University Technology Fee Advisory Board Minutes – April 13, 2015

Attendance: Taylor Farley, Chair, CVMBS; Kyle Gruenhagen, Vice Chair, WCNR; Nicole Ramo, GSC; Brandon Earle, SFRB Liaison; Sam Laffey, ASCSU; Jake Loughridge, COB; Adam Lynch, CNS; Blaire MacNeill, CVMBS; John Roos, Ag. Sci; Yusuf Yilmaz, CLA; Bryan Reilly, Student; Brigid McCreery WCNR; Matt Todd, COE; Jason Huiit, ACNS; Pat Burns, VPIT, Advisor; Rusty Scott, ACNS; Scott Baily, ACNS

Meeting commenced: 4:02PM

Minutes from April 6, 2015 – Approved by unanimous consent

Library FY16 Presentation

- Checkout Technology Update
  - Laptop checkouts outside of the Library have been fully handed over to CASA.
  - Video editing rooms and equipment consistently utilized.
  - Laptop checkouts are close to peaking, but feeling is that current fleet is sufficient.
  - iPad checkouts are close to 100%, consistently. 10 iPads funded by UTFAB.
  - Chromebooks, funded by the Library, quite underutilized (on average, about 20% checked out).
  - PC laptops running between 75-95% checked out.
  - Macbooks running between 65-95% checked out.

- Wireless Networking
  - Wireless in the Library upgraded (switch infrastructure funded by Library, access points by UTFAB). Wireless network supports checkout technology fleet in addition to CSU user consumption. Perception is that wireless network in the Library is vastly improved.

- 3D Scanning / Printing / 2D Scanning
  - Adding 2nd touch screen scanner added soon, funded by Library
  - Adding another PaperCut pay-for-print station soon
  - Document scanners have become problematic to use – automatic document feeders no longer functioning correctly

- Budget Request for FY16
  - Replace computers and monitors in labs 171 & 173
  - Refresh 24 checkout Macbooks
  - Expand checkout iPad fleet, suggest add 40, 50% co-sponsored by Library
  - Replace half of available document feeder scanners
  - Request includes 6 FTE co-sponsorship
  - Desktops are on a four-year replacement cycle, desktops last far longer than checkout technology
    - FY17 projected request: $237,600
    - FY18 projected request: $223,400
    - Upcoming year projections increase based on having extended four year replacements cycles for most technology, which increases the amount of technology that will need to be replaced in coming years.

- Q&A
  - Why not check out the Chromebooks for longer – perhaps a week?
    - Library would certainly consider that
When were Chromebooks introduced?
- One year ago, started at 10, doubled to 20 in last twelve months

Is there quality control at the check in process?
- Yes, as time allows. Broken screens are always caught, less obvious problems like broken connectors for keys are usually reported after the next checkout.

Did you say warranties aren’t offered as much?
- Warranties are offered, but “fix anything” warranties are no longer offered, so some incidental damages are not covered.

Do manufacturers accept broken equipment back?
- Parts are usually replaced on site, but most broken equipment is cannibalized for spare parts in house.

Macbook replacement is $1,200?
- Mostly correct, some price fluctuations occur between funding authorization and purchase.

Office 365 FY16 Presentation
- Students can now download up to 5 copies of Office Professional per device platform
- Cost savings to students - 140 or 80 dollars for personal copies
- Campus contributes 350k per year to Office 365, leaving about 54k unfunded - roughly $1/student per semester
- ASCSU ($15k) and UTFAB ($39k) contributed for FY15
- ASCSU is dropping out for FY16
- Students are eligible to retain rights to Office for one year after graduation
- 8700 activations to-date, waiting for days from Microsoft on how many are students, presumed to be mostly students (activations, not students)
- Request for FY16 contributes to be $1/student per semester based on current enrollment
- 84.6% co-sponsored for FY16

Q&A
- What’s the total cost to the University?
  - Total university cost is over $400k, derived from university FTE count of Information Workers (5,218)
- Do we expect the university to continue the current funding split going forward? Yes, for the foreseeable future.

Legitimacy Votes
- Library
  - What are students using iPads for?
    - Anecdotal evidence suggests that students are primarily using them for e-Readers
  - How are the other colleges using Library checkout technology?
    - Colleges outside of Business seem to be using them extensively
  - Maybe smaller technology checkouts should not be included in subsequent fiscal years to cut down on future Library funding requests
Could the Board get some additional information about what the iPads are being used for?

- Answer from Library – yes, we’d be happy to survey students on this.
- Vote on Legitimacy: Approved unanimously

Office 365
- Vote on Legitimacy: Approved unanimously

Bylaws Amendment

- **Article VIII: Voting, Section 6.** The Board shall have the authority to recommend an increase or decrease to the University Technology Fee assessed to all students. A motion to this effect may be offered by any member, and requires a two-thirds majority vote at two consecutive regularly scheduled meetings. *After the first vote is taken, a two-thirds majority vote shall be required to amend the amount of the increase or decrease.* The Chair and Advisor shall be responsible for ensuring that at least one open forum session is held for the entire student body to gain understanding and offer feedback to the Board on the rationale behind any proposed modification to the University Technology Fee prior to a final vote on a motion to that effect.
- Recommendation from Dr. Mike Ellis, SFRB Advisor, based on the process employed in other fee areas with a similar process.
- Suggestions were offered to make the first vote more of a “legitimacy vote”, the Board will review this in the coming week and prepare a modified amendment.
- Motion to table one week: Approved unanimously

Upcoming Schedule Discussion

Adjourned: 5:10PM