

NDSU INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Delivering core solutions and propelling innovation

TECHNOLOGY FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TFAC) MEETING

Friday, March 31, 2007, 2 p.m.

Quentin Burdick Building 206E

Meeting Notes – approved at the Oct. 24, 2017 TFAC meeting

Present: Rian Nostrum, TFAC Chair; Seth Bisbee, Mari Borr, Warren Christensen, Anne Denton, Jeff Dertinger, Marisa Mathews, Ken Mbuba, Jared Melville, Nick Reitan, Melissa Stotz, CeCe Rohwedder, Dominic Fettig (proxy for Aaron Weber)

Unable to attend: Dani Collison, Lauren Singelmann, Aaron Weber, David Wittrock

1. Members were welcomed, and introductions were conducted
2. **M to approve the 11/15/16 meeting notes as presented (Seth/Nick); MSC unanimously.**
3. Review of Action Plans received for funding in the 2016-2017 academic year:
 - A. \$50,000 available
 - B. Initial review of the Action Plans received:
 - a. #1701, Theatre Arts: unsure if the department can proceed with the project if this action plan is not fully awarded, though there is a match of \$19,000. It is an innovative project and has a wide audience (various departments in Performing Arts, all who attend productions, as well as students in Architecture). Does the department have the capacity to finance future upgrades, and if not, what will happen to the investment? Any project involving equipment will have this same question – hopefully, the state’s financial situation will stabilize in the near future allowing for upkeep and upgrades. It is unclear how the installation costs will be paid. In terms of whether the TLMC currently possesses equipment that could be checked out to students, and filling the need of this action plan, Melissa replied that this is not an option, as the equipment of this action plan would be permanently mounted and of better quality. Milestones 2 and 4 should incorporate additional and more detailed means of assessment to accurately reflect the impact, and these details should be reported back to TFAC. More information on comprehensive current use and anticipated future use of the equipment should be part of an additional milestone.
 - b. #1702, Public Health: this solution would serve as a pilot for distance student collaboration that could then be used by other departments. The system lends itself well to small group discussions. Melissa recommended to the department that they confirm with Registration &

Records that the classroom be confirmed for availability to this department for reservation. This class taught in a SCALE-UP room would require a lesser investment since some of the needed technology (microphones, for example) is already there. However, the SCALE-UP rooms are primarily designed for in-person collaboration and interaction. All of Public Health's classes are offered in the evening, so there would be no conflict with classes currently scheduled in SCALE-UP rooms, since they are held during the day. The equipment for the project would not interfere with what is currently in the space; most would be in the teaching podium, except for the camera, which would likely be placed in a corner and have a wide lens. It would be good to make use of the SCALE-UP rooms for distance students, as well, as much as possible.

- c. #1703, Animal Sciences: the project would fill a need for technology that is currently not present. The type of equipment needed would be built specifically to the unique needs and cold environment of the meat labs and is not available anywhere else on campus. Installation of the equipment would not require services by Facilities Management.
 - d. #1704, ND State Climatologist: Once set up, this system would create a database for other classes to utilize, and department funds would maintain it, so the investment, though minimal, would have a broad and lasting impact. NDSU's work on climatology has become a state standard, so continuing to invest in the program would continue to enhance it and benefit our students. Since the expense is student labor, this project would also provide students with both income and valuable experience. Should the project be funded even if the specific course identified is not approved, or is the value of data collection sufficient justification to fund the project? How useful will the data collected be, and how will it be reviewed for reliability? Is the project innovative or is the innovation the act of collecting and utilizing the data?
- C. Consideration for funding:
- a. **M for all four action plans to be fully funded with stipulations as the committee already specified or might specify in the ensuing discussion (Mari/Anne).**
 - b. Discussion re #1702: there would be no additional charge by ITS for installation. The Learning Spaces Executive Committee has approved of the concept of the project but not the specific classroom space; documentation of such approval would be a stipulation of awarding the project. The milestones of this action plan need to incorporate evaluation and statistics of the impact of the technology.
 - c. Discussion re #1704: approval of the course offering would not be a stipulation for funding.
 - d. **Vote: MSC unanimously, approving full funding for Action Plans #1701, #1702, #1703 and #1704, with stipulations to #1701 (Milestones 2 and 4 to incorporate additional and more detailed means of assessment to accurately reflect the impact, and these details to be reported back to TFAC; more information on comprehensive current use and anticipated future use of the equipment to be part of an additional milestone) and #1702 (documentation of the Learning Spaces Executive Committee's approval of use of Hill 300 for the project to be provided; milestones to incorporate evaluation and statistics of the impact of the technology).**
- D. The revised reporting and funds managements of action plans were presented to TFAC.
4. Returns of funds awarded for Action Plans and not used:
#1117, Computer Science, "Virtual Desktops and Applications Pilot Project." \$0.61 returned to the student tech. fee fund
5. Changes to Action Plans (on Blackboard):

#1404, Mechanical Engineering, ALA, Libraries, "3D Printer Filament Processing System." Approval granted to spend more in salaries and less in materials & supplies, without overspending the awarded funds

6. Action Plan reports:

A. Status reports received since the last TFAC meeting (on Bb):

#1602, Memorial Union Gallery, "Visual Technology Tools for Interaction with the Gallery

B. Final reports received since the last TFAC meeting (on Bb):

a. #1118, ALA, "Technology for Feedback in Energy Efficient Building Design." \$274.90 was returned to the student tech. fee

b. #1127, ITS – Help Desk, "ITS-Help Desk Initiative."

c. #1130, Enterprise Computing & Infrastructure, "Ongoing IT Infrastructure Support."

d. #1132, ITS – Help Desk, "ITS-Help Desk Initiative." \$46.89 was returned to the student tech. fee

e. #1215, Thunder Radio, "Broadcasting Technology Maintenance." Final report was revised to reflect that \$733.41 was returned to the student tech. fee rather than \$737.41 (change made by Accounting)

f. #1302, Computer Science & Operations Research, "Expansion of Departmental OpenStack Infrastructure"

g. #1404, Mechanical Engineering, ALA, Libraries, "3D Printer Filament Processing System

h. #1503, ACE Tutoring Center, "ACE Group Room Study Needs"

i. #1604, HNES, "Human Performance Lab Technology." \$1,835.08 was returned to the student tech. fee

7. **M to adjourn (Seth/Jeff). MSC.**