Student Technology Fee Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

January 15, 2020
Technology Services Building, Room 129
1:00pm – 2:00pm

Attendees: Ginny Boss, Nicholas Clegorne, Jack Delinsky, Brichaya Shah, Jim Herbert (for Jeff Delaney)

Elected Chair: Nicholas Clegorne

Absentees: Jeff Delaney, J. J. Lopez, Carly Keller, Derek Broome, Bailey Veeder

Recorder: Lori Meadows

Call to Order 1:01 PM – Nick Clegorne, Chair of the Student Technology Fee Advisory Committee (STFAC):

- Opened the seventh Student Technology Fee Advisory Committee (STFAC) Meeting by welcoming everyone.
- The purpose of this committee is to serve as an advisory group that reviews and advises the Chief Information Officer on funding criteria and eligibility for new STF expenditure requests.

Approval of Agenda and Minutes:

- STFAC January 15, 2020 meeting agenda approved.
    - Motioned to approve: Ginny Boss (1st) and Brichaya Shah (2nd)
    - Unanimous agreement
- STFAC August 28, 2019 minutes approved.
    - Motioned to approve: Ginny Boss (1st) and Brichaya Shah (2nd)
    - Unanimous agreement

Quorum Vote Threshold:

- 51%, now scalable based on Committee size
- The Committee meet the quorum for voting with three voting members present
- Voting should take place electronically when necessary
- It was again noted that we need three (3) voting students and one (1) additional faculty member on the Committee
- Nicholas Clegorne will continue to campaign for volunteers; recommended that we have each Dean appoint one representative from their college
- Lori Meadows will send Nicholas Clegorne a list of current Deans and their administrative assistants

Student Technology Fee Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

- The Committee will continue voting at the meetings when appropriate; Nik is working to simplify and improve the online voting process

Budget Review:

- UITS
  - Jack Delinsky delivered report on STF budget
  - Color legend has been updated to make the report easier to read
  - We are in better shape because of the changes we made at the last meeting
  - The goal is not to go in the red on an annual basis
  - There will be a little red as we start normalizing the fund: black in 2021, red in 2022/2023/2024, and black again in 2025
  - The normalization plan over seven years will show that we aren't losing funds
  - We are currently about $2mil to the good now due to the changes that were made
  - The High Performance Computing Labs will be LCR every two years now
  - There are around 450 of those machines, or roughly an additional $700K
  - Even with that LCR, we would still have $1.2-$1.3mil in the account over seven years, not including any carry forward funding
  - We'll continue cleaning this up, which will allow us to focus on doing right for the school instead of whether or not we have the funding to do something

Informational Items:

  - Nicholas Clegorne feels this committee operates in a context-poor environment
  - We are an advisory committee
  - If we are deciding on funding eligibility, we may be working in opposition to the CIO
  - The CIO has the right to overrule the recommendation of the Committee
  - The CIO also has the right to revisit any item that is voted down which he feels is important to the campus
  - We should focus on making recommendations to the CIO and let him make the final call on whether or not to proceed
  - Jack Delinsky affirmed that the CIO wants to be sure that we are looking at things the right way
  - Jack Delinsky encouraged the Committee to pursue meeting in the Microsoft Teams environment, and reminded them that not everything will require a face to face meeting
  - Teams is appropriate for quick discussions
  - Qualtrics will tell you the vote count on an item, but not who voted
  - We will continue to tweak the Qualtrics response process and reminders
  - Jack Delinsky questioned whether or not the campus is aware this funding

might be available to them, or how to get it
- o Nicholas Clegorne voiced concern about an influx of ineligible requests if we openly publish the information
- o Jack Delinsky said we should be strategic in where we push out the information
- o Dr. Delaney can share the information with the Deans
- o Nicholas Clegorne suggested that Dr. Delaney tell them they can submit a fixed number of requests each year, and recommended two
- o Jim Herbert said the criteria for funding should be communicated
- o Nicholas Clegorne suggested building the criteria in to Qualtrics using skip logic
- o Lori Meadows acknowledged that sometimes this type of information can be lost with the Deans and suggested pushing the information out to the Business Managers instead
- o Lori Meadows said that use of this fund should not be based on whether or not there is funding available in the requesting department's budget; rather, it should be based on whether it is an appropriate alignment of an expense to a potential funding source
- o Nicholas Clegorne concurred that use of STF should be an *a priory* consideration: here's what we need to buy, and this would be a great earmark for these funds
- o Nicholas proposed that we get on a semesterly cycle of asking the Business Managers to look at this, and the Colleges to put forward its (5) proposals for the semester, and then we can look at them, prioritize them, build our meeting schedule around the volume and depth of those proposals
- o This would allow us to move away from our current ad hoc approach
- o Jack Delinsky reminded us that this is a new Committee, and that we should be working on how we can better assess the requests
- o Nicholas Clegorne asked when the next Business Managers meeting is scheduled
- o Lori Meadows said in a perfect year, she thinks they are once a month but that they can be cancelled frequently due to competing priorities
- o Nicholas asked if we can get an item on the next agenda: We have these funds, they are available, this is how they've been used in the past and it may not have been the most productive application for everyone, we'd like to say that each semester, we would like to solicit up to (5) proposals from each College
- o Lori Meadows asked about taking solicitations from non-academic units
- o The group voiced concern that (5) from each College might be too many; they didn't expect that high of a response
- o Nicholas Clegorne suggested (3) proposals in compromise
- o Based on what we get, we'll tell them that their proposal will be reviewed at some point during the semester, and then we can set up our meeting schedule around that

