

Central Student Technology Committee (CSTC)
Meeting: Friday February 25, 2005
Location: Union 203

Attendees: Maggie Deming, Jesse Ballard, Marcus Curley, Phyllis Brecher, Matt Deasaro, Klaus Hanson, Jack Hatfield, Cheryl Hilman, Natalie Kosine, Paul Medina, John Nutter, Dee Pridgen, Dean Roddick, William Russell, Mark Sunderman, Renee Tihen

1. Maintenance for server (OfficeScan antivirus for lab system)

Maggie gave an explanation that this is a server that used to be a domain controller and is being re-deployed as the antivirus OfficeScan server for the UWStudent lab system. In order for the server to be covered under warranty the committee needs to fund a one year maintenance contract.

John Nutter moved to approve \$456 for the maintenance contract on the OfficeScan server for use on the UWStudent lab system.

Marcus Curley seconded

Favor – all
Opposed – none
Abstain – none

2. LCD Brackets for BU 307

Jesse explained that the brackets are needed in BU 307 to support LCDs which will be going into the lab this summer. Jesse explained that there are currently CRT monitors in the desks.

Cheryl Hilman Moved to approve the funding of the LCD brackets
Mark Sunderman seconded

Favor – all
Opposed – none
Abstain – none

3. Lab Desktop CPU Configuration

Jesse explained that the computer configuration for this summer will not include a zip drive by default. Jesse stated that computer manufacturers were moving away from magnetic media (zips and floppies) towards flash memory and CDs. Jesse wanted the committee's feedback on whether zips should be provided in some

fashion. Mark Sunderman recommended removing some of the zips from the computers being replaced this summer and placing them in the new computers. Jesse stated that he did not know if the internal wiring would be compatible, but if it was that was most certainly an option they could explore.

Committee members questioned the current location of the USB ports. Jesse stated that the new CPU configuration that will be coming out this summer will have the USB ports in a much more accessible location (in front near the floppy drive area).

After some discussion it was decided that some zips should be provided to students, but more as a means to transfer files to another medium (flash memory or CD). Jesse stated that they will look at putting zip drives on the 'scanner' machines in the labs.

Jesse requested feedback from the committee regarding the need for floppy drives in the lab computers. Floppy drives will still be available on the new units purchased this summer, but Jess warned that floppies are likely to be removed from the default configuration in the next year or so. After discussion it was decided to continue with floppies this year, but start informing students, faculty and staff that they will begin to be phased out in the next year. This way students, faculty and staff will have time to adjust to the removal.

4. Wireless Access Points - Union

Maggie explained that the Union is willing to split the cost of the additional Union wireless unit. The unit is designated to reach the ballroom, senate chamber, and the open area in the hallway.

Maggie also mentioned that Jud Brown thought the committee should support the placement of a wireless access point in the Family Room.

Discussion took place that the union areas are both a mixed use areas. The union is used for both student and administrative functions.

Maggie stated that there are possible savings if both runs are done at the same time.

Jack Hatfield moved that the CSTC move to approve up to \$2000 to fund wireless units in both the Ballroom area and the Union Family room.

Klaus Hanson seconded

Paul commented that the Family room is probably used more by students than any other group on campus.

Favor – all
Opposed – none
Abstain – none

5. CSTC Wireless furnishing areas

Marcus Curley questioned the committee wanting to know if anyone knew of a location where the CSTC could place furniture in order to create a wireless lounge. Marcus commented that even though we have a large amount of wireless around, there is a limited amount of space available for students to be able to work on their laptops.

No member was able to identify a location where a wireless lounge might be possible.

6. Possible Future Projects

Jesse explained that he has been looking at some projects that the CSTC could consider funding if there are leftover funds available after all central needs had been considered, along with the call for proposals. Jesse had identified possibly placing e-mail kiosks outside of the BS 37 lab, E-mail kiosks near the Coe coffee area. Jesse also identified e-mail kiosks within the classroom building, but considering the construction time-line it would not be appropriate to fund anything until after the biennium. Paul commented that the e-mail kiosks in the Union are always being utilized. Jesse stated that the committee could also work with the Union and possibly identify additional areas in which they could place additional e-mail kiosks.

Discussion took place about how and when these projects would be considered. Some committee members did not want these projects to get consideration in front of ideas that might come up in the call for proposals. Jesse clarified that these are projects that would be considered if funding was available after all the other needs had been met. They would be used to guarantee that no funds would be left unexpended at the end of the biennium.

The committee recommended that cost estimates be developed for these projects.

7. Call for Proposals

Discussion took place regarding the existing wording

Mark Sunderman expressed his frustrations that proposals received last year and how many of them seemed like projects that would have been funded even if the CSTC did not approve them.

Matt Deasaro recommended choosing a word that or phrase that indicates that proposals should not be used to pay for projects other units might fund, but for funding to expand on existing technology.

The committee discussed that the proposals should be to: enhance, augment, and innovative and not to replace existing core requirements, but expand what was on there.

John Nutter recommended that the first and second bullets be switched, to clarify how the proposals should be submitted (first to the college committee chair, and then forwarded on to the CSTC committee chair).

After some discussion Maggie requested that all the committee members look at the existing call for proposals. At the next meeting the committee will need to consider the following:

Changes to the wording

What dates should be used when sending out the request

How much funding should the CSTC state will be available

Maggie stated that her and Jesse would try and develop an additional guideline to include wording on what the CSTC is looking for in proposals.

Maggie adjourned the meeting at 3:30pm