Central Committee on Educational Technology 2006-2007
Meeting 10/10/2006

Attendance
Susan DeMaio, Laura Dull, Jun Lin, Margo Lynn Mankus, Rachel Rigolino,
Lura Speth (Chair), Steve Vinson

Meeting convened at 11:37 am.

Two Handouts were provided by Lura Speth:
- SCAP Call Letter 2005
- SCAP Guidelines for 2006-2007

Review/Approve Minutes of last meeting on 9/12/2006
Lura Speth made a motion to accept the CCET Meeting minutes of 9/12/2006.
Steve Vinson seconded the motion. Vote: All were in favor, none opposed and none
abstained.

Old Business

Website – [http://www.newpaltz.edu/techcommittee/](http://www.newpaltz.edu/techcommittee/)
Lura Speth reviewed the web site and the minutes of the CCET from last year. She
updated the site with the names of the current committee members as of this date.
The wording for the charge of the committee with regard to “form the SCAP
subcommittee” will be change to wording indicating that the entire committee will
review proposals (Lura Speth).

New Committee Members (Vacancies)
Lura Speth spoke with John VanderLippe about current vacancies on the CCET
Committee. He recommended contacting Nancy Nielson (Library) to suggest a
representative for CCET. Steve Macaluso (Coordinator for Distance Learning) has
mentioned that he is interested in serving on CCET. Lura Speth will contact Nancy
Nielson and share the information that Steve Macaluso is interested.

Ping Jin (Music) will be removed from the committee list. Susan DiMaio (Art History)
will be a regular member of CCET.

Lura Speth shared that we have several names for student committee members.

New Business
New SCAP Guidelines and the 2005-2006 Call for Proposal letter were passed out to
each attending committee member.

Final Reports (Brief Summary) from SCAP Awards for 2005-2006
A motion was made by Lura Speth that the principle contact of SCAP Awards for
2005-2006 must submit a brief summary (final report). If a summary as requested in
the original Call for Proposal letter is not received by December 1, 2006, they will not be considered for a 2006-2007 SCAP Award. Margo Lynn Mankus seconded the motion.

Discussion: There was discussion that this report was not to be viewed as a penalty but to keep records of the awards and to get the feedback for the program. Jon Lewit will write a full report and this individual award data will be useful. The full report must be filed before monies for 2006-2007 are awarded to the campus.

A reminder letter will be sent out to the principle contacts for each award. The letter will contain a template summary report addressing items such as the location of the equipment, a list of courses where the technology is being used or where the technology is being used, the approximate number of students using the technology, and any issues or problems encountered with the implementation of the technology. There will be a 350 word limit on the final report. A reminder letter and final report template will be crafted by Susan DeMaio and Lura Speth. This reminder will be sent to the principle contacts as soon as possible but sometime before the Call for Proposal letters are sent out. (See below - October 27, 2006.) This reminder will also be posted on the CCET web site. The final summary reports will be due back to the CCET by December 1, 2006 as mentioned above.

Lura Speth mentioned that she does not have a list of who received awards last year. She will look up that information.

Vote: 5 in favor, 1 opposed, 0 abstained

Call for Proposal Letter for SCAP Awards 2006-2007
The letter and application will be updated (Lura Speth) with the monies available for this year. Lura shared that $135,440 is available for the awards which is about $5000 more than last year.
The application will be updated to contain a section to query the principle contact if they received an award last year. If so, they will be asked if they have submitted the brief summary (final report) and be reminded that their proposal will not be considered if they did not complete this action.

There was a discussion to keep each award to 20% of the total amount as in the current letter. This lead to a discussion on faculty technology visions which are more costly. See the next section for more of this discussion. The Call for Proposal letter may contain some information on this action.

SCAP Timeline
The Call for Proposal letter will be sent out by October 27, 2006 and will be due on January 26, 2007. The October 27 date is about two weeks earlier than last year allowing more time to develop proposals. The January 26 date is in alignment with the due date from last year. The time frame last year provided enough time for proposal submission, award decision, and purchasing efforts for the awards.
Lura Speth will also post the Call for Proposal letter along with the Brief Summary (Final Report) template on the CCET website.

**Learning about Faculty Vision on the use of Technology**
There was a discussion about how to encourage those with “wish lists” that are more costly than the 20% of the SCAP funds to share their ideas. Lura Speth mentioned that currently there is no mechanism for to find out faculty ideas for technology. Most information is word of mouth. Margo Lynn Mankus suggested that we have a place on the web site where faculty can post their technology visions along with the cost of the vision so that Academic Computing and the CCET can get ideas of what is desired. This will help understand the needs for future funding beyond the SCAP awards. Lura Speth mentioned that this is part of the CCET mission and she would look into getting this type of web form for the CCET site. The Call for Proposal letter may contain information about this action.

Meeting adjourned at 12:32 pm.

**Next Meeting**
- The next meeting will be set in January to align with the submission of the SCAP proposals.
- E-mail discussions on the modifications of the SCAP Award reminder letter and template along with the updated Call for Proposal letter will be ongoing.

Minutes Respectfully Submitted by Margo Lynn Mankus