Student Technology Fee Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

- o Jack Delinsky proposed that we set up our timeline to meet and then either meet or release them based on what proposals are on the table
- o Nicholas agreed with pre-setting the meetings for the second Wednesday of the month at 1:30 PM
- o Nicholas also wants Committee members to find proxies so that the voting isn't delayed
- o Lori will find out the meeting date for the Business Managers
- o This year's schedule will be truncated, but Nicholas thinks this will become an efficient process
- o We can open up an official application season, with the application window falling between January 28th and February 7th
- o Once the application window has closed, we can't take any more
- o Nicholas Clegorne and Jack Delinsky recommended closing the website application process at the end of March and reopening it in early August for the next cycle
- o Any proposals received after the March cutoff will need to be submitted after August 1st, during the next application window
- o The proposals will be submitted for the next semester, even if it's in a different fiscal year
- o Lori Meadows agreed that March is a good time to close the application website because year-end funding requests are usually approved around that time, so we could receive additional requests for expenses that were not approved for institutional funding
- o This timing would also allow Dr. Delaney to cull items from the One-Time Funding list that he feels would be a better fit for STF funding
- o Nicholas proposed two application seasons:
    - ▪ January to March (for the following Fall semester)
    - ▪ July to September (for the following Spring semester)
- o We would spend the rest of the year reviewing the requests for the following semester
- o Jack Delinsky explained that the licenses are staggered throughout the year; having everything due at the end of the year is not advisable because it creates a resource constraint
- o Lori Meadows offered to draft a process proposal to share with the Committee in preparation for the Business Managers meeting
- o Jack Delinsky said it should contain the purpose of this funding, and what they should be considering when applying for STF funding
- o The next Business Managers meeting is February 6 from 2:00 to 4:00
- o Lori will ask that we be added to the agenda
- o Nicholas Clegorne said we'd be looking at meetings in April (two meetings) and May (one meeting)
- o Finals start on April 28th, we should have as many meetings as we need in Teams before then
- o Nicholas Clegorne recommended creating a Word document in Teams that

contains all of the proposals received and any feedback from the Committee, including any questions we have
- o This should save a lot of time at our meetings
- o The group concurred with Nicholas
- o His goal is to move 90% of the discussion into the Teams document prior to the meeting
- o First round, we are just asking for the Deans' best proposal instead of three
- o Lori Meadows will work on the chronology of application timeline and the STF meeting schedule versus the Business Managers meeting schedule

Guests and Request Review:

- No guests present.
- Network 3-D Printing
  - o $30K
  - o These consumer-grade printers require supplies
  - o Material costs will be offset by use charge
  - o Jim Herbert shared his experience with consumer-grade 3-D printers
  - o There may be some safety issues
  - o Lori Meadows voiced concern about the line item for Student Assistants
  - o We need more information than what is provided in the proposal: We have concerns about the model and longevity of the printers requested, as well as serious concerns about the support and chargeback model
  - o Nicholas Clegorne proposed the following vote structure:
    - Reject
    - Revise and Resubmit
    - Accept with Minor Revisions
    - Accept as is
  - o Motion proposed to have the requestor revise and resubmit
    - Motioned, Brichaya Shah (1st) and Ginny Boss (2nd)
    - Unanimous agreement
- AdmitHub
  - o Jack Delinsky said this has already been approved but is being put before the Committee as an informational item for a vote of support
  - o Academic Affairs paid the first year
  - o All 40K students would have access
  - o Text and chat available
  - o Two-way dialogue within website available
  - o We need usage analytics from the current AdmitHub app before we vote
  - o Motioned proposed to table request until the next meeting
    - Motioned, Ginny Boss (1st) and Brichaya Shah (2nd)

Student Technology Fee Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

- Unanimous agreement

Discussion Items:

- Updated Funding Request Form
- Nicholas Clegorne asked if we need to clarify on the application page how broad is the impact of a funding request
- Can Qualtrics send up a flag warning the Committee that it might not be approved?
- Nicholas Clegorne will research Qualtrics skip logic
- Nicholas Clegorne thinks it can be a 2-step review: If the request makes the first cut, then we invite the requester to present to the Committee

Announcements:

- No announcements.

Standing Action Items:

- No standing action items

Adjournment: Meeting adjourned at 2:00 PM.