

University of North Carolina at Greensboro
Academic Computing Committee

Meeting Minutes
9am-10:15am Friday October 31, 2014
Jackson Library Rm 216

Present: Aprille Black (Bryan Business School), Frances Clerk (HHS, Chair), Kenneth White (School of Music, Theater, and Dance) , Lixen Fu (College of Arts and Science), Todd Sutto(ITS), Bo Bodenhamer (Office of Provost), Michelle Soler (University Teaching and Learning Commons Representative), John Neufeld (Faculty Senate Liaison)

Not Present: Erin Lawrimore (University Libraries), Lois Von Cannon(School of Nursing), Fatih Oguz (School of Education),

Agenda Items

1. Minutes from last meeting approved. Todd Sutton to find someone to take minutes at next meeting.
2. Reports from Committee Liaisons
 - Aprille Black: The Bryan school ACC met; ITS covered their departmental overview as guest speakers.
 - Frances Clerk: IOC talked about the Poodle vulnerability. It has been patched in most places; there is a Poodle patch that works for the most part. There was also a discussion about the responsive design assets (the template will resize for whatever size you need automatically) University assets are available from Chris Waters, and they are working on documentation.
 - Noted that Canvas does incorporate responsive design. Blackboard is an old design that has to be updated.
3. Question about Box offering: It is necessary to store certain types of info – like student grades on a network drive for security reasons, and Box is intended for secure data. However, Box cannot sync with a network drive. Is this an intentional decision or is it not possible to change that?
 - Box duplicates what Google drive and Dropbox do. Box has more space and its more secure. There is a document from ITS that lists all cloud services and characterizes them as 1, 2, and 3 locks. Box is the only cloud service that is allowed to have FERPA

information. Noted that it is possibly an inconvenient way to sync files from a network drive into FERPA.

- ITS will present on Box next meeting, Dec. 5
 - John asked that Goggle invites be updated with location of meeting. Frances will do that.
4. Frances Clerk: Continue discussion from first ACC meeting about the ACC charge. To officially make a change in the charge, we have to present resolution to faculty senate.
- We can either change the charge of the ACC to match what we are doing, or we can go back to the original charge.
 - John Neufield: One reason the ATCC was formed is that no one was attending. The ATCC is plugged into the Provost in a way that the ACC was not—they had a direct line to the Provost. The result is that the chair of the ACC was given explicit permission to write to the Provost. Not sure where that is written. ACC members are not aware of that.
 - John talked about Net-Op software that is installed in computer labs and how faculty just doesn't know that it is even there. He has communicated extensively with ITS on this issue. He wonders if there are a number of other faculty who have had similar communications with ITS and if we could identify them and get their input.
 - Frances mentioned possibility that ITS inform committee about upcoming IT issues that affect Faculty before they are fully implemented.
 - Todd commented that from ITS perspective, IT initiatives do come from faculty. That this is a problem for ITS. They would like to communicate better with faculty and are searching for ways to do that.
 - Todd looks to these committees for input. It is a problem for ITS that they don't have enough feedback from faculty.
 - Todd talked about the Service Catalogue. This is an attempt to communicate to faculty.
 - Communication: how do committees communicate with faculty and departments? How does committee get input? There is no unified mechanism.
 - Faculty does not know about ACC.
 - Todd Sutton mentioned that the ACC should recommend that ITS communicate more with faculty about what is going on with the computing labs.
 - Lixen mentioned the possibility of a subcommittee to deal with computer lab issues.
 - Pedagogical issues that intersect with computing issues might be run through the UTLC Faculty Senate Committee

- What faculty members are represented on the new LMS faculty implementation team?
 - Lixen talked about a unified top down structure. Where one committee with representation from students and faculty would be the place where faculty could go. Right now there are a number of committees that deal with computing issues but it is not clear who deals with what.
 - Todd was looking for a list of those.
 - Discussion of differentiation between ATCC and ACC. Todd said the ATCC was more administrative and he saw the ACC as being more the voice of faculty.
 - Discussion about membership. Should committee have only faculty on it? Discussion of how non-faculty members are appointed.
 - The ACC should represent the faculty body with regard to computing issues.
 - Ken White said ACC should be the voice of the faculty in the trenches.
 - Discussion around looking at the sizes of the units and trying to identify more representation, especially from the larger units like the College and possibly HHS.
 - John talked about identifying people who are interested in IT issues and getting input from them. He thinks ITS might know who those people are.
 - Members having someone who could attend in their place if they cannot.
 - Policies can be found at policy.uncg.edu
ACC should review the policies that relate to Academic Computing that are listed there as that is part of their charge.
 - Consultation and representation activities of the committee are important.
5. Look at outstanding projects from last year and decide where to go with those.
 6. For next meeting: John Neufeld to discuss computing lab use for this committee.

Meeting closed at 10:15am