

Central Student Technology Committee (CSTC)

Meeting: Friday February 4, 2005

Location: Union 203

Attendees: Maggie Deming, Jesse Ballard, Christy Boggs, Phyllis Brecher, Jud Brown, Luc Carr, Marcus Curley, Dee Pridgen, Matt Deasaro, Klaus Hanson, Jack Hatfield, Cheryl Hilman, Paul Medina, John Nutter, Michael Stephens, Mark Sunderman, Renee Tihen

1. **Law College Lab Proposal**

Maggie asked for the CSTC's opinion on whether the Law proposal should be heard at this meeting or if it should wait until the formal call for proposals.

Cheryl Hilman stated that those in EN responded that the committee should look at the Law proposal in the call for proposals. Mark Sunderman and Jud Brown also felt that the lab did not meet the requirements to be considered a core request.

Jack Hatfield ask that the committee listen to the presentation that they had developed before making a decision if the proposal met the criteria of a core request. Discussion took place on whether the proposal should be listened to. The committee agreed to listen to the proposal.

Jack gave a presentation on the lab itself and justification for why the CSTC should absorb the lab centrally.

Maggie raised the issue regarding the current Law school budget and how much they had available. After figuring in replacing computers every 3 years, staffing costs, printing and maintenance Maggie's numbers indicated that Law would still have substantial funds left over when looked at in a 3 year cycle.

Clarification of the intent of College Technology Fees was made. Colleges were awarded technology fees through the approval of the Board of Trustees, and those funds are intended for College's student computer technologies; software; and lab development, maintenance, and administration - including life cycle replacements of computers.

Michael Stephens stated that it sounded like there is a need for a CSTC controlled lab on the east side of campus, but that a stronger proposal from all entities would be much more appealing. Michael recommended that Law partner with the other colleges in the area (AG, Fine Arts, and Health Sciences) to see if a joint proposal could be drafted.

Other committee members voiced support for Michael's suggestion and expanded it by recommending they find an alternate site other than LS 242. They

recommended finding a location that could house a substantial number of computers (20 – 30).

Jud requested to close discussion on this issue and requested a vote to determine if the Law proposal met the criteria of core needs.

Cheryl Hilman moved to vote on the Law proposal as core or not core
Michael Stephens seconded

Those who voted the request did meet the criteria for Core consideration – Jack Hatfield, Dee Pridgen and Matt Deasaro

Those who voted that the request did not meet the criteria for Core consideration -
Remainder but 1

Abstain – Renee Tihen

2. Meeting Frequency

Maggie asked the committee how often they felt they should meet this spring. It was decided to meet weekly except for the weeks before, during and after spring break. It was also recommended to expand the meetings to an hour and a half.

Maggie adjourned the meeting at 3:05 pm