

SUMMARY FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING COMMITTEE MEETING

DATE: April 22, 2014

TIME: 9-11 a.m.

LOCATION: Milton Bennion Hall, Room 201

IN ATTENDANCE:

Rick Ash	Martha Bradley	Kirsten Butcher	Fernando Rubio
Wayne Samuelson	Catherine Soehner	Cory Stokes	Patrick Tripeny

COMMITTEE SUPPORT: Cindy Hanson, Rene Eborn

UNABLE TO ATTEND:

Eric Denna	Pam Hardin	Nalini Nadkarni (on leave)	Patrick Panos
Linda Ralston	Jean Shipman		

AGENDA ITEMS DISCUSSED:

- Review projects requesting Student Computing fee funds

Review projects requesting Student Computing fee funds

The portfolio is evaluating the proposals seeking funds from the Student Computing fees. The fees are allocated into two sections, disbursements and maintenance. The total of all requests exceeds the disbursements portion. The group is told there are several ways to approach the task. One would be to combine disbursements and maintenance into one fund and make decisions based on the total.

A 1975 article from the Daily Utah Chronicle explains the history of the maintenance portion. The impetus for the fee was to supplement state funds so desktop computers would be available in computer labs. Machines were much less reliable then and would often break, so the University built in a maintenance portion equaling 45 percent of the initial cost of a purchase, distributed in equal parts over three years. That money would go toward repairs, replacement components, networking equipment, etc. It was pointed out that as equipment has become more reliable over the years, the cost of maintaining machines has fallen.

The group discussed whether to adjusting the funding sources or sort through projects to fit within the original funding structure. It was noted that budget requests typically include more than the requestor is reasonably expecting to receive, and therefore funding every project may not be in the strategic interest of the University. The portfolio members agreed to dive deeper into the requests to ensure they were appropriate.

Members noted there were several requests that sought funds for technology similar to something already centrally funded and available. Virtualized desktops, media streaming, and storage were among the most requested items. In cases where the request would fund something already centrally

available, the group decided to suggest the use of the available technology, with the option to revisit the decision if more information showed the current technology was insufficient for the specific use.

The committee noted some requestors sought to replace machines on a four-year cycle, while others worked on a three-year cycle. They suggested it would be beneficial to adopt a consistent program. After noting some inconsistency between certain requests and the funding objectives of these particular funds, the committee suggested it may set guidelines for future requests to ensure the funds are used properly. Some requests would be better served through other channels such as eClassroom funding.

Cory Stokes will apply the committee’s decisions about current projects to the master spreadsheet and resend the information so members can see where they are in the process. More work will be done at the next meeting.

Action summary			
Action	Topic	Person/Group	Next step
Discussed – approved – denied	Review projects requesting Student Computing fee funds	Portfolio	The committee will review the decisions made up to this point and continue to evaluate project requests.
Action item	Update projects spreadsheet	Cory Stokes	Stokes will apply the decisions already made to the spreadsheet to show committee members how far they have come toward meeting the budget.