1. Meeting was called to order at 10:05 AM by Kris Wright.

2. Andrew Pawl was nominated as secretary.

3. Meeting agenda approved unanimously.

4. Minutes of 11/20/2012 meeting approved unanimously.

5. Mike Sherer provided OIT updates:
   a. Two vacant OIT positions, principal vacancy is CIO.
   b. Industrial Studies is testing the virtual desktop with a group of “traditional” (on-campus) students. Goal is to reduce the number of dedicated computer labs.
   c. OIT has compiled a strategic goals document for 2013. Will be forwarded to AITC.

6. Colleen Garrity out sick so no MTS updates.

7. Todd Carothers gave updates on the TOPC.
   a. Desire to set up a service to point faculty to existing technology resources. Could be under the help desk, or could involve a new committee.
   b. TOPC is debating how AITC should/could be involved in their process. Current feeling is we could help to publicize and expand use of funded initiatives. Lisa Landgraf asked for clarification on this issue and Todd estimated that about half of the proposed projects could be classified as “academic”.

8. Future and goals of AITC.
   a. Reviewer for APC? Lisa Landgraf (APC liaison for AITC) reports that APC is charged with detailed evaluation of all academic programs on a 5 year cycle. Approximately 12 programs per year. They need to evaluate several areas including information technology use/needs. The feeling is that we might complete this portion of the review in Spring and pass it along to APC in the Fall. Right now it is wide open what information we would ask for and report. This may be up to us. The general feeling is that this role would give the AITC “teeth”. APC is going to the next Faculty Senate meeting to discuss their ideas. We will brainstorm about this at our next meeting. One question to consider is what “value added” can we bring to the review process? Are we contributing something or just another bureaucratic check box?
   b. We should consider how we can strengthen our relationship with the library as a hub of academic IT.
   c. We should consider whether members should be elected (vs. named).
   d. We should consider whether meetings should be on a pre-defined schedule (vs. ad-hoc).

9. It was decided that we will meet next on March 4th (10 AM in 156 Gardner) as originally planned.

10. Adjourned 10:50 AM