Present: Rian Nostrum, Chair; Nichole Brunner, Preston Gilderhus, Jamal Haidari, Jim Hammond, Jalen Johnson, Tanya Kramer, Jake Lynch, John Pollock (for Tanner Langley), Michelle Sauvageau, Melissa Stotz, David Wittrock, CeCe Rohwedder

Absent: Mari Borr, Anne Denton, Viet Doan, Tanner Langley

Rian called the meeting to order at 3 p.m. The current “Technology Fee Action Plan Form” and “Technology Fee Grant Review – Discussion Form” were reviewed with the following recommended changes adopted:

1. **Submission and acceptance process:**
   A. Only a hard copy of the Action Plan is to be submitted; no email to TFAC Chair is needed. This change will be noted in all communications and information about Action Plan submissions.
   B. Action Plan hard copies will be opened and reviewed after the submission deadline has passed. This change will be noted in all communications and information about Action Plan submissions.

2. **Technology Fee Action Plan Form:**
   A. Section III, “Project Description”: add the question, “Background of project – how did it come to fruition?”
   B. Section VIII, “Budget Match”: add two sections: “Attempted Matches” and “Actual Matches”
   C. Bottom of page 3, below “Executive Summary”: add in bold font the statement, “We will only accept for consideration Technology Action Plan Request forms which are fully completed and signed according to the guidelines listed in the Instructions, pages 1 and 2. Request forms will be opened and reviewed after the submission deadline.”
   D. Add to page 1, “Instructions,” below the second paragraph, in bold font: “Request forms will be opened and reviewed after the submission deadline.”

3. **Technology Fee Grant Review – Discussion Form:**
   A. Add the question: “Would the project be possible with partial funding?”
   B. Add the question: “Do other peer institutions have similar projects to which the proposed project can be compared, demonstrating that it meets best practices?”

Other discussion:
   a. Should the Action Plan Form include a question on whether the organization/unit and/or Project Director received funding from TFAC in the past? Would/should this information be relevant to the consideration of a current proposal? Or should such a question be asked only if needed: if a given proposal has equal merits with one or more other proposals and TFAC may want to consider awarding a department that has not been previously funded? The decision was made that such a questions should not be asked, but that TFAC can research the records of a department’s funding history.
b. Would we at some point either not fund renewals or cap the number of renewals awarded?  
   Decision: no.

CeCe will incorporate into the forms the changes agreed upon during this meeting and will post the 
revised copies on Blackboard, asking TFAC members to review them and provide their feedback 
as soon as possible. Once finalized, the revised forms will replace the forms currently posted on 
the TFAC website, and communications will be coordinated with the campus community, as in 
previous years, inviting Action Plan submissions.

The meeting was adjourned.