Library, Media, and Academic Computing November 5, 2004

Attending were: Bill Barry (ex-officio), Randy Bentson, Sigrun Bodine, Karen Fischer (ex-officio), John Hanson, Rob Hutchinson, Norm Imamshah (ex-officio), Matt Murray, Geoff Proehl, Matt Warning (chair), and Paula Wilson, with visitors: Michael Nanfito and Mark Young

The meeting was called to order just after 1600, 2004/11/02.

The revised minutes for October 4 were approved.

At the invitation of the chair, Bentson restated his query about an OIS proposal to TPG. Imamshah and Young outlined the proposal to TPG for Microsoft Exchange/Outlook. It was described as server/client software which provides email/calendaring/collaborating and would replace the current webmail and corporate time system. It has its own web interface augmentetd beyond webmail, with support for IMAP clients. The administration is calling for calendaring software because our license is changing and support will be going away. This upgrade would cost X dollars to acquire necessary hardware, a Y dollars the first year, and Z dollars a year thereafter in licensing and support. (See footnote.)

The alternatives are to stay with what has become Oracle/Corporate Time for $65 to 70K/yr which will rise to $200K/yr, Novell for unspecified amount, IBM for (at least) $250 to 300K/yr, or find open source alternatives (which Norm dismissed). Barry questioned whether this topic is within LMAC's purview. Bentson replied that if LMAC is to review OIS's "mission and objectives" as called for in the bylaws, it should be aware of what OIS is doing on behalf of the faculty. Warning called a time-out on this thread and asked that we return to it as item 3 in the agenda.

Warning raised the issue of "extra stuff" in Cascade menus, specifically the questionnaires. He expressed concern that the list of options is growing. Bodine said she didn't notice. Proehl suggested that a proper hierarchy would push unwanted stuff to the side. This lead to the discussion of two possible outcomes: putting the new stuff on the bottom of any menu, and a mechanism permitting users to control how these lists of options are to be presented. **A motion was made, seconded, and approved that LMAC recommends new, transient items such as questionnaires be put at the bottom of menus.** In addition, Rob Hutchinson volunteered to put together a hierarchy of some sort for the cascade list.

Warning then re-exposed the continuing existential question: "What of LMAC?" (Someone said he was too late, this should have been asked at the beginning of the term.) Bentson noted since our task is in part to "review periodically the mission and objectives of the library and OIS and to recommend such changes as are needed" we needed to ensure these are testable (can be shown to be met or not met), and that we needed to see if

they are being met. Barry noted that the library has recently presented its M&O. Fischer noted that the library needs our review as part of an accreditation process. Barry said we should ask questions about processes which lead to decisions, e.g., would like to see input about data projectors and e-class rooms. Warning reiterated the question: "why are we here?" Imamshah would rather see LMAC be proactive than reactive. Warning reiterated the question: "why are we here?" Barry said LMAC can properly respond to OIS proposals. Proehl said we should have been consulted regarding Exchange and consulted regarding the new policy of e-mailing advisee changes. "Any thing which changes our digital workplace is of interest to us". He further likened LMAC to an "editoral function with respect to proposals." We should see more and provide critical review. As editors, we should also recognize not all suggested changes will be honored. Imamshah would rather see LMAC be proactive than reactive. Proehl noted that we are mostly reactive. Imamshah wants to see statement of requirements from faculty. He then noted that TPG will start reviewing/generating a Strategic Plan for Information Technology on November 15. Fischer noted that Refworks was rejected by LMAC and other faculty and was therefore not licensed. Imamshah would like to see SPIT reviewed by LMAC.

We adjourned, exhausted, at 1700.

Footnote: The updated values for X, Y, and Z were provided by Imamshaw on November 12. The initial equipment cost, X, is $101K; the one-time software cost, Y, is $5k; the recurring software and hardware costs are $15K/yr and $2K/yr respectively.

Submitted by Randy Bentson