Committee Members Present: Sonit Bafna (committee president), Kristen Butler, Amy D’Unger, Michelle Powell (Executive Board liaison), Carrie Shepler

Not present: Peter Hesketh, Denise Johnson Marshall, Arjun Meka, Susan Wells Parham, and Helena Mitchell

Sonit Bafna called the meeting to order at 12:06pm.

The November meeting minutes were presented. Amy D’Unger motioned to approve them, and Michelle Powell seconded. The committee voted provisionally approved the minutes (we did not have a quorum).

Update on Open Access Policy Implementation committee [Carrie]
- Susan attempted to gain access to a website openaccess.gatech.edu, but someone already owns it. She has attempted to contact the owner with no success. MP suggesting contacting OIT.

Committee response to GA Tech IT Master-plan [Sonit]
- Sonit prepared a document and will circulate via email for input from absent members (see below)
- Item 1: Universal accessibility
  - Amy D’Unger commented that everything moving forward should be accessible but what about all of the things we already have that are not accessible? IRBwise, etc.?
  - Michelle Powell responded that there is no guidance or information regarding how to be accessibility compliant for IRBwise. GTRI delays many things make sure they are in compliance. Michelle stated that she felt more guidance and more information to address 508 compliant issues were needed.
  - Amy D’Unger questioned who was in charge of these issues, and Michelle commented that it is not clear; however, there is a committee on which Lori Sundel serves.
  - Amy D’Unger questioned whether Disability Services (Denise Johnson-Marshall’s office) would be responsible. Michelle Powell responded that Disability Services defers to other offices.
    - When CATEA was state funded, they assisted with compliance evaluations. However, they can no longer do so because they are grant funded.
    - There is another group on campus that does something similar, but these groups do not write policy.
• Action item: Make a statement that there are issues with current implementation and maybe MasterPlan can address.
• Action item: Make this an agenda item for spring. Perhaps the committee should prepare a report on issues?
• Physical accessibility and costs are also issues.

• Item 2: InCommons
  o This system allows people to use campus login to log into systems like NSF, etc. We need to make sure it doesn’t create issues with campus login security policies (in particular, faculty sharing login information with administrative support who help prepare and submit grants).
    ▪ Update provided by Michelle Powell on January 16: "...we are working with OIT/Eric Buckhalt to use the federated login [InCommon] to a couple of agency systems. It is just in the initial stages but are moving forward with this piece. We rec’d confirmation that it wouldn’t interfere with our current support model."
  o Maybe need an additional PIN number for Human Resources issues (payroll compensation, benefits, etc.) could be created so that login information could be shared for Fastlane, etc.

• Item 3: Integration with personal devices
  o There are issues similar to those associated with item 2

• Item 4: implementation and day-to-day implications of the Master Plan
  o Should we ask for more clarification up-front, or is it nature of plan to be vague?
  o It may be appropriate to raise the issue so that it is readily considered even if there is no immediate answer.

The spring meeting schedule was discussed.
• Action item: Carrie Shepler will send out an email regarding this.

Sonit Bafna raised the issue of the spring agenda
• Amy D'Unger commented that the committee name has been changed to the Faculty Services Committee
  o Amy will find and distribute the link to the Daily Digest article in which she read this.
  o Sonit Bafna will check with Ron Bohlander to determine whether there is any intent also to change the purpose and focus of the committee.
  o The implications of such changes in committee names and purposes relative to the upcoming reclassification of faculty and staff relative to committee membership was discussed.

• Accessibility (see above)
  o After some discussion, the committee members present suggested that we should not focus on physical accessibility at that time and instead limit ourselves to items such as those discussed above.
• Research portal launched
  o Michelle Powell gave an update and commented that the portal is all about research.
    ▪ Portlets with project numbers, etc.
    ▪ Feedback from faculty is that the portal omits the academic half of what they do (number of grad students graduated, etc.)
    ▪ There are questions about to what extent it makes sense to expand and how far.
      • Many chairs/associate chairs want management reports, too.
      • Is there info from a faculty standpoint that we can add and make it more general?
      • How is this redundant with GT Scholar?
        o The two are separate but linked projects. GT Scholar can be accessed from the portal.
• Michelle Powell asked if academic services refers only to teaching or can branch out to research.
  o Sonit Bafna responded that perhaps we should take a wider view. We should consider the ramifications of inter-faculty services (faculty providing services to other faculty).
    ▪ There are a few areas in which the Institute is thinking about broader services (MOOCs, etc), services provided to alumni, etc.
    ▪ Perhaps the committee should consider providing academic services to the community. The library, in particular, offers potential. The committee could function as instigators or have a subcommittee to focus on this long – term (both identifying best practices outside of the Institute and looking at developing new things).
    ▪ New faculty orientation offers another opportunity. The committee could collaborate with Susan Cozzens.
  o To what extent should the committee be involved in these projects? Sonit Bafna questions whether we should think of them as big comprehensive reports with what we have in mind or short reports from which the committee develops committees. Amy D’Unger responds that Ron Bohlander may have insight regarding that (especially in light of the renaming of the committee).
  o Action item: Sonit Bafna will contact Ron Bohlander and report back to the committee.
Sonit Bafna commented that the committee is not representative—we do not have members from all other Institute committees, and we do not have representation from all Colleges. This is problematic in terms of data collection efforts.
• Perhaps the composition of committee should change to mandate members from each College.
• Action Item: Michelle Powell will raise this issue with the Executive Board and Sonit Bafna will speak with Ron Bohlander.

Sonit Bafna adjourned the meeting at 12:57

Minutes respectfully submitted by,

Carrie Shepler
Secretary, Academic Services Committee