Central Committee for Educational Technology 2006-2007
Meeting February 8, 2007

Attendance:
Rebecca Adae, Susan DeMaio, Rachel Rigolino, Lura Speth, Chair

Meeting Called to Order 11:38 am

Review/Approve Minutes of last meeting on 10/10/2006
The minutes from the last meeting could not be approved because less than half the committee was present and did not constitute a quorum, for which a simple majority is necessary. Review and approval of the minutes were tabled for the next meeting.

Note: Other motions were also tabled because of the lack of a quorum.

Old Business
Final Reports (Brief Summary) from SCAP Awards for 2005-2006
Lura Speth reported that all SCAP recipients from last year submitted the required summary on time. Most of these were successful with the exception that two proposals have not yet been implemented. Equipment purchased for two Chemistry proposals are not yet set up due to some logistical problems, but the principals are working on the issues. Their summaries report progress so far, but are vague as to when the setups will be complete.

SCAP website
Lura has continued to update the SCAP website.

New Business
Distribution of 2006-2007 SCAP Proposals
Ten proposals were submitted. Lura provided additional handouts:

- Spreadsheet of the proposals showing that a total of $165,586.69 has been requested. SUNY New Paltz’s 2006-2007 allocation is $135,440.00.
- Summarization of the SCAP guidelines to assist with analyzing the proposals, which emphasized several points
  - Proposals must be computer related
  - Purchases of furniture (desks, etc.) and accessories (carrying cases, tripods, etc.) are restricted
  - Consumables cannot be purchased with SCAP funds.

Discussion: Lura Speth remarked that each proposal should be complete, but we still need to check each proposal to ensure that each section is filled out. Lura noted that it is acceptable to partially fund any proposal should some of the expenditures be for items not allowed by SCAP. She also observed that the proposals all seemed to respect the cap of requesting not more than 20% of the total pool of funds available. Rachel Rigolino asked whether quotes were to be included with proposals. Lura clarified that only an estimated cost of equipment is required for the proposal.
Timetable to Review SCAP Proposals

Lura remarked that the 11:30-12:20 time slot on Tuesday and Thursday appeared to be a difficult time for several committee members to attend SCAP. She suggested two times for regular meetings:

- 1st choice: Fridays at 9:30 beginning February 23
- 2nd choice: Thursdays at 11:30 beginning February 22

Rachel Rigolino suggested that these two dates be put forward for consideration by the rest of the members of the committee via email with a final decision on a regular meeting time to come. A vote was not held, but all the members present were in agreement.

Discussion: Rebecca Adae reported that last year 2 or 3 proposals were reviewed at each meeting. She noted that there are fewer proposals this year than last. Lura Speth expressed the desire that the first meeting to discuss the proposals occur no later than the week of February 19-23 and that the review process conclude not later than the end of March in time for Purchasing deadlines. Rebecca Adae pointed out that this would give us 6 or 7 weeks.

Review of SCAP proposals by Academic Computing Staff

A motion was made by Lura Speth that a set of the SCAP proposals be furnished for Academic Computing staff to review. It was agreed by those present that it is useful to include Academic Computing’s insight during the decision-making process, but the motion was tabled until the next meeting due to the lack of a quorum.

Meeting adjourned at 12:22 pm

Next Meeting to be determined via email according to the suggested dates and times noted above.

Minutes Respectfully Submitted by Susan DeMaio