Delivering core solutions and propelling innovation

TECHNOLOGY FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Tuesday, Nov. 15, 2016, 9:30 a.m.
Quentin Burdick Building 206E

Meeting Notes – approved on March 31, 2017

**Present:** Marc Wallman, VPIT; Rian Nostrum, TFAC Chair; Jason Blosser (for Melissa Stotz), Warren Christensen, Dani Collison, Dominic Fettig (for Seth Bisbee, until 10:25 a.m.), Marisa Mathews (until 10:15 a.m.), Ken Mbuba, Nick Reitan, Lauren Singelmann, Aaron Weber (until 10:45 a.m.), David Wittrock (at 9:53 a.m.), CeCe Rohwedder

**Unable to attend:** Seth Bisbee, Mari Borr, Anne Denton, Jeff Dertinger, Emma Ewen, Melissa Stotz,

1. Welcome and introductions were conducted.

2. Discussion of recommendation for a request for an increase to Student Technology Fee:
   - Marc reviewed the overall process for requesting increases to the Student Technology Fee.
   - Marc distributed and reviewed information (attached) about this year’s request for an increase to the student technology fee, for consideration by TFAC and recommendation for next steps.
   - The Student Fee Advisory Board (SFAB) has received or will receive requests for increases to other fees.
   - The current average salary for IT student employees is $9.20/hr. This does not compare favorably with salaries for jobs in the community, and individuals with IT skills are in high demand in the community. The IT Division is committed to offering competitive salaries to students and may have to hire fewer students as a result. There is no process for balancing salaries of all campus student positions.

   [David Wittrock arrived, at 9:53 a.m.]

   - Equipment replacement in the Hill Center will first be due in two years. Refresh costs were not included in the budget for the building project, as is customarily the case.

   - The IT Division cascade program of three-year-old computers is a revenue source for the Student Tech. Fee fund and provides an economic alternative
to departments needing computers.

- If the requested increase to the Student Tech. Fee is not approved, reserve funds (built up from one-time, year-end funds granted in the last few years) will be used to cover the costs of the items for which the increase is requested; this will result in cuts necessary when the reserve funds have been depleted. The Provost is aware of this.
- The difference to the UND student tech. fee costs is due to the fact that UND has no IT Division equivalent, doesn’t offer as many campus wide IT services, and its IT fees are rolled in with department and program fees, as the various UND departments have their own IT units.

Marc left the meeting, at 10:05 a.m.

- M to discuss each increase area individually (Aaron/Lauren). MSC.
- Hill Center: M to approve the increase request as presented, at $0.63 per credit (Nick/Aaron).
- Discussion: this increase would put us at 21.8% of the cumulative 1% total that the student fees may be increased without Chancellor approval. Student fees are a viable option for replacement of one-time funding that is not expected to continue in the current fiscal year and the near future. It is unfortunate that refresh costs are not budgeted in new building projects, but it is understandable.

Marissa left the meeting, at 10:15 a.m.

- Is all the equipment in the Hill Center being used as intended, and what is the impact on students who have classes and labs in that building? Graduate students would also pay for the fees associated with this building yet do not have classes in it and so receive no benefit; however faculty may request moving graduate courses there. Should student fees continue to be the only revenue source for costs such as this?

Dominic left the meeting, at 10:25 a.m.

- The data of the student experience and impact of instrumented classrooms such as those available in the Hill Center would be useful; it is unknown whether data is being collected, nor what type of data would be desired.
- Are faculty prepared to fully use the Hill Center technologies? Would funds be better spent on training the faculty on such use vs. refreshing the technologies?
- Vote on the Hill Center motion was held: MSC (1 abstention, Jason).

30 additional classrooms: M to deny the increase request (Aaron/Nick).
- Discussion: the amount of the requested increase is too large. If the overall request for increase to the student technology fee is not too high, it is more likely to be approved by SFAB. SFAB approval of the overall request is not binding: the revenue from the increased fee may be used by the IT Division for any of the three areas of need presented to TFAC, depending on the division’s prioritization; such prioritization would be helpful to SFAB as that group considers all the increase requests.
- One of TFAC’s jobs is to be an advocate for technology, and one of its
responsibilities is to be good stewards and include political and strategic considerations in its recommendations.

[Aaron left the meeting, at 10:45 a.m.]

- Vote on the 30 additional classrooms motion was held: MSC; 5 yes, 1 abstention (Jason), 1 no
- Student salary increase: M to approve this increase request as presented, at $0.28/credit (Lauren/Warren).
  - Discussion: hiring and retention of student employees is a need; student fees are being used to pay students, so essentially the student employees help pay their own salaries. Combined with the increase request for the Hill Center, this request would put us at approx. 31% of the 1% overall increase to student fees that can be approved without Chancellor approval.

[David left the meeting, at 10:55 a.m.]
- Vote on the student salary motion was held: MSC unanimously.

3. M (Nick/Lauren) to approve the 10/6/16 meeting notes as presented. MSC unanimously.

4. Action Plan solicitation for the 2016-2017 academic year:
   A. $50,000 available
   B. submission deadline: 1/13/17, 5 p.m.
   C. TFAC to meet and review proposals the week of 1/30 or 2/6

5. Changes to Action Plans (on Blackboard):
   A. #1612, Geosciences & ALA, “Augmented Reality Sand Table.” Request for Scope Change, to allow for expenditure of some of the awarded funds for supplies needed to better utilize the sand tables for both outreach and in the classrooms, submitted and approved on 11/8/16.

6. Action Plan reports:
   A. Status reports received since the last TFAC meeting (on Bb):
      None to report
   B. Final reports received since the last TFAC meeting (on Bb):
      b. #1216, CFW, “CFW Session Video Recordings: Enhancing Training, Expanding Service.” $69.80 not utilized was returned to the student tech. fee general account
      c. #1603, ECE, “Remote Student Access to ECE Software.”
      d. #1612, Geosciences & ALA, “Augmented Reality Sand Table.”