

University Charges for Technology Committee
Meeting Minutes
Friday, November 13, 2009
4:00 – 5:00 PM
Computer Sciences Building 130

Attending the meeting: Ed Peryonnin(Chair); Ken Blehm , Larry Cobb (CVMBS); Jack McGrew, Jim Cox (Natural Sciences); Chris Ketterman (Liberal Arts); Dave Carpenter, Eric Tisdale, (CAHS);; Debbie Devore (WCNR); Michael Brake, Billy Mihelich, (CASA); Jon Schroth (COB); Rebecca Fraley (BFS); Pat Burns (VPIT); Mark Ritschard, Hannah Hudson (COE)

1. Meeting called to order
 - a. Brief discussion of change of committee oversight to CITAC.
 - b. Spring committee meeting reviewed and approved
 - c. Requested for comments regarding the spring report. None given.
 - d. Next Spring Report due early April. Next UCFT Meeting after Spring break, prior to 15 April. All TBA. (Ed will contact Kathy DuQuoin, Rick Miranda's Executive Assistant, for due date and relay to committee members)
2. UTFAB updates provided by the VPIT, Pat Burns
 - a. Student Information System will have updates by the spring. Class wait list pilot project will be conducted in the spring.
 - b. Library technology upgrades continuing on a five year refresh cycle.
 - c. Wireless network expansion and upgrade to cope with laptop density (1400 simultaneous connections at measured in the library. 121 out of 126 incoming freshman surveyed own a laptop.
 - d. Units encouraged proposing projects for \$140,000 surplus (due to increased enrollment).
3. Printing for students –
 - a. VP-IT briefed on student efforts to get free printing in the library.
 - i. Students lost free printing when the Weber computer lab was closed.
 - ii. The library is under contract until July 2011 with Communications and Creative Services RamPrint at \$.15 per page.
 - iii. ASCSU passed a resolution to allow some free printing in the library to be paid for by UTFAB.
 - iv. ASCSU presented a proposal for UTFAB to pay for printing.
 - v. A credit of \$5 per student would cost UTFAB \$250,000 annually.
 - vi. UTFAB went back to their respective colleges, and voted against the proposal.
 - b. Colleges should be prepared to go back and look at their colleges to see if there can be an alignment in policy.
 - c. The library is actively looking at a solution to implement on July 1, 2011.
4. ATRC funding change proposal
 - a. In the past, ATRC has used a “budget authority model with” a “cap” of \$20,000. ATRC presents its individual purchase summary at the spring UTC meeting. The summary of these add-hoc requests are voted on and have typically been passed

unanimously with minimal discussion. The ten year expenditure history was passed out. The average annual expenditure for the past ten years has been about \$16,000.

ATRC TECH FEE EXPENDITURES

Order Period		Amount
Dec-00	Jun-01	14,156.66
Aug-01	Mar-02	15,759.86
Jul-02	Mar-03	10,845.33
Jul-03	Mar-04	16,229.87
Jul-04	Mar-05	19,669.02
Aug-05	Apr-06	15,179.67
Jul-06	Apr-07	14,238.01
Aug-07	May-08	19,579.09
Jul-08	9-May	14, 542.84

Avg Yearly Total	15,707.19
-------------------------	------------------

- b. Dave Carpenter (CAHS) motioned to provide ATRC an annual budget from which they would spend through the year and provide their report to the committee as all colleges. The ratio of charges would not change. The funding model would allow ATRC to schedule and plan purchases and align their processes with the rest of the group. Ken Blehm (CVMBS) seconded the motion.
 - c. The motion – ATRC would be provided \$20,000 a year from College Tech Fee accounts at the beginning of the year in the same ratio they now provide. Any unexpended revenue will be rolled over into the next year. ATRC is required to file the annual tech fee report to the UCFT chair in the spring. If ATRC needs an adjustment to their budget, they must provide UCFT rationale officially, and UCFT will vote on its merits.
 - d. After a good discussion, motion carried unanimously.
 - e. Mark Ritschard, COE, made the motion to discuss changing how the charge ratio is determined from percentage of tech fees brought in to total number of students per-college. The rationale was that students who have raised their own tech fees pay disproportionately. The outcome of any change would be that there would be less than a .5% change in anyone’s budget with Engineering gaining the most and Liberal Arts losing the most. The question was called. The motion failed 9 – 3.
5. No updates for the Tech Fee Manual.
 6. Only College of Agricultural Sciences indicated that they were raising the Tech Fee.
 7. Next meeting will be placed on the calendar.
 8. Meeting was adjourned at 5:02PM