

Tech Fee Committee Meeting Minutes – 4/22/14

4:00pm

Black 141

Present: Chris Pratz, Colin Pringle, Sandy Sperline, Yosef Gamble, John Anvik, Ian Loverro (a little late). Zachary Geesaman was also in attendance as was a potential new student member, Derek Whittom.

Chris spoke for a few minutes regarding a financial handout for Period 9 FY14 projected fees for the Tech Fee account. We have approximately \$247,000 left for this year's budget, with an \$80,000 hit coming down the pike for bandwidth for K20 Network. The Tech Fee has always carried \$100,00 in reserve for emergency slush fund.

Discussion from last meeting picked up regarding funding for department labs versus open student labs. Chris would like the committee to up with a definitive stance on what the Tech Fee will fund in regards to department labs, open student labs and classroom podium systems. He would like to keep it as simple as possible, but the committee needs to define and we will put it in the meeting minutes for future reference.

The Tech Fee has an intake of about \$300,000 each quarter for a total of \$900,000 for the year from the student tech fees. Karen Hamel, Budget Analyst, produced the handout Chris gave to each of us. Chris will have more budget information at the next meeting.

Colin went right into discussing old business regarding the Computer Science funding request. A question arose about the cost of each unit, Zachary Geesaman answered with an estimate of \$1,400 each computer, for a total cost of \$39,096 for the project. Voting members voted and the request was passed. Zachary thanked the members on behalf of the Computer Science Dept.

Zachary noted the earlier conversation regarding open labs, he calculated the Hebelers labs are open to all students 80% percent of the time.

Budget discussion continued – the budget summary provided indicates that the Tech Fee is at \$144,000 minus the \$39,096 just approved for Computer Science, so that puts us at \$104,904 the committee decided not to allow any more spending on big projects for this year.

The bigger discussion of the budget, involved student fees. Chris sent out an email with a listing of fees for fall quarter 2013, and a concern was voiced regarding unchecked student fees should we decide to go the route of requiring departments to be more responsible for the upkeep of the labs. Chris stated fees do have to be approved by George Clark, Chief Financial Officer/VP for Business and Financial Affairs. Ian said there is a Budget & Finance Committee, and he thought the Board of Trustees also had to approve student fees before they become a requirement. There is one student on the Budget & Finance

Committee from the BOD. There are a lot of student fees and Colin noted his ITAM classes all have a \$25.00 fee and ITAM pays nothing to help maintain the SS labs that they use for their program. Some fees are restricted to certain items, example, fees collected by a department which are designated to be used for field trips. Colin stated he learned from this spreadsheet that there are a lot of student fees and it's good to know they must be checked and approved.

Chris said if we were to filter on the far right column on the pull down arrows, you can pull down a list filtered by computer lab for different categories.

Colin continued, back to computer labs, we are faced with having to address this issue by either raising the tech fee or lowering the additional expenses the tech fee pays for, example; K20 Bandwidth –tech fee helps with a portion of this expense and if we reduced those, we could bump up the expenses needed for student labs. At the heart of this discussion is the question what does the tech fee pay for. In the past Chris' predecessor has held back to some extent on department labs, especially up in the ETSC lab. In contrast the ITAM department has one lab of their own in Shaw/Smyser, but schedule the other 5 open labs extensively for classes, which limits free student access. Also talked about is the possibility of blocking off certain labs so they cannot be scheduled for classes, thus ensuring availability during all open lab hours. It is a very convoluted situation we have here with the funding mechanisms the University has used to build out these labs

which use different funding sources for furniture vs computer equipment vs expendable supplies etc. Which departments have scheduling priority to specific computer labs. One of the reasons departments establish their own labs is so they can maintain control of software provisioning. The art lab in Randall is an example of that. So the University really needs a definitive stance on where to draw the line on what the Tech Fee will fund.

If the Tech Fee funds all computer labs the quarterly fee will need to be raised, or the number of labs reduced. With construction of the new Science building underway there will be more labs created with capital money, however once in place it will be up to the Tech Fee to continue with the ongoing costs of refurbishment.

The university is also moving towards RCM – Responsibility Centered Management, which makes the Academic departments responsible for their own enrolment and ties department funding to that enrolment. Departments will be faced with a competitive business like approach to recruiting students and retaining enrollment. We are guessing the equipment they have in their labs, software, etc. will become increasingly important to them for their recruitment. Chris is anticipating higher department specific demands for Tech Fee money next year.

Colin was looking at the student survey that was sent out by the EISC committee. There are comments regarding desires for

more labs, more mac labs, more laptop labs, a faster log-in, better printing, and wanting more labs or more accessible hours in labs. One of these said it perfectly, there should always be 1 lab open to students during the day. There should be no classes scheduled in this lab. Are there labs other than the library or SURC laptops always available? Zachary Geesaman says the Hebler 218 lab is always open. Colin thinks the Hebler labs are great, however most students who are not Computer Science majors don't know about these labs. Sandy says the Ed tech Center lab is Black 106 has no classes scheduled, and they have 12 machines. Should we have a fee for departments to use labs so they subsidize their usage for classes in their program?

Chris has been talking to the AVP of Information Services about blocking out labs from R25, so they cannot be scheduled for classes or reservations. R25 is the scheduling system for labs and classrooms. Another suggestion was to block out 4-5 hours per day in a lab so classes cannot be held during these times.

To address these questions we need to start with funding component. Should departments be required to fund their program specific labs, or conversely should the Tech Fee open funding to all labs? Chris needs our thoughts on these issues.

The question was asked, what is the feasibility of raising the tech fee? We can raise it as a committee, however the ASCWU/BOD would also need to approve the increase.

The voting members of the committee approved the addition of Derek Whillom to our committee, he is a senior and anticipates graduating this June. Welcome Derek.

At the next meeting, Chris will have a rough draft of practices and procedures pertaining to member roll-over, who will stay, etc. and also a more concrete figure of what we have left in the tech fee budget. We hope to set a goal in the next meeting of a rough draft of what the tech fee will approve.

Next meeting will be held on Tuesday, May 6th, at 4:00pm, tentatively in Bouillon 211.

Meeting adjourned.