

Meeting 06 (02/01/2024)

Attendees

Ashley Ahlbrand, Alex Alexeev, Curtis Bonk, Ariana Gunderson, Daniel Hickey, Ethan Fridmanski, Michele Kelmer (UITS), Anne Leftwich (UITS), Scott Michaels (Research), Angie Raymond, David Taylor (BFC)

Agenda

1. Welcome
2. Approval of the Minutes from the last meeting.
3. Review/discuss FAR Language Change
4. Update on FAR RFP
5. Comments/Concerns/Questions
6. Adjourn!

Notes

1. Welcome
 - a. "Ah-riana" Gunderson
2. Approval of the Minutes from the last meeting.
 - a. Approved unanimously.
3. Review/discuss FAR Language Change
 - a. Made one change; Angie to review for other obvious changes.
4. Update on FAR RFP
 - a. Logan gave an update on the progress of the FAR RFP process.
 - b. Need to do an accessibility review – Michele.
5. Feedback on the AI Task Force
 - a. Angie and Anne facilitated a discussion about how this committee can and should be involved in the university-wide AI Task Force.
6. Comments/Concerns/Questions
 - a. Would like an update on storage/enterprise agreements/timelines.
 - b. Logan to contact BFCOFF about One Mail project.
7. Adjourn!

Notes (Not for Posting; from Co-pilot)

- School of Education 100th anniversary: Bonk shared his appreciation for Fritz Leiber's speech and book, and the history of the school. 1
- Faculty activity reporting system selection: Paul reported that the RFP committee recommended symplectic over interfolio, based on survey feedback, library preferences, and Elsevier concerns. 2
- Faculty activity reporting policy change: Paul proposed adding a clause to require any configuration changes that affect the information collected or removed to be reviewed by the BFC or the unit policy committees. Siek suggested changing "should" to "must". Raymond agreed to review the policy for other obvious changes. 3
- AI task force update and feedback: Leftwich, Raymond, and Hickey shared their concerns and challenges with the AI task force, such as the broad and unrealistic charges, the lack of expertise and diversity on the committee, the slow and unclear process, and the potential ethical and academic issues with AI use. They asked the committee for input and guidance on teams, and for areas of interest or expertise related to AI. 4