
Others: Mark Harsen

John presented what the SGA had laid out as being most important. The SGA Resolution was presented to the committee. The 1st and 2nd requests were considered to be the most important and the largest requests. It was stated that there were some carry-over monies available; so those could help to make the requests possible. Everyone was informed that there was $461,000 carry-over available and $124,000 reserve was built into the budget this year. This is one-time money that is available this year only; so it is important to spend in the best way possible. How the money came available was discussed.

The open computer lab in Glass Hall was discussed. It was stated that it would be possible to take out some walls, add windows to the hall, and add some furniture which would create an environment similar to the Learning Commons.

It was discussed that the one-time money could either put with the other funds for the proposals or to do something else with, such as the Glass Open Lab.

It was stated that with the possibility of state budget cuts, the PCOB may not be leased if programs are cut, so an open lab there wouldn’t be a good possibility. Brick City was discussed as an option later down the road when it could be developed for an open lab. There is also a possibility at the Morris Center. SGA was looking at the PCOB Atrium room. It was mentioned that they weren’t set on PCOB and would be open to waiting a year if the committee would know better of what the outcome of PCOB would be at that time. It was stated that the Morris Center space would not suit them. It is too small; only holds 20 computers and they were looking at 40 computers. It was stated that SGA needs to be realistic and may need to relook at the Morris Center. Discussion continued on what an open access lab really was. It was questioned how the SGA determined that there was a need for an additional open lab. Everyone was informed that a survey for open lab users would be conducted. It also stemmed from students talking about what they wanted/needed. There is also an increase of presence downtown. SGA worked on compiling this for a year. It was mentioned that the SCUF users needed to be questioned to see if they had any further requests for one-time money. Space options and how many courses were taught downtown were discussed. Possible questions to ask students as they log on to an open-access computer lab computer were discussed. It was stated that by having an open lab downtown, it would help take usage away from the Professional Building’s lab.
It was suggested to possibly wait and see if the money would be needed elsewhere in case there are other cuts. Steve will send a note out to the SCUF users, John will work with Jeff on the open lab user survey.

John moved and Carey seconded the motion to have SGA work with Computer Services to create survey. This will be brought back to the April meeting. It was suggested to say in general terms, the amount of money available. It was then suggested that it would be stated that there was approximately $450,000 one-time carry-over money.

Color printing in open-access labs was discussed. The PaperCut Subcommittee recommendations were discussed as presented in a handout. Discussion continued on letting the departments set their fees.

It was suggested that the PaperCut Subcommittee recommendations would be the first topic at the next IT Council meeting. Jeff opposed number 8 on the handout, because it was equal to what Copy This charges and it should be charged a higher rate for the convenience of printing in a lab.
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