1. Approval of Minutes – The minutes of the 12/07/07 and 02/01/08 meetings were approved.

2. Previous Meeting Action Item Review
   a. Computer Lab Information – The library has information about hardware and software in their labs posted on the library website. Levin will work with all colleges during the summer to post a listing of all campus labs hardware and software.
   b. Web CT – no further issues.
   c. My Academic Planner features – Eric Forbes is attending today’s meeting to review.
   d. Moodle implementation costs – Levin has been in contact with SFSU’s Director of Academic Technology who confirms that the Moodle implementation costs total $1.7 million; however Levin has not yet received a breakdown of these costs.
   e. Flyer regarding suggested file formats to be used (PDF and RTF vs. Word and others) – Godard asks if Polewczak received any feedback from committee. Godard shared an auto reply email that he sends whenever he receives a document in Word format. There was discussion about posting some explanation on the ATC website.

3. Announcements
   a. Campus Quality Fee Proposal will go before the Faculty Senate on April 10, 2008.
4. Discussion Topics
   a. Academic Technology Reorganization and Quality Fee Proposal – Provost Hellenbrand

   Campus Quality Fee Proposal – This is an omnibus fee to cover a number of areas supporting instructional and co-curricular expenses, including technology. The fee will fund various academic projects some of which will be recommended by Academic Affairs. This fee is being discussed through the alternative consultation process rather than through a student referendum. Hellenbrand stated that this process will ensure that the fee is widely discussed and deliberated by a variety of groups including ATC.

   Polewczak asked about the timeframe of the proposal going through the approval process. Hellenbrand explained that ideally, the President will receive the proposal in early May, and pass on to the Student Advisory Committee, with the ultimate decision by Chancellor Reed by end of May. The fee would go into effect this fall.

   Polewczak asked if Hellenbrand has an idea of the feelings the faculty and students have regarding the fee. Hellenbrand explained he does not know about the students, but the faculty seem to be split into two groups: one group believes no fees should be imposed and the state should provide the funds, and the other group seems more engaged with the overall budget situation and their concerns lie more in the logistics, such as how the funds directly affect their individual college budget. Polewczak commented that he and Miller briefly spoke about the title just before the meeting began and do not feel Quality Fee is an appropriate name. Hellenbrand said that he is open to any suggestions on the name since it was decided on very quickly. The name can be changed as it goes before the President, so Hellenbrand asked for suggestions to be sent to him. Hellenbrand encourages the committee as a whole or individually to provide feedback directly on the Campus Quality Fee web site.

   Academic Technology Reorganization - This collaboration brings a group of people together as a team to work on technology issues. It is essential to provide faculty a resource team they can go to and get the assistance needed. Many things with technology are interconnected and one team will be more effective than having a more fragmented approach.

   b. ATI – Sue Cullen

   Cullen provided a handout with an overall project timeline (September 2008 – fall term 2012); as well as a more detailed April timeline with sample templates for faculty to use to create accessible web pages. With the Academic Technology reorganization, the ATI team is now located in the garden level of the Oviatt Library. There are three areas ATI: procurement, web and instructional materials. The team along with the CSU is looking at each area as a process to determine how to continually improve compliance efforts.

   A pilot project to address instructional websites is currently taking place in Humanities working with Stephanie Nguyen. In the next few weeks the team will begin working with HHD. Each college will have the opportunity to have the ATI team provide one-on-one assistance with the templates that have been created. Each college ATI coordinator
Polewczak asked if other styles are available for use or only the templates they have created. Cullen explained that the templates are a guide, and as long as the formats are accessible, other styles can be used. The templates that have been created are easy to use to meet the basic needs for all faculty members. Some faculty members have more advanced technical skills which enable them to incorporate accessibility into their web pages without the use of templates or assistance from an ATI coordinator.

