Technology Advisory Board (TAB)
Minutes of Meeting of May 19, 1999

Location: AHT 4th Floor Conference Room
Time: 2:00 – 3:00 pm

In Attendance


Discussion 1: Membership for the Next Year

Muly requested that the SGA and GSA presidents notify her of the appointment of new student members prior to the June meeting. A request has also been made to the appropriate administrative offices to nominate members for the FY 99-00 year.

Discussion 2: Audit Report of Technology Fee Activity

The report of the Internal Audit of the Technology Fee activity was issued May 11, and the overall result of the audit was positive. This report documented that the

- Fee has been administered as intended by the board of Trustees,
- Procedures for managing the fee are appropriate, and
- Expenditures are generally within the established guidelines.

Two recommendations were made in the report. The first recommended that procedures should be established for approving and appropriately funding technology fee expenditures that provide shared benefits to non-academic activities. This issue will be explored with the Technology Advisory Board during the coming year. The second recommendation concerned one graduate student employee funded by the technology fee whose job duties were not directly related to the technology fee. Muly noted that this student had been reassigned in November 1998 and previously paid salary had been reimbursed to the technology fee fund.

Discussion 3: Recommendations for FY00 Funding

Gnilka distributed a handout of tech fee requests which was color-coded to indicate the swat team's recommendations for actual funding, based on previously published guidelines and further review of the proposals.

Allocations for FY00 are budgeted at $750,000 with the total recommendations being somewhat higher (approximately $780,000). Gnilka and McNeil indicated that additional revisions, price changes, and anticipated discounts should reduce the total to the $750,000 limit.
McNeil noted that some requests for very small components were not recommended. Tracking and management of such small parts is extremely difficult. Priority was given to "whole" items rather than "parts and pieces."

The next step in the FY00 process is to send a letter of notification to each department that requested funds.

**Discussion 4: Other Comments**

Disney asked if there was any new information on the proposed student lab at Presidential Court. This is still in the planning stage and because of the renovation needed, the target date for completion of this project is January 2000.

Parrado asked if there were sufficient funds to provide support for existing equipment. Muly answered that the technology fee currently provides some limited staff support to departmental computing labs, but this will be phased out after next year. Departments that have received this support are aware of the impending changes. McNeil stated that support is easier to provide if labs are larger in size, but fewer in number. Combining labs to consolidate support staff is a way to reduce ongoing costs.

Singh asked if departments are permitted to upgrade computers purchased with tech fee funds. McNeil said that she is unaware of departmentally-funded upgrades, but any would complicate inventory management. As older equipment is reassigned to other locations, tech fee funding could supply upgrades where feasible. Latimer noted that the labor cost of upgrades is often the more important concern.

Muly suggested that an agenda item for the next year will be for the Board to provide recommendations for reassigning or disposing of aging equipment. As the technology fee enters its fourth year, outdated equipment becomes a more relevant issue.

**Next Meeting**

The next meeting will be June 16, 1999 in the 4th floor conference room of Andy Holt Tower.
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