Central Committee on Educational Technology  
Minutes of Meeting of February 16, 2010  

*Members Present:* Susan DeMaio Smutny (co-chair), Orkunt Dalgic (co-chair), Jonathan Lewit (ex officio), Colleen Lougen, Doug Maynard, Rachel Rigolino, Lura Speth, Emily Trapp, Jack Wade

The meeting was called to order at 3:08 PM.

1. **Old Business – Rich Media/Lecture Capture**

Emily moved that this discussion be tabled in light of the SCAP business before the committee. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

2. **Review of SCAP Proposals**

   a. Susan distributed a revised copy of the SCAP spreadsheet outlining costs associated with each of the proposals. A few points were made:

      i. It was noted that Chemistry withdrew their proposal, as they were able to identify a cost-free alternative to the items they initially requested.

      ii. The total amount of requested equipment across all proposals is less than the amount of allocated SCAP funding. The possibility of approaching departments who submitted proposals to increase their requests was discussed. Jonathan noted that SCAP funding does not roll over across fiscal years, and that any leftover SCAP funding is used on equipment for student labs, so no funding ever goes unused. It was decided that the proposals would first be reviewed as submitted before deciding about this.

   b. **Discussion of the ranking procedure**

      i. As in past years, a 1 to 4 scale will be utilized, from 1 (does not meet SCAP guidelines and cannot be recommended for funding) to 4 (recommendation for funding without reservations, no or only minor questions)

      ii. Members will recuse themselves from any vote on a proposal which includes that member’s home department

      iii. Ratings are averaged across all present voting members to arrive at an average rating

      iv. The average rating will be communicated to absent members, who may then raise any important issues they have with a given proposal

   c. **Review of particular proposals**
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i. Physics – Microcomputer-Based Laboratory Upgrade

1. There was only one notable question, namely how many photogates were actually being requested (6 or 12). Lura was going to check with the proposer on this.
2. Votes were given and averaged on this proposal. The average was 4.0.

ii. Theatre Arts – Interdisciplinary Co-Lab Digital Performance & Interactive Facility

1. Questions included the following:
   a. It was unclear why 24 licenses were being requested when only 2 Macs were being requested.
   b. More information was requested about how the space would be monitored during open hours (e.g., if work-study students were serving as monitors, how would they be selected or trained to maximize the security and safety of the equipment).
   c. Would one or both projectors be ceiling-mounted? This would require electrical work which could not be funded through SCAP.
   d. Will network connections need to be installed? This is also work that would need to be funded through another source.
   e. Would the department prefer to upgrade the projector screen?

2. It was agreed that a vote on this proposal would be tabled until these questions could be addressed.

3. Plan for Next Meeting

It was agreed that the order of review for next meeting (Wednesday, February 24th) will be (time permitting): (1) Theatre Arts, (2) Art, (3) Music, and (4) Communication and Media.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:16 PM.

Submitted respectively,

Doug Maynard
Secretary pro tem