

## Tech Fee Committee Meeting

May 20, 2014

Bouillon 211, 4:00pm

Present: Chris Pratz, Colin Pringle, Sandy Sperline, John Irvik, Josef Gamble, Derek Whillom, Zachary Geesaman. Absent: Dr. Ian Loverro and a representative from the Library.

Colin emailed Dr. Stein regarding his request for a color printer in the Ed Tech Center. At the last meeting, his request was declined. Dr. Stein responded there is no viable option for color printing in the Black Hall, so he doesn't have usage stats. He thinks this would be beneficial for students and would like to pursue his request with our help. Discussion followed. There is a color printer, although it is old, in the Ed Tech Center computer lab, it costs students a dollar per page. Colin states there are two color printers in the SURC for students to print from, which is right next door to Black Hall. According to David Carrothers from the last meeting, there is not much call for colored pages in the library. Sandy stated the same for the Shaw/Smyser labs. According to the student survey, there were only 5 requests for color printers. The committee has decided at this time, they do not feel Dr. Stein had enough information to warrant a new color computer. Colin will email him again.

Colin wrote on the whiteboard 4 options how we could fund the computer labs.

1. Fund all labs (tech fee discretion)
2. No Dept. labs (what defines a dept lab)
3. Fund them based on availability
4. Fund them based on usage

If the committee chooses #1, we would fund all computer labs. A dept. would come to the committee with a request. If we should see a need

elsewhere, for instance, where equipment is older and in much more need of replacing, it would be the committee's discretion to approve or deny request.

If #2 was chosen, we only fund labs that are open 100% of the time to students. This option will have to determine what is a dept. lab. John asked if we have any such labs, Sandy feels the Randall Art lab and Hogue labs could fall into "Dept. labs".

Chris then brought up the Student Technology Fee Contractual Agreement which dates back to 1996. He could not find where this contract was superseded by another. In reading the policy, Chris feels it is spelled out that funding the labs will be based on usage. The policy states "Hardware that is used solely by students in open laboratories, or for checkout may be funded 100% by the Student Technology Fee. Hardware that is shared between student usage and instructional delivery may be jointly funded based on the proportional usage. (i.e. Laboratory/Classroom desktop computers and peripherals)." Perhaps this statement should guide the committee's decisions. Derek looked at the governing law and it says the tech fee money can only be used essentially for computers that are always available to students and that are not used for instructional purposes and are not always available to students. Interpretation would be this technology is available to all students. What this is saying, for instance, the SURC and Library checkout laptops are available 100% of the time to students, will be funded 100% by the tech fee. And if for example, ITAM uses the Shaw labs 80% of the time, they would fund 80% of the upgrade monies. Chris feels this is a reasonable conclusion. For simplicity, maybe we should charge a flat rate for the labs (for classes). If you teach a class in a lab 3 hours every day for the quarter, it will cost the dept., xx amount of dollars. If you have a class in there, but not using the computers, it's still going to cost you xx amount of money. This will land like a bombshell on academics. John feels the departments will then come

back and say if we charge them to use the lab for classes they will in turn charge the students to cover these costs. Some departments are already charging students an “extra” fee for lab use. For instance, ITAM charges a “lab fee” which is not used for the labs.

Zachary Geesaman commented that if the committee went with 3 or 4 option, he is fine with that because the Hebelers labs are open and available to all students. For instance, he just helped an ITAM student who was working in the Hebelers labs. He’s glad to do as it is his job. If you go with 3 he is happy to put up signs in the SS labs that say “Hey, if these labs are full, come over to the Hebelers labs.” He is willing to get the word out. If we go with option 4, he will want as many non-CS students as possible. Computer Science is considering a request for 25 more stations and an additional 15, which may go into an adjoining lab. If we go with option 4 – this will not happen. CS is planning on using their funds to fill this order for computers. If we decide today we are going to bill for usage, that’s not going to happen. Not \$1 of CS lab fee money is going towards new hardware because they will have to save it to cover our fees. But if you go with option 3 then he can commit to their faculty that we spend the money on the hardware because then it’s a joint arrangement. CS is contributing some, tech fee will contribute some and they will get a better product in the outcome. The danger of the university’s management program is the university is already very siloed. The more siloed it becomes, the less the departmental cooperation there will be. How effective is it to have hardware only for 1 department who is using the lab the most? Do we want to support philosophies that would encourage that siloing or will it actually encourage cooperation that will say “yes please” if you have a class and you can’t find a computer lab, come into our labs because they are open and available. You don’t have to walk to the library, you can walk to Hebelers which is right next to Shaw.

