

**Educational and Administrative Technology Advisory Committee
(EATAC)**

Minutes of Meeting – November 9, 2004

Present

Brent Foster
Don Noakes
Nancy Levesque
Dan O'Reilly
Geoff Wilmhurst
Doug Baleshta
Wes Cole
Alastair Watt
J.S. Bourget
Richard Paweska
Nancy Bepple

Absent

Trevor Davis
Ernie Millard

Guests

Natasha Scott
Martin Voelkening
David Burkholder
Dorys Crespín-Mueller
Wayne Pinette
Les Tabata
Doug Smith

Regrets

Colin James
Brian Mackay
Heather Friesen

1. Adoption of Agenda

Changes and additions to the agenda

New Business:

- 4(a) - Announcement from N. Bepple
- 4(b) - D. O'Reilly – Report from LMS Committee
- 4(c) – Campus Security
- 4(d) – Smart Cards
- 4(e) – Multimedia Classrooms
- 4(f) – Tom Friedman, email.

The Agenda was adopted as amended.

Moved by G. Wilmhurst, seconded by N. Bepple. Vote: All in favour

2. Approval of Minutes

The Minutes of October 12th were approved.

Moved by R. Paweska, seconded by D. O'Reilly. Vote: All in favour

4. New Business

(a) CIPS dinner and presentation (N. Bepple)

N. Bepple advised the committee that CIPS (Canadian Information Processing Society) is putting on a presentation on November 25th, 2004, and invited EATAC members to attend.

(b) LMS Committee Report (D. O'Reilly)

D. O'Reilly advised the committee that the Learning Management Systems contract with WebCT ends July 2005. He stated that the LMS committee recommends that evaluation of the system should be put on hold for at least another year until the merge with BCOU has taken place.

(c) Campus Security (L. Tabata)

L. Tabata advised the committee that there has been an increase in crimes involving electronic property such as flat screen monitors and multimedia projectors. He stated that while some of the crimes are crimes of opportunity, some were planned in that tools and force were used.

Some of the security measures other institutions are using are: Security labels, spray painting, hardening of locking hard wear, installing astragals (can't pry door open), cages around multimedia projectors, sonic shock alarms, and engraving.

Les brought a sample of a Sonic Shock Alarm to show the committee. He explained that the system works through a high-pitched alarm and that it would cost about \$100.00 each or if bought in bulk, \$80.00 each. There was further discussion on the different types of security measures available. JS Bourget explained how his students implemented the card system and the pros and cons of it. There were concerns that bar codes on cards are easy to falsify.

L. Tabata told the committee that he has submitted a Purchase Order for the Astragal Security System (a metal plate which goes on the door so it can't be jimmed with a pry bar or screwdriver). He just received the sample of the Sonic Shock Alarm last week and there has been no decision to purchase. The bright painting of projectors as a deterrent will go ahead. He also advised that caging of the projectors is Media Services responsibility and will likewise go ahead.

The importance of getting the awareness of the need for security out to UCC was discussed. D. Baleshta offered using space in the TAG team's column in OMEGA to do this.

N. Levesque also raised concern that the William Lake Library is at risk. It is a semi-public building and there are no smart cards or security on the doors.

A. Watt suggested the committee come up with ideas for the next meeting on how to make UCC aware of the need for security for room access, parking access, etc.

ACTION: Committee to bring ideas back to next meeting re raising Security Awareness.

(d) Smart Cards - PowerPoint presentation re RFID (D. Baleshta)

D. Baleshta's PowerPoint presentation can be viewed by clicking on [📁](#). Discussion ensued. It was agreed that the most cost-effective way to proceed is to have students explore RFID applications under JS. Bourget and D. Baleshta's direction.

ACTION: JS. Bourget and D. Baleshta to quarterback the RFID applications project with help of B. Foster and Yearn to Learn Funding.

R. Paweska suggested that we need a plan on what levels of security are required and where; N. Levesque added that such a program needs to be scaleable and flexible.

ACTION: – The committee recommended that A. Watt carry forward its concern re a need for an institutional wide security program and ask for direction.

Moved by R. Paweska, seconded by D. Burkholder. Vote: All in favour.

(e) Multimedia Classrooms (handout, A. Watt)

25% of classrooms are multimedia and 33% of faculty claim they use multimedia at least once a week, but not all multimedia classrooms are used all the time. There was discussion about whether faculty are actually using the multimedia equipment in classrooms or not, how many portable loan-outs are available for use, and if the new scheduling system will help determine which faculty members need access to multimedia classrooms.

D. Noakes requested another column added to the table for seating capacity in the multimedia classrooms.

ACTION: K. Anderson

(f) Tom Friedman – email

A. Watt handed out a portion of an email from T. Friedman, President, UCC Faculty Association, which levelled allegations that EATAC does not include faculty in their decisions about key IT issues: “Many key IT decisions [are] made by administrators and then simply reported to the committee.” Animated discussion ensued, at the end of which the committee directed the co-chair to invite T. Friedman to the next EATAC meeting to explain his comments.

ACTION: A. Watt

3. Business Arising

(a) Laptop Leasing – Home Insurance (D. Baleshta)

D. Baleshta has spoken with two different insurance companies re coverage of laptops. The first was a house insurance policy, which would insure the laptop with a separate rider of \$30 per \$1000 of insurance per year. You must have the serial number filed with the insurance company, and there is no deduction for this type of insurance. The reimbursement cheque would be made payable to the insured and UCC.

ICBC insurance would cover the lap top to a maximum of \$1,500.

A. Watt offered some options on the responsibility of the lap top loss or damage:

1. Indemnification would be the sole responsibility of the leasee
2. The leasee and division out of which laptop came (top up charge) would be jointly responsible.
3. Division or school/faculty purchase and own laptops outright, and would be solely responsible for indemnification.

There was further discussion of the data on lap-top servicing provided by W. Cole, and on who would be responsible for maintaining/servicing laptops and what the cost and labour would be.

A. Watt asked D. Noakes to ask the Deans whether they would take on responsibility for covering off cost of stolen or lost laptops and cover cost of repairs if these laptops were purchased by their division.

ACTION: D. Noakes

Meeting adjourned 5:05 pm

Next Meeting: December 14, 2004 3:00 – 5:00 pm CNBR