

Tech Fee Meeting Minutes

May 6, 2014

Meeting started at 4:00 PM in Bouillon 211.

Present: Chris Pratz, Colin Pringle, Sandy Sperline, Josef Gamble, Derek Whillom, John Anvik, Ian Loverro, David Carrothers, Library Rep and Zachary Geesaman, Computer Science.

Chris opened with a screen shot of the document – ASCWU-BOD and CWU Student Technology Fee Contractual Agreement of 1996. Discussion followed as to what hasn't been followed by the BOD and the Tech Fee Committee. This is a big issue we are facing how we, as a tech fee committee, interface with the BOD. Obviously, this agreement needs to be updated. In the agreement it states the BOD will appoint members and chairs to the committee. If we are going through with what we are doing, technically, we are violating the agreement so it does need to be revised, assuming it is still contractual. Last three years the BOD has not appointed members and the previous IT administrator of the tech fee did nothing about this issue. We have not had a chair since before Chris took over. Chris may need to contact the BOD about these issues and he will discuss the issue with his supervisor. Colin would like this policy agreement revised by the end of the year. .

Chris shared another document regarding "CWU Student Tech Fee Membership Policy" he created. It's been hard to get students to participate and to keep them coming back each year. We will get students at the beginning of the academic year and they slowly drop out for one reason or another. Then it starts all over again the next year. If the committee approves the policy, which they did, Chris will revise it. Colin brought up that the policy doesn't say anything about the chair. The chair is chosen every fall quarter, Chris will address this issue in the

policy. Colin asked if there were any rules, guidelines, polices the committee feels that needs to be in a this agreement so we can operate from year to year. Main issue is membership recruitment which Chris is in charge

Financial Items – Chris stated there is about \$200,00 in the tech fee budget over what was reported at the last meeting. The sheet he passed out is a projection, not a ledger. Bottom line is the tech fee will have approximately \$360,000 left thru March, minus the \$40,000 the committee approved for Computer Science. So the tech fee will be in the black at the end of this fiscal year, June 31st.

One of the questions we have been faced with before, is coming up with the funding of different labs, the propriety lab versus department labs, for example, the Communication, Art, Computer Science, ITAM, etc. In discussion right now, is the ITAM Department is actively looking to take over Shaw/Smyser 214. They would like it as a departmental lab only, used exclusively by ITAM which they will then maintain. If they do that, we may charge them for the equipment in the lab now and the monies would go back into the tech fee account. More on this to come at a later date.

The dilemma we are faced with is with the current bills that the tech fee does pay, the maintenance budget is approx. \$200,000 a year, and our labs have grown beyond the point that \$200,000 budget can maintain the equipment on a 4 year cycle. We are going to get more labs when the Phase II Science project is completed with capital funds and the university will have take those on. All departments generally look towards the tech fee first for money, so where do we draw that line between depts. and specific labs?

Suggestions are:

1. Fund all labs, tech fee committee decides
2. No department labs funded
3. Fund them based on availability (share funding)
4. Fund based on usage

5. Specialty costs (3-D printers, color printers, etc)

Chris would like a statement from the Tech Fee Committee regarding this issue. We are faced with the same issue in Lynnwood as the 114 lab in there doesn't have much usage, but 115 is fairly well used. So based on usage for 114, down the road do we put new equipment in that lab? How do we determine usage? Labstats can grab those statistics for us. Chris showed examples on the smartboard. The committee needs to settle on one option and write a statement on that issue. The EISC task committee will be coming up shortly with what they would like to see done with the computer labs. RCM model is being passed on to academics and Chris predicts next year we will see more departments coming to the tech fee for more money.

Colin brought up the request for funds by the Ed Tech Center for a new color printer. Ian states the color printer in there now is old and they do charge \$1.00 per copy. Steve Stein initiated the request. We need some kind of advertisement regarding where there are colored printers on campus – Shaw/Smyser 217 & 218, the library and the SURC. David says there is not a high demand for color copies. The committee voted on funding a new color printer for the Ed Tech Center. Request was denied. Colin will send Dr. Stein an email and address the reasons why the request was denied.

Colin reiterates the 2 goals we have before us – make guideline policy for the committee and finalize about committee membership.

No new business. Meeting adjourned at 4:45pm.

