learning technology innovations series by discussing "Exploring What to Do with an iPad in Teaching and Research". They will discuss the "Why" and "What" behind their instructional technology strategies, with an opportunity for attendees to ask questions and share ideas of their own. The idea is to have an open forum three times a term covering an array of different topics. Each event will begin with a selected topic and at least one faculty member sharing his or her big (or small) idea(s) to kick off discussion.
c. Winter term IEF Teaching with Technology grants

   i. There were three proposals submitted for Teaching with Technology (TwT) grant consideration for fall term. Two of the five met the TwT guidelines, which required the proposal to clearly define why/how leveraging the identified technology might help improve teaching and learning outcomes and how the faculty member planned to measure and assess successful acquisition of those desired outcomes.

   ii. The committee was asked to remind faculty in each of the respective divisions that these funds are available within the IEF grant process each term and encourage their colleagues to submit a proposal for winter term.

d. Digital Studio

   i. The first Digital Studio User Group meeting occurred on October 24th. In addition, equipment for the Production Studio was ordered and has arrived (e.g., studio lights, cameras, microphones, headphones, and an iMac/editing software). A black curtain backdrop was also installed on a ceiling mounted runner that spans halfway around the Production Studio (for those faculty and staff that do not want to use the chromakey greenscreen backdrop). The Digital Studio will be completing the installation of acoustic sound paneling in one of the multi-purpose rooms and a sound barrier wall will be built between the FCRC and isolation booth over the next several weeks. The entire Digital Studio space is set for a hard launch on January 2, 2014.

4. Google Apps for Education Memo

   a. The committee continued its discussion initiated last week about the memorandum of explanation regarding the decision to move to Google Apps for Education for e-mail services. The discussion continued to focus on the three main requests:

   i. Request 1: The commercial agreement between Union College and Google governing the College’s use of Google Apps for Education be made available to the members of the campus community.

      1. It was noted that the FEC is the liaison to senior staff and the LCACT interacts with the CIO. It was put on the table that this item (i.e., the request for the contract) be sent up to FEC to review and decide on whether the request be forwarded to Senior Staff.

   ii. Request 2: LCACT and FEC together appoint a study group charged to thoroughly examine concerns and on that basis re-revaluate all commercial agreements between Union College and Google with an eye toward offering policies to address them as completely as possible.
1. The members of the committee agreed that the LCAST committee does not have the jurisdiction to create/appoint this study group. Who would the group report to—Ellen? The question was raised if the results were meant for senior staff or for ITS to consider. The committee agrees the creation of this group needs to go to the FEC for consideration.

iii. Request 3: FEC use the lessons from this matter to formulate a campus-wide policy on the dissemination and circulation of information including the terms of relevant commercial contracts, that empowers members of the Union community to participate in the shared governance of the college.

1. When asked what the end goal of this broad charge is, the answer given was that the primary goal is to evaluate the evidence of risk of e-mail traffic getting offloaded to a server that is not in house. To the faculty that signed this memo it is a privacy issue in terms of control over your ideas. Who has access to our stuff? This question includes e-mail and all documents that people could potentially upload to a cloud-based environment, like Google Docs. Is there an alternative e-mail service that is willing to provide more transparency about what they will/will not do with our material on their server? The study group may come back and say they are satisfied with the current Google environment. They may come back with a recommendation for one of these alternative e-mail providers.

2. The point was raised that it is important to differentiate between the regular consumer Google agreement and Google Apps for Education (GAFE) agreement and what apps fall under each area. Union College’s GAFE agreement protects all content as all content is owned by Union College, not Google. There are no ads under GAFE. It was noted that there are still several individuals, including some who have signed this memo, who are currently forwarding their Union Gmail to their personal Gmail or other e-mail service account. Doing this compromises the protections defined in the current contract – the content is now governed by the consumer terms of service and not our GAFE agreement. Feedback indicates that we need to do a better job of educating people about the differences. If Google were to change the GAFE agreement in any way, we would be notified and would have the option to opt out at that point in time.

3. It was stressed that the study group can’t just look at e-mail in their evaluation. They would have to consider the total cost of running this service, which includes e-mail archiving. It should be noted that Union College has already been using Google to archive e-mail for a long time under Postini. The study group would need to determine the costs to set up an appropriate storage infrastructure that will expand as our e-mail usage expands. The study group also needs to consider the costs involved with migrating staff and student accounts.
4. A draft motion is going to be put together by Steve Sargent (Co-Chair of the LCACT) that can be critiqued and voted upon in the next meeting.

5. New Business
   a. The committee asked that the requested information Denise sent out to LCACT regarding how to access Gmail offline and how to use a client like Mac Mail be forwarded to all faculty.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:45 p.m.

Reminder: LCACT website:
https://its.union.edu/about-cio/committee-academic-computing-and-technology