

Technology Appropriations Board Minutes of the meeting December 10, 1997

Location: AHT P-115 Conference Room
Time: 2:00 - 3:00PM

In attendance:

Rob Power (Co-
Chair)

Bill Blass	Jeff Maples
Bill Drumright	Susan Metros
Joe Gipson	Danny Sehr
Mark Hall	Surya Singh
Paula Kaufman	Ken Walker
Matt Disney	Fred Tompkins (for Jerry Stoneking)
Kerry Henry	Dewitt Latimer

Minutes of November 19, 1997 were distributed.

Blass, speaking for Gipson, reiterated that the dorm upgrades should be completed by the time the students returned for Spring Semester '98. When Gipson arrived, he confirmed this and added that future plans include the ability for students, living in the dorms, to be able to plug their computer into the network and be automatically connected. He did warn that by prioritizing the dorm wiring project, the wiring of other buildings would be slowed down. He agreed to provide a cost projection at the next meeting.

Mark Hall passed out the [STF budget ledger](#) and stated that we were on target for the \$5M for FY 1997-98. There was some discussion about the market and borrowing strategies, but Maples conclude that there was not much fluctuation in school bonds. Kaufman asked about the priority of projects and asked to see a list of outstanding projects.

Gipson reconfirmed that the CBT and Software distribution server would be upgraded to Netware 4.11 by Spring Semester '98. This will provide IP access for the student dorms. The Ethertalk protocol will be enabled at the same time.

The following agenda items were discussed:

1. Discuss ways in which TAB can investigate, respond and act on new directions in IT in order to keep pace with the changing face of technology. Drumright questioned if we should look in new directions and advise Mettlen in ways to proceed after the initial 3

year plan has been instituted. Power commented on the long debated issue of more public labs vs. mandatory student ownership of a computer. He surmised that the latter would be difficult at a state institution with a land grant mission. Metros brought up the concern over the widening technology gap between faculty and students. She warned that students would not be able to use technology to its fullest potential at UTK if faculty did not have access to similar resources. A long discussion pursued in which Power defended the separation of student and faculty resources. Latimer suggested that TAB should be a strong advocate in this area of concern and inequity. The group discussed various alternatives.

Kaufman reminded the group that departments are not misusing funds, they simply do not have operating budgets to fund this type of expenditure. Singh questioned why faculty did not use the public labs. Drumright argued for integration, not segregation of resources to foster the growth of technology across campus. He explained that, in the long run, a technology literate faculty and staff will yield a technology savvy student body that is better prepared to go out into the workforce. Blass suggested that the STF could be used to leverage matches from Academic Affairs and Central funding sources. The tuition fund was suggested as a possible funding source. The group agreed that they did not see the STF as a source to indiscriminately fund "a box on every faculty's desk" but that it would be worth exploring ways to increase support for faculty who are willing to influence, train and teach using technology.

Power concluded that this group was unanimous in agreeing that motivated faculty should have access to technology but the question is, "where does the money come from?." He said that he would entertain proposals. He suggested the discussion be continued using a Web-based discussion forum. Metros volunteered to set one up.

2. Devise a plan to expand upon DII's existing services to loan equipment (laptops, projectors, etc.) to students (and faculty?). Kaufman mentioned a program to loan laptops to students within the Library had been considered. Gipson said his group was working (at their own expense) with the Library on piloting an infrared network system. There was discussion about the cost of turning ports on in student carrels. Power was interested in loans for students to take equipment off campus. Gipson suggested that Aconda Court might be in the position to institute such a program. Metros described the leasing program that the Instructional Media Services manages in the College of Education.
3. Consider the possibility of working collaboratively with Academic Affairs to fund some IT projects using a match of Tuition Funding and STF. Power stated this item was previously discussed. Metros mentioned a memo she drafted for Clif Woods, Assoc. VC of Undergraduate Programs, to send to the Deans and Directors describing ways in which the ITC could help faculty assess their technology needs and budget to cover expenses when submitting proposals for upgrades to either Academic Affairs or STF.
4. Discuss ways to improve the level of expertise of and training for DII (and departmental) lab staff. Power offered to wait until Latimer settled in before bringing this up for discussion.
5. Shortening the URL for funnelweb. Latimer and Gipson explained that this is in the process of being rectified and the URL will be shortened, however a name has not been

selected yet. Singh suggested using aliases and Gipson warned that the trade off for a long alias list was slower access.

6. CAS support for WordPerfect. It was explained that WP 5.1 was "best effort" supported. The new upgrade would be server-based and while the support is scaled back, it is still available.

New Business:

- Power asked for TAB to approve an \$11,000 to \$20,000 appropriation to outfit an area on the 3rd floor of the UC with computers and required peripherals for student organizations. Questions were raised about where the funding was coming from and if other resources and support issues had been addressed such as staffing, networking, port charges, etc. Maples said the Student Activities Fee was funding the purchase of furniture. The group agreed it was a sound proposal but wanted to take it under advisement until they had a better idea of where the funding source. Power agreed to present that information at the next meeting.
- Disney brought up the issue of the lack of support for student technology training. He handed out a sheet describing the limited staff and lack of resources in CAS' Training Group. He complimented the quality of work that the staff do, but maintained that is was hardly enough to serve the needs of the student population. He described the University of Iowa's training program and promised to do further research on their staff size and budget. Metros mentioned discussion by Academic Affairs to institute a mandatory computer competency requirement.

The next meeting is scheduled for 2-3 p.m., January 21, 1998 in AHT 4th Floor Conference Room. The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

Minutes submitted by: Susan Metros