Polewczak mentioned concerns about departments like math and science, which utilize formulas, and the difficulty with making this information accessible. Cullen explained that there are many advances in this area and suggests they discuss further on an individual basis. Cullen asked the ATC committee members to provide feedback on the templates and any suggestions on how to disseminate the information.

c. Digital Repository – Elizabeth Altman, Luiz Mendes and Helen Heinrich
Altman provided a handout with an overview of CSUN eCommons; a repository for instruction, research and administration. The Library is currently working on this repository which is built on the dSpace software program that MIT utilizes. The repository project is part of CSU Scholar Works, which is part of the strategic plan of the CSU Council of Library Directors. The Library is reviewing the potential uses for the repository. The first area of focus is on learning objects which includes audio and video files, tutorials, animations and exercises and stimulations. Other potential uses of the system are for storing conference proceedings and CSUN’s WASC information.

Dobbour asked about any copyright issues on work that has been published. Mendes explained that the individual would need to consult with their publisher.

d. SOLAR – Eric Forbes and Tracey Shields
Forbes provided a handout listing SOLAR and SOLAR-related projects currently in progress and those not yet scheduled. This list was determined last May and the list is reviewed each quarter to update progress and see if any adjustments are needed.

Cleveland mentioned the My Academic Planner (MAP) software works well for a student who does everything right, but is difficult when planning out the final semesters. Forbes explained this is an early version of the MAP software and development is continuing.

Polewczak asked about having an area within SOLAR to write advising notes. Forbes explained that SOLAR has this capability and that it is currently used only with the early warning system (TEWS). Forbes also mentioned that there are records management and legal considerations to review before we could expand this functionality.

Cleveland asked about having the graduation application available in the system instead of paper format. Forbes noted that this functionality is connected to the online billing project, also known as eMarket.
Godard asked about registration linkage for a course that includes a lecture and a lab. Forbes noted that if one combined grade is required for the lecture and lab, the SOLAR system can link the lecture and lab. He explained that when separate grades are required for the lecture and lab, the current SOLAR functionality cannot link the lecture and the lab and student must register for the lecture and lab separately. Forbes explained we are conducting a feasibility study to determine the CSUN cost to change this functionality. Forbes also mentioned that another problem occurs when courses are cross-listed.

Godard asked about the creation and distribution of permission numbers. Forbes explained that new permission number functionality became available last summer and additional functionality will be available in a future SOLAR release, including the ability to assign permission numbers to students to drop classes online.

Godard asked about a feature that would require students to complete online course evaluations, prior to issuing grade, or withholding course enrollment for the next semester. Forbes mentioned that currently there is no linkage planned between a SOLAR event such as release of grades or registration and on-line course evaluations. He mentioned that Institutional Research is the custodian of the current combination of scan and on-line functionality for course evaluation so perhaps Bettina Huber could reveal any development in this area or review any salient recommendations.

The committee requested that Forbes return for a MAP demonstration at a future meeting.

5. Chair’s Report
   a. ERC/ATC joint meeting – ERC has proposed a joint meeting for possibly April 15th, 2-4pm. Approximately four ATC members can attend on this date. Godard proposed that the members who can attend do so, and he will confirm details with the ERC chair and send an email to ATC.
   b. Elections of new ATC members within the colleges should have taken place or will take place for the members whose terms are expiring this year. Jeff Wiegley may be replacing Xiyi Hang; no others have been confirmed.
   c. Election of a new ATC chair will take place at the May 2nd meeting.
   d. Dissemination of ATC information to other committees has not been clarified yet. Godard sent a note to Jennifer Matos and will send another email to the committee with the follow up response.
   e. No update from the ACAT meeting.
   f. Godard received a message concerning problems with a broken link regarding the account page. Baker asked Godard to forward the error because there shouldn’t be broken links.
   g. Polewczak mentioned concerns regarding the upcoming wireless authentication requiring browser access. Baker explained that wireless authentication will provide improved security and enhance the ease of wireless use for students and guests coming to campus. Data is currently being collected by IT and the IT technicians within the colleges to determine the need for special accommodations such as those users who do not use browsers.
6. Department / College Issues
   None

7. CIO’s Report
   a. IT Update
      Baker provided a handout and briefly reviewed items. The handout included a sample of
      the revised IT Faculty web page. Baker asked members to review and send feedback on
      the pages to David Levin.

   b. Faculty IT Survey
      The survey will be going out in the next 2-3 weeks. Baker requested any additional
      feedback to be sent by next Thursday.

8. Policy
   None

9. New Business
   None

Meeting adjourned at 3:10 PM.