Meeting Agenda:
1. Approve minutes and agenda
2. Course Management System Memo
3. First Reading of Special Project Requests
4. Date & Time of Next Meeting

1. Meeting called to order at 8:35 by chairperson, Rebecca Moorman. Meeting began with 1 person short of quorum but within five minutes a quorum was reached. Minutes of the previous meeting will be considered at another time. Agenda approved without change.

Old Business:
2. Rebecca distributed for review the draft memo regarding the adoption of Blackboard or any other statewide course management software as discussed at the November 22nd meeting. The memo will be sent to Information Technology Council (ITC), Statewide Academic Council (SAC), and the Coalition of Student Leaders. Roberta Stell explained that there was a “placeholder” initiative to buy course management software for UA such as Blackboard this year. Mike Sfraga, Statewide Administrator assigned to Distance Education issues, is to recommend to SAC how to spend that initiative money which will expire at the end of the fiscal year. Besides considering the purchase of Blackboard, SAC is considering buying licenses for web authoring tools such as DreamWeaver, Flash, Adobe, etc. Discussion followed with the following recommendations about the content of the memo:
   - remove specific references to UAS Online,
   - emphasize the need for a process of looking at course management software,
   - emphasize the experience of UAS faculty in using course management systems.
   - end at . . . since 1996 and pick up in the final paragraph.
   - add . . . with student input . . . after . . . driven by faculty

Rebecca with modify the draft memo and fax the original prior to the SAC meeting Tuesday, December 5.

Since the memo may generate the need for a response, Tia Anderson suggested that a committee be set up to act if necessary. Volunteers are: Rebecca Moorman, Susan Warner, Tia Anderson and Michael Ciri who volunteered either Michael Byer or Tom McKenna.

3. First Reading of Special Projects:
   The subcommittee of Todd Walter, Alice Tersteeg, Shannon Kempton, and Mark Graves met, reviewed proposals, and made the following recommendations.

   “We recommend funding four of the eight proposals for a total cost of $13,450. Though is more than the $11,500 officially available, we find the four proposals recommended for funding to be well deserving of funding and, given last years dismal spring Special Project’s turn-out and unexpected unused funds, we feel our recommendation is appropriate. The table below is a summary of our recommendations followed by slightly expanded synposes of our discussions regarding each proposal.”
### Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Alice Albreht</td>
<td>Classroom Upgrades</td>
<td>$10k-20k</td>
<td>Resubmit focusing on specific aspects of this proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sherry Tamone</td>
<td>Radiobutton Projector</td>
<td>$4800</td>
<td>$4800 Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 David Ackerman</td>
<td>Computers for Income Tax Services</td>
<td>$3250</td>
<td>$3250 Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Michelle Blais</td>
<td>Spike's Café</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Address Student Government for this proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Eric Peterson</td>
<td>PCR</td>
<td>$3800</td>
<td>Resubmit showing wider range of student use and/or co-funding source.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Robin Walz</td>
<td>Apex AD-600A DVD</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$200 Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Mathew Wood</td>
<td>Student Government Website</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Supply more information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Tia Anderson</td>
<td>5 Laptops for Checkout</td>
<td>$13k</td>
<td>$5200 Fund</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Michelle Blais from Spike's Café spoke on behalf of her proposal for computers. Tia stated that the computers in Spike's Café were originally bought by Student Government and a grant from Mapco for non-academic pursuits. TLTR is for academic purposes. If Spike's is supposed to be the non-academic location on campus it shouldn't be funded through the Tech Fee. Michael Ciri noted that he was not been aware of issues with the computers at Spike's and will look into the problems. Tia Anderson stated that determination of who is responsible for maintenance/repair of Spike's computers has not been clear. Susan Warner inquired about a printer in Mourant. Michael clarified that he's looking for a printer in the general part of Mourant, not Spike's specifically.

- Jonathan Anderson spoke regarding proposal 7. The question was raised by Jonathan about Student Government’s readiness to take on a web site commitment? Tia, student body president answered that they were not ready to take it on. Michael Ciri stated that in the FY02 Capital Request, emphasis would be on some of these needs. In the meantime perhaps someone in the Knowledge Worker program would like the site as a project.

- Michael Ciri spoke to proposal #3. He suggested that merging proposals #3 and #8, would be excellent idea. He volunteered Computing Services to work with the two applicants to meet both needs. It was affirmed that the process to checkout laptops should be through Media Services. Todd Walter stated that if there were additional funds available in spring, they would like to prioritize # 8 for additional funds.

- Susan Warner spoke to proposal #6, the international standard DVD player. The information is outdated and the cost is likely to be higher. Subcommittee members agreed to work with the proposer.

- Susan Warner also noted that "radiobutton" is an artifact from the html form and should be removed from proposal #2, a request for a projector. Susan also noted that the Anderson Building has successfully received other equipment through Tech Fees and for the record, this equipment is shared with UAF faculty and students. UAF should at least be asked to contribute.
A final vote on the fall proposals will be taken at the next meeting. If TLTR approves the projects as recommended, the spring projects budget would need to be adjusted to stay within the academic year’s budget.

4. The next meeting is set for Friday, December 8 at 8:30am.

   Announcements:
   • The spring proposal deadline is February 15. Word should go out as soon as possible in January about the application deadline.
   • A quorum to take action on the proposals is necessary for the final vote so everyone should attend the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 9:25am.