School of Liberal Arts   REVISED DRAFT
Technical Services Committee
Minutes, 5 May 2000

•**???Present:** Subir Chakrabarti (chair), Julie Freeman, Ain Haas, David E. Hoegberg, Mike Scott, Robert Sutton, Thomas A. Upton, Jeffrey S. Wilson, Kim White-Mills

Prof. Chakrabarti convened the meeting at 11:05 a.m to consider the STF small grant proposals remaining from the meeting of 28 April.

1. Correction to the minutes of 28 April: the proposal from **Kenneth Cutler** (History) was also approved.

2. The following STF grant proposals were approved:
Catherine Souch (Geography). In the future this kind of hardware request should not be considered among the small grants, but included as part of lab appropriations. Procedures need to be established to consider upgrades and additions to existing labs and other facilities.

Robert White (Sociology). This was approved only as a one-time grant. Other funding must be sought for ongoing support. This and other proposals indicate the need for a policy concerning wages for student assistants.

Kenneth Barger (Anthropology).

• **Ellis**. Make sure it works [I have nothing else on this proposal: who is this person, and where from?]

Jennifer Cochrane (Communications Studies). This proposal was funded with deep reservations as an emergency measure, as a last resource on a one-time basis only. The recipient is encouraged to find other alternatives, including web site training for students and instructors and to use CTL to train instructors for free.

3. The committee was inclined to approve the proposal from **Monroe Little** (History) and **Otha Meadows** (Community Education -- IUL), but requested clarification and modification:
The applicants need to provide a more detailed budget, giving specifics of student employment, with a statement of who will be responsible to see that this project is completed. The applicants must understand that TS staff cannot be responsible for completing this project.

4. The committee denied the proposal of **Stuart Schrader** (Communications Studies). All of the hardware requested is either already available at SLA or is currently being purchased. The applicant was urged to borrow a laptop as needed from the School's pool.

Prof. Chakrabarti adjourned the meeting 12:40, with the understanding that applicants would be send letters as soon as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert F. Sutton, Jr.
May 16, 2000

Appendix to Minutes of 5 May 2000:
Suggested Revisions for STF Small Grant Application Procedures
Arising out of Committee consideration of recent Small Grant Proposals

Need to (re)define small grant & create other grant categories
• create separate categories and budgets for
      • small grants for single course or single faculty use
      • upgrades of lab/facility software (add line to lab/facility budgets)
      • upgrades for lab/facility hardware (add line to lab/facility budgets)
      • proposals to add new functions to existing labs and for new labs & other facilities
• set maximum dollar amounts & other parameters for each of these categories
• for all, establish distinct budget categories (with maxima?), including at least:
      • hardware
      • software
      • salary

Salary for student assistants
• set absolute dollar maximum
• set hourly rate cap, with guidelines for a scale
• applications need to justify actual rate cited based on duties, skill, experience

Applications
• set deadline earlier to allow better consideration (October 15, March 15?)
• include short title
• require date or period of time grant will cover (see below, re report)
• ask how to be implemented & by whom, with qualifications/experience; applicant must assume ultimate responsibility to ensure the success of the project
• ask "What role do you see for Technological Services in achieving what you propose?"
Include explicit statement that TS staff can help train faculty &/or student assistants, but cannot be asked to actually do the work; point them to CTL
• ask if this will be an ongoing expense, and how that will be covered: Do we need statement on how this might fit into department and school budgets in the long term?
• how to deal with the issue of external and alternative funding sources and applications?
• Committee may want to meet with applicants, at least in some cases/categories

Final Report
• require a final report describing what was done, and how successfully. Even if a project is not fully complete at date indicated, require progress report with final report when finally done.
• enforcement?

Evaluation
• Committee needs to set priorities for various categories
(see also documents circulated by Profs. White and Vermette concerning evaluation criteria)

RFS 5/16/00