

Central Committee on Educational Technology 2005-2006

Meeting 11/8/2005

Meeting Minutes taken by Emily Puthoff

Attendance | Tom McQuaide (Chair), Erik Ekman, Jun Lin, Stan Kudzin, Ide Katims, Ping Jin, Emily Puthoff

Agenda:

Committee met to discuss and vote upon recommendations from SCAP committee 2004-2005. 5 recommendations were considered. CCET considered recommendations from #5 to #1.

5. CCET should consider disbanding the subcommittee and consider other means to assess proposals (e.g., review by the CCET committee).

On point 5, the CCET made a motion to have the Central Committee on Educational Technology review SCAP proposals directly with no subcommittee. Vote: 6 in favor, 1 opposed, 0 abstaining, Motion passed.

4. CCET should consider SCAP proposals going directly to Computer Services and not through the subcommittee at all.

3. CCET should be consider the feasibility of Computer Services first receiving proposals in order to determine from the outset what type of hardware, software, and accessories may be purchased through SCAP, and to determine if proposals are scheduled for upgrade under Academic Computing upgrade program.

On points 4 and 3, the CCET recommended that the Central Committee and Computer Services should receive the proposals prior to meeting so all parties will have time to read through the proposals thoroughly. Computer Services will be invited to sit on the committee to offer input on the feasibility of the proposals at the time of review.

CCET (Tom McQuaide) is contacting Academic Computing to get clarification on the Academic Computing Upgrade Program: i.e. the pending future schedule for upgrades and eligibility for new applicants. CCET will provide this information once obtained to SCAP applicants on our website. SCAP applicants should determine prior to submitting their proposal whether the proposal is eligible for the Academic Computing Upgrade Program.

2. CCET should develop ways to improve communication between SCAP subcommittee and the Capital Planning Council in order to better address potential construction and space issues vis a vis proposals.

1. A representative from Facilities should be invited to join the SCAP subcommittee.

On points 2 and 1, CCET recommended that it is the responsibility of the SCAP applicant to determine feasibility and obtain approval for space from Facilities and/or Capital Planning Council prior to submitting their proposal for that calendar year. A member of Facilities will be invited to join the SCAP committee.

Committee determined deadline form SCAP Proposals 2005-2006

Motion for deadline of SCAP proposals (15 copies to committee) to be set for January 25th, 2006, provided follow-up with Jon Lewitt that this deadline allows Academic Computing enough fiscal time to process grants in late March.

Motion accepted unanimously