

Central Student Technology Committee (CSTC)

Meeting: Monday, November 28, 2005

Location: Union 203

Attendees: Jesse Ballard, Christy Boggs, Phyllis Brecher, Tami Browning, Charles Christensen, Glen Cox, Maggie Deming, Jack Hatfield, Cheryl Hilman, Tim Kearley, Warrie Means, Graham Mitchell, John Nutter, Mark Sunderman, Renee Tihen

1. Introductions

Introductions by all the committee members present were made.

2. Flat bed scanners

Jesse explained that the flatbed scanners in the CSTC controlled labs are beginning to fail. There were questions regarding the price. Jesse explained that the scanners are business class, which should have a longer life than more inexpensive consumer class models.

Charles Christensen moved to approve spending \$2090 to purchase 5 new scanners

Jack Hatfield seconded the motion

Approved: all

Opposed: none

Abstain: none

3. Possible central request to explore

Maggie explained that there are several possible central solutions the CSTC could explore with their remaining funds:

Wireless Printing solution. Jack Hatfield explained that this would be very beneficial for law students because so many have laptops. Other students on the committee also expressed interest in such a solution. The committee provided voice approval to proceed with examining the feasibility and costs of the project.

Charles Christensen requested WiMax type technology be explored so students across Laramie might be able to take advantage of UW high-speed internet. Maggie stated she would pass on the request to the IT networking team.

LabStats software for more accurate and real-time usage information. Jesse explained that this software package, or something similar, would provide much more accurate usage statistics for the labs. It would also provide the ability to generate lab maps which students could look at to see if computers were available

in a particular lab. The committee provided voice approval to proceed with examining the feasibility and costs of the project.

Keyserver for software monitoring / metering. Jesse explained that this type of product would provide IT the ability to determine what software packages are being used by students. The product would also allow IT to provide more software packages to student through a concurrent use model, vs. purchasing a piece of software for each lab node. The committee provided voice approval to proceed with examining the feasibility and costs of the project.

Instructional screen sharing technology. Jesse explained that this technology would allow an instructor to share their screen to all student screens in the room in addition to displaying the image on the projection screen. The software would also allow an instructor to choose a specific students screen to share with the rest of the class. Instructors may also have the ability to lock student screens, preventing them from using the computers while a class is in session.

Charles Christensen questioned the educational value of the software vs. just using a projections screen. He also voiced concerns about an instructor having the ability to lock a student out while a lecture is going on.

Glen Cox believed that it was a good idea if the use was voluntary – vs. being forced on the users

Jack Hatfield stated that he felt it would be beneficial for students. The committee provided voice approval to proceed with examining the feasibility and costs of the project, but they also noted that this should be given a lower priority when compared to other projects identified.

4. Call for Proposals

College of Law – Wiring and Electrical

This would provide internet access to all carrels. Tim explained that most students come with laptops.

Jack explained that carrels are located on the edges of the building and tend to be in areas that have wireless dead spots. Carrels are distributed by a lottery and for specific users. Jack and Tim explained that if a carrel is open other students could potentially use it.

Mark Sunderman expressed concern regarding the wiring. It would only benefit a very specific student sub-set and even limited to specific students in the law school.

Tim Kearley explained that there is turn-over in the use of the carrels, so it would not always only benefit specific students.

Discussion took place regarding who would benefit.

Charles Christensen moved to approve funding up to \$23,681.25 to provide internet to the carrels and add electrical grounds.

Jack Hatfield seconded

Favor – John Nutter, Phyllis Brecher, Jack Hatfield, Glen Cox, Tami Browning, Warrie Means, Tim Kearley, Graham Mitchell

Opposed – Charles Christensen, Christy Boggs, Cheryl Hilman, Mark Sunderman, Erin Mills (by proxy via Jesse)

Abstain – Renee Tihen

Carries with a vote of 8 to 5 with one abstain

College of Law – Law Clinic

Charles wanted to know why desktops and not laptops. Tim responded that it would be beneficial to create an office type environment

Graham Mitchell expressed a concern that it is client service vs. student benefit.

Mark Sunderman questioned whether the proposal meets the criteria of benefiting the entire student population.

John stated that it appeared to only benefit the 16 students providing services in the clinic, vs. the student population as a whole.

Discussion took place regarding which students would benefit. The committee wanted to know if Law would be willing to split the proposal to focus on the ASUW clinic portion. Jack and Tim stated that it would be acceptable to split the proposal to focus on the student benefit.

Jesse wanted to remind the members that the core requirement of the committee is to enhance technology for students.

Charles Christensen moved to allocate up to \$5000 to fund two laptops and a printer for the ASUW clinic.

Jack Hatfield seconded

Favor – Warrie Means, Tim Kearley, Renee Tihen, Christie Boggs, Cheryl Hilman, Mark Sunderman, Glen Cox, Jack Hatfield, Phyllis Brecher, Charles Christensen

Opposed – John Nutter, Graham Mitchell
Abstain – none

College of EN – Email kiosks

Glen Cox asked why the numbers are so limited. Cheryl stated that it is more of a proof of concept. If it does work more kiosks may be purchased in the future.

Charles Christensen stated that he believes it is beneficial but the number requested might not meet the demand.

Mark commented that he appreciated how the proposal was written for a limited number of kiosks to provide proof of concept. He also applauded EN for matching the funding.

Glen commented that more than just EN students would benefit because a variety of classes are held in the EN building.

Glen Cox moved to approve the proposal
Christy Boggs seconded

Favor – all
Opposed – none
Abstain - none

Maggie adjourned the meeting at 3:00 pm