

## Tech Fee Committee Meeting Minutes – 4/08/14

5:00pm

Black 141

Present: Chris Pratz, Colin Pringle, Sandy Sperline, Yosef Gamble and Ian Loverro.

Chris called the first meeting of Spring quarter, to order and turned it over to Colin Pringle. Colin introduced Zachary Geesaman, Systems Analyst, Computer Science who submitted a fund request for the lab in Hebel 209. Zachary presented his reasoning for needing close to \$40,000 for new iMacs in the lab stating the computers in the lab now are four years old, out of warranty, and in need of being replaced. This request expands the current capacity from 20 to 25 machines. The Hebel 209 lab is Tech fee supported, however Zachary images and takes care of the machines.

A long discussion followed Zachary's presentation. This is essentially a departmental lab but open to all students. However, the funding of department specific computer labs has been an issue in recent years.

A few years ago the Hogue Tech remodel brought this to the attention of the previous Tech Fee Administrator because several new labs were funded for the ETSC department with State Capital funding from Olympia as part of the remodel. This presents a problem for the Tech Fee as its funding is static and based on enrollment. As additional student labs are created with one time State funding they present an additional financial load for the Tech Fee renewing expensive equipment as it ages. Should departments be responsible for their specialized labs or should they pay a percentage of the hardware cost? In the case of ETSC a memorandum of understanding was drafted in 2012 between the ETSC department Chair and the Director of ITS, which outlined the ETSC department funding equipment renewal in one lab while the Tech Fee would fund equipment renewal in the other. Yet both labs would be open to general student use during unscheduled hours. Since the drafting of this MOA the ETSC department has instituted its own department tech fee as an additional requirement for each of its classes.

In contrast, our ITAM department maintains one lab in Shaw yet utilizes the other 5 Tech Fee funded labs for teaching to such an extent that that the labs are not

openly available for general student use. The ITAM curriculum makes extensive use of the standard suite of software that is installed in all of the Student labs, and consequently does not need as much specialized software or exceptions to the standard configuration as the ETSC department. Because of this they are able to meet the needs of their program with only one department specific lab which ITAM funds entirely.

The fundamental question for the Tech Fee Committee at this point is to determine how to equitably provide some funding for these labs, and where to draw the line between department funding requirements and what the Tech Fee can provide without raising its quarterly fee. Usage of the labs whether for general student use, general teaching, or department specific use, has always been a factor in consideration of this, should that continue?

Or should the Tech Fee fund all labs equitably and instead focus on a mechanism of governance within the University to control growth and maintain sufficient funding for ongoing maintenance?

Or should future Tech Fee funds be focused more on programs that are specific to the general student population such as the laptops available in the SURC, or the new systems available in the EdTech center?

Many scenarios were discussed and it was tabled until next meeting to give everyone time to think about the issue.

A request was made for Chris to provide information on current fees charged to students for specific programs, and a summation of the Tech Fee budget status.

Chris will be in charge of recruitment of new committee members. Colin will send him any emails he receives from prospective members. Colin has also created a group on FaceBook for recruiting new members.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00pm.

Next meeting will be held on April 22<sup>nd</sup> at 4:00 PM.