



Brock University Senate

MINUTES OF MEETING #3 (2010-11)

**SENATE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND  
INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE**

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 1, 2010, 3:30 PM

13<sup>TH</sup> FLOOR BOARD ROOM, SCHMON TOWER

**PRESENT:** Professor David Vivian (Chair), Professor Tony DiPetta (Vice-Chair),  
Professor Babak Farzad, Interim Dean Joanne MacLean, Professor James Mandigo,  
Mr. Sebastian Prins, Professor Felipe Ruan

Dr. Jack Miller, Mr. Steven Pillar, Ms. Margaret Sanderson, Mr. Scott Walker,  
Margaret Thompson (Administrative Support)

**GUEST:** Professor Barry Joe, Director, Centre for Teaching, Learning and Educational  
Technologies

**REGRETS:** Professor Alexandre Amprimoz, Dean Fiona Blaikie, Professor Donald Brown,  
Professor Marilyn Cottrell, Dr. Murray Knuttila, Professor Kelly Lockwood,  
Professor Dan Malleck, Ms. Betty-Lou Souter, Mr. Denis Ursov, Ms. Helen Young

Professor Vivian welcomed members and Professor Joe to the meeting. As there was an absence of a quorum, and in accordance with FHB II: 9.1.1, the Committee would proceed with the agenda; however any decisions made would need to be ratified as a later full-quorum meeting in advance of being forwarded to Senate.

**1. Approval of Previous Minutes**

The minutes of Meeting #2 held on October 27, 2010 had been posted with the meeting materials. Due to the absence of a quorum, the minutes would be presented for approval at the next Committee meeting.

**2. Business Arising from the Minutes**

Professor Vivian noted that, as indicated the minutes of the previous meeting, the Committee had reviewed the draft Brock University Strategic Plan, and he had presented comments from the Committee at a subsequent meeting of the Governance Committee with Senate Committee Chairs and Vice-Chairs. He noted that Professor Farzad had an additional comment to bring forward. With respect to the proposed increase in cross-disciplinary activity as outlined in the

draft Plan, Professor Farzad cautioned that difficulties arise in obtaining research grants from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC) when the application is of a multidisciplinary nature which could negatively affect certain Faculties who rely heavily on NSERC funding.

**3. Report of the Chair - None**

**4. Classroom Response Systems**

Interim Dean MacLean noted during a meeting of the Student Affairs Committee, an issue had been identified and it had been suggested that the matter be presented to the Information Technology and Infrastructure Committee for consideration. The matter involved the use of clickers and other devices used for interactive delivery of courses. It had been questioned if there was a need for a common system across campus and concerns has been expressed regarding the institutional support for this type of technology within the classroom.

Professor Vivian noted that the IT&I Committee had struck a subcommittee last year to examine current policy and practices related to the acquisition of academic computing resources as current policy provides Senate the authority to recommend, on the advice of the IT&I Committee where the acquisition and use of the resource would be consistent with the University's strategic plan for academic computing and communication. It was anticipated that a Report from the sub-committee (Mr. Prins, Dr. Wright, Professor Lockwood, Professor Vivian) which would outline the reporting process of advising Senate of the needed resources to support ITS would be presented at the next meeting of the IT&I Committee.

**5. Draft e-Learning Plan**

[The draft e-Learning Plan had been posted with the meeting materials.]

Professor Joe referred members to the draft e-Learning Plan. The draft plan had also been reviewed by the Teaching and Learning Policy Committee and had been forwarded to Senate for information on November 17, 2010.

Professor Joe reviewed the draft e-Learning Plan in detail. During the Committee's consideration, members provided feedback to Professor Joe. It was noted, for the record, that the Centre for Continuing Teacher Education has been offering additional qualification on-line courses for many years and they were offered prior to Adult Education on-line courses.

It was emphasized by Professor Joe that the draft Plan was in its early phase of development and modifications to the document would continue as feedback was received. As well, several outstanding issues, as detailed in the draft plan, such as those related to BUFA, compliance with AODA (Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act), and infrastructure needs would continue to be addressed as would other issues which may arise during the initial pilot project anticipated to commence in September 2011.

The Committee offered its continued assistance and support to the e-learning steering Committee in advancing the institutional e-learning initiative.

**6. Space Allocation**

[A memorandum from Dr. Jack Miller re: Revised Guidelines for Space Allocation - 2010 dated November 8, 2010 had been posted with the meeting materials.]

Dr. Miller provided an overview of the Revised Guidelines for Space Allocation – 2010, noting that space allocation continues to be a complicated process and priorities may change due to the circumstances involved.

During discussion, comments and feedback were provided to Dr. Miller. Following a request received at Senate in 2009-10, it was questioned if it would be beneficial to strike a committee to assist with the space allocation decisions. Mr. Pillar indicated that discussions were currently underway regarding the processes going forward with the Provost and Vice-President, Academic which would also include input from the Faculty Deans. The Committee looks forward to an update on the development of space allocation policy.

**7. Other Business**

Mr. Prins noted that there are some inconsistencies with respect to the mandate of the Committee as outlined in FHB II: 9.7 and the functions of the Committee as outlined in FHB III: 16.2 Functions of the Senate Committee on Information Technology and Infrastructure. In particular were questions surrounding the oversight of Library services. The Governance Committee would examine and sort out any inconsistencies.

**8. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.