So what would funding based on usage look like? Checking R25 would give us a look at when classes are scheduled versus open times. Lab stats gives us a good picture of components being utilized but not whose using them. Would high usage labs get more funding than lower usage labs? Such complex questions!!

If we decide to go against what the policy is saying and fund all labs, what happens since we are in violation of the policy? Unless we can articulate a real good reason to go against this, we can change it, but the agreement clearly states that they should be jointly funded based on proportionate usage. If we decide to change the policy, how does this work? Chris believes we would have to start with the BOD to be approved. Josef asked if this policy was backed up by an RCW (Revised Code of Washington) and Chris says yes it is. Josef stated the BOD wants all new policies voted on by students for approval. The BOD will be changing its' name to ASCW-SG (Student Government).

Colin asked if from here on out do we need to be funding each lab proportionately? We have not been doing this in the past. And this is the reason we are faced with this issue now. Basically, we have doing Option #1, example, we just put new monitors in two Shaw/Smyser labs with no contribution from other departments.

Option #4 – usage is hard to define and constantly changing. If we go for charging of availability when we go to update labs, we'll go back to usage from the past 4 years. For example, ITAM has used the labs the past 4 years for classes, X amount of times, and we need to upgrade now, so ITAM will owe this amount of money. We should inform all departments now to give them a couple years to budget for their share, so that when it comes time to upgrade the labs based on usage, they will have money to pay for their percentage of hardware. What happens when we ask, for example, ITAM, that labs need to be upgraded and ITAM used SS 212 70% of the time, therefore, you owe

70% of the bill? ITAM comes back and says they don't have the money so can't pay their percentage, which Chris feels will definitely happen. Do we have ITAM go into debt to us, or do we not replace the lab? This will only hurt the students using the labs and will make us look like the bad guy. Part of our MO is to make sure the labs are usable and if the computers are 8 years old, the labs will not be usable. What if we take the funding away from the departments and throw it back on the university? We can put it to the Provost, or whoever helps replace the labs. Let's say it will take \$200,000.00 to update labs and say these departments have taught in these labs this amount of time, so let the Provost know we need \$80,000 from the university. If we go to the department level, it's going to be hard to say, ITAM- you used SS labs 35% of the time, Theatre Arts, used it 7% of the time, therefore you owe 35% and Theatre owes 7%. It's going to become a real mess. Is it a viable option to go the Provost. All we can do is have some statistics and go to the Provost with them. The committee decided option 4 is out of the questions and settle on option 3. This option will follow what we should have been doing all along and falls within the contract. The committee took an official vote and unanimously voted for option 3. Based on usage we will pay up to x amount and someone else will need to come up with the rest. It would be up to the Provost to get the money from the departments. How do we get the university to hold up their end? We could go to the BOD and have them talk with the Provost. Chris will discuss this issue with his supervisor, Gene Shoda.

How do we revise and ratify the Student Technology Fee Contractual Agreement? We need to have the BOD involved or we can make changes and send it to them for approval and/or add their input. We'll focus on this issue at our next meeting. Colin asked the committee to bring recommendations to the next meeting and discussion will follow. Colin will send out a reminder with the document attached on (Tuesday, 5/27) and another email reminder on Monday (6/02).

The next Tech Fee Committee meeting will be held on Tuesday, June 3<sup>rd</sup> at 4 PM in Bouillon 211.

Meeting was adjourned.