Technology Advisory Board (TAB)
Minutes of Meeting of April 21, 1999

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

In Attendance

Bill Britten, Will Carver, Lyle Culver, Matt Disney, Frances Fogerson, Jim Gehlhar, Joe Gipson, Nancy Gnilka, Mark Hall, Ray Hamilton, Chris Hood, Judy Huddleston, Marcia Katz, Dewitt Latimer, Jeff Maples, Robin McNeil, Susan Metros, John Moore, Faye Muly, Fernando Parrado, Surya Singh, Kenneth Walker.

Discussion 1: Introduction of New Members

Muly introduced and welcomed in-coming Presidents for the Student Government Association, the Faculty Senate, and the Graduate Student Council.

Discussion 2:

Disney asked that the board consider amending the by-laws so that new student and faculty members serve from May to April of each year. This was approved without objection.

Discussion 3: New Internet Connections

Muly noted that since January of 1997 a total of $3.7 million in technology fees has been invested in departmental computer laboratories. For this year, however, allocations must be reduced to bring them in line with income. A total of $2.4 million in requests was received for the current year, for $750,000 in available funding.

The procedure for recommending which requests to fund will begin with a SWAT team consisting of several DII staff members and several student members of TAB. This team will actually visit the site to determine if the request is physically feasible and adjust cost estimates as needed.

Muly emphasized that funding will not include supplies (paper, toner) or ongoing port charges. Ports will be installed and activated for new labs only. Additionally, staffing expenses are considered only if indicated as a high priority by deans and with the understanding that this is the final year for such fund use.

Gnilka distributed a "Quick Summary" handout of all new requests.

Discussion 4: Student Affairs Request

McNeil reviewed the request from the Student Government Association for a new laboratory in Presidential Court (listed in the Student Affairs section of the summary). She noted that

approximately $15,000 in networking costs was omitted from the estimates. Gipson noted that an additional $10,000 may be necessary to bring fiber to the building. With other equipment this would bring the total request to approximately $110,000.

Maples added that Housing would contribute the building renovation costs to this project for a match of approximately $170,000.

Closing some small "pocket" labs and converting the Apartment Residence Hall lab to a non-staffed lab would provide funds to staff the proposed lab. McNeil stated that the small pocket labs are consistently difficult to manage, with high costs and frequent vandalism damage.

Walker moved that the Technology Appropriations Board membership support the proposed Presidential Court lab in principle, pending the determination of more accurate cost estimates, with a second by Gipson. Motion carried.

Discussion 5: Guidelines for Funding

Disney asked for discussion/approval of the funding guidelines listed in the "Quick Summary" handout. Metros questioned the inclusion of cameras as a secondary priority. It was noted that some departments had asked only for a digital camera, making it their single priority. Discussion concluded with an agreement that an exception could be made for those requesting a camera as first priority and depending on the student impact of its proposed use.

The guidelines were accepted as written.

Discussion 6: Inclusion of Furniture as Technology Equipment

Because numerous requests were for computer workstations, tables, or chairs, a question was raised asking if this was really "technology." This year's guidelines do not mention furniture, but list cameras and VCRs as peripheral equipment with a "secondary" priority. Walker moved, and Singh seconded, that the purchase of furniture be given the lowest priority beginning next year. Motion carried. (Note: For this year, furniture is a matter of judgment for SWAT team recommendations.)

Discussion 7: Other Comments

Latimer commented that some departments seemed to have multiple "number one" priorities and that this would complicate considering their request. Discussion concluded that the SWAT team would try to determine if these were actually separate requests or components of one.

One other department was noted to have asked for equipment for staff and faculty use. Discussion referred to the original intention of a student technology fee to fund "high impact applications" (from the Guidelines). Use by an individual staff or faculty member would not constitute a high impact application for students. Again, the SWAT team will make a recommendation on the individual requests.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be on May 19, 1999 at 2:00 pm in the 4th floor conference room of Andy Holt Tower.

Minutes prepared by: Frances Fogerson

Minutes posted by: Janet Miles