

Technology Appropriations Board Minutes of the meeting January 21, 1998

Location: AHT 4th Floor Conference Room
Time: 2:00 - 3:00PM

In attendance:

Sue Mettlen (Co-Chair)	Rob Power (Co-Chair)
Bill Blass	Dewitt Latimer
Bill Drumright	Susan Metros
Joe Gipson	Jerry Stoneking
Mark Hall	Surya Singh
Paula Kaufman	Ken Walker
Matt Disney	Arthur Burke (Proxy SGA)

Minutes of December 10, 1997 were distributed, reviewed and approved with minor corrections.

Mettlen stated it was time to plan for years four and five so that we could assure always having an updated three year plan.

Student Technology Fee Request Form and Selection Process

Mettlen presented a draft of a Student Technology Fee Request Form intended for requesting departments. The purpose of the form is to alleviate the confusion of submitting requests and provide for better, overall planning. The consensus of the group was that the form was an excellent idea. The majority of the meeting was spent discussing its merits and making suggestions to improve its use. In addition, a process for making decisions was proposed and deadlines discussed. Highlights of this discussion follow:

- It was agreed that the Deans or Directors must sign off and assure that the form is complete. There was concern that, in the past, some Deans were not able to prioritize proposals because their department's needs were so great. Kaufman and Stoneking assured the group that it was a Dean's job to make these hard choices and that they would convey the importance of prioritizing to the other Deans.
- Metros suggested that the cover letter clarify how the STF should be used to clear up any confusion when requesting departments submit their requests.
- The group agreed that a once a year cycle made it easier to plan and schedule upgrades.
- Power questioned if the newest models would be specified if equipment listed in a proposal was not ordered right away. Mettlen assured him that purchasing would specify the most up to date equipment at the time of purchase.

- Mettlen explained that DII would send out a SWAT team to sites listed on the highest ranked proposals for the purpose of gathering additional information and calculating any additional costs for items such as renovation or infrastructure improvements.
- Gipson proposed a Thanksgiving deadline to allow for plenty of time for this appraisal procedure.
- The group discussed requiring matching funds and decided this would disadvantage the student body served. It was noted that the Deans have been very generous in the past by providing funds and in-kind matches whenever possible.
- Burke voiced concern that the labs be located in areas that were accessible to the majority of students. Gipson commented that staffing is an important element to accessibility on evenings and weekends. Sigh suggested that Parking Services might be asked to run shuttles between lab locations. Power stated that they have been amenable in the past to rerouting their service to better serve students. Mettlen mentioned that CAS was working on a real-time procedure to let students know when and where there are available seats in the labs.
- Metros recommended that the form include a line requesting if faculty training would be required to assure that the facility or equipment would be used effectively for instruction, if appropriate.
- The group voiced concern over Physical Plant's work overload and noted that they were almost one year behind on projects. It was stressed that equipment should not be purchased until renovations and infrastructure improvements were almost complete. This would assure that the newest versions were purchased and full warranty coverage was in effect.
- Power asked for TAB to approve a less than \$10,000 appropriation to outfit an area on the 3rd floor of the UC with computers and required peripherals for student organizations. After a brief discussion, it was requested that he pilot the Student Technology Fee Request Form and fill it out for this specific need.
- Blass suggested we hold back a percentage of funds for emergencies or mid cycle special requests. Mettlen assured him this would be done.
- Mettlen proclaimed that the Deans had the prerogative to resubmit an unfunded proposal in subsequent years, reprioritize or withdraw proposals.
- Hall reminded the group that it was important to keep good records on both recurring and non-recurring costs.
- Metros suggested the group devise a plan to migrate down equipment to users that do not have top-end needs. A discussion followed on whether this was inefficient use of resources and time.

Budget

Mettlen explained that this year there was more money in the accounts because of the extra semester of funding, but that this would not be the case in subsequent years.

Gipson explained that all dorm rooms will be networked at one time to save on labor and afford volume purchasing. The cost of this upgrade will come out of next fiscal year. Gipson explained that the newest version of wire is used, in addition to multi-mode fiber to the face plate in all network upgrades.

Hall handed out the Budget Overview and noted that the bonded interest was in the 4% range. Hall commented that the university factored inflation by the discipline/area. Mettlen commented that the we borrowed less than planned and we waited to the last possible moment to defray additional interest changes.

Mettlen explained that upgrades for technology were cyclic. Initially the departments were hardware starved and once equipment is in place they need staffing. About three years pass and they clamor for a refresh. She suggested a sub group of TAB study these peaks and valleys and make recommendations on refresh timelines. She noted that disciplines vary in their refresh needs. Metros asked if the hand me down machines could be given to faculty for instructional purposes. Latimer said faculty at a research university deserve better. Mettlen thought the machines would be able to be used to fulfill additional student needs and hoped to find another way to serve faculty.

Fee Waiver Policy

A brief discussion ensued in which the group debated whether off campus students should be required to pay the STF. Power commented that students use many of the resources afforded by the STF through access to licensed software, CBT, email, Web pages, etc. and should therefore, pay the fee. Disney argued that many only used email and limited web service. It was agreed that in the near future, more and more university services will have online access. Drumright thought that exceptions should be few because the budget was based on support from all students. Power reminded the group that the STF was already prorated for students taking partial credit.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

Minutes submitted by: Susan Metros