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FY2004 Student Technology Fee Allocations

Dr. Fraser reported for the Student Technology Fee Subcommittee. He noted the introduction of pre-proposals in this funding cycle in order to allow reviews by Facilities Planning and ISAT regarding space, infrastructure, etc. He commented on several issues raised by the subcommittee, including use of Student Technology Fee funds for security systems, laptops, construction, and staffing.

Dr. Henry suggested initial discussion center on the recommendations for allocations. Dr. de Castro responded that the recommendations had been shaped by the positions of the subcommittee on the issues mentioned by Dr. Fraser, in particular the disqualifying of proposals with requests for room renovations.

Dr. Kaminshine cited the Board of Regents directive against using the Student Technology Fee funds for facility improvements. He pointed out some of the proposals had substantial portions of funds targeted for renovations. Dr. de Castro questioned the reasonableness of totally separating space needs from technology needs in the funding process. Dr. Tai described a case in the Biology Department of a PC lab made unusable by excessive heating from PCs and how restricting use of Student Technology Fee funds for air conditioning such spaces is counterproductive. Dr. Henry observed the pre-proposal approach was designed to address issues of this type.

Dr. Kaminshine commented that the rejection of Student Technology Fee funding for renovations was more difficult because of the other budget constraints faced by the university. Dr. de Castro added that this limitation damaged creative efforts. He pointed to the proposal from the Psychology Department which was ranked third by the College of Arts and Sciences, but received no funding because of the disqualification of proposals with renovation costs.

Dr. Jacobs asked about the view of the subcommittee as from where funds for renovations related to proposals should come. Dr. Fraser replied that the subcommittee had not addressed this at length, but in the case of furniture, it was felt the colleges should bear the costs.

Dr. Tai requested an inquiry to Board of Regents regarding the use of Student Technology Fee funds for renovations, air conditioning, etc. Dr. Henry responded that the Board of Regents could be approached, but after five years of operation such stipulations tend to be set. He suggested departmental cost shares for proposals requiring renovations would be the more likely successful approach.

Dr. de Castro asked about any room alterations associated with funded items 1.1.7 and 1.1.8 on
the allocation spreadsheet. Dr. Fraser and Ms. Casto did not have detailed information with them concerning these proposals; however, Ms. Casto conjectured 1.1.8 was an Alpharetta Center classroom already configured for this use or not requiring major renovation.

Dr. Henry asked if all proposals with construction costs were denied. Dr. Fraser indicated all construction costs were flagged. Dr. Kaminshine stated funding was limited to incidental construction. Dr. Fraser posed the possibility of a percentage of funding allowed for construction, but opted for a less specific rule of not-dominant. Dr. Henry asked if the subcommittee had been consistent with its approach in prior years. Dr. Kaminshine answered this was the case. Dr. de Castro voiced doubt about consistency regarding some funded proposals in past years.

Dr. Huss made a motion to recommend the allocations as presented by the subcommittee. Dr. Tai seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Dr. Henry asked about changes in the timing of the call for proposals next year. Dr. Fraser indicated the call for pre-proposals would be moved up to allow more time for Facilities Planning and ISAT to review the pre-proposals. He noted a large number of pre-proposals arrived in the last days before the due date, which taxed those doing the space, infrastructure, etc. pre-reviews for the subcommittee. He reiterated the value of the reviews of pre-proposals to the subcommittee. Dr. de Castro emphasized FACP also needed more time to review the recommendations from the subcommittee prior to the meeting at which these recommendations were acted upon. Dr. Henry explained that the meeting this year had been scheduled based on an erroneous assumption about the subcommittee having completed its work.

Dr. Henry noted the position of the subcommittee that the Student Technology Fee should not fund staff. He spoke for revisiting this issue in better budget years when staff positions could be moved to regular state funds. He also noted a surprising number of GRAs funded through the Student Technology Fee.

Dr. Henry asked about the next move regarding funding for security items. Dr. Fraser indicated the subcommittee excluded funding for security cameras this year, and would like to add security to the pre-proposal reviews.

Dr. Henry asked about the reluctance to fund requests for laptops. Dr. Fraser responded that the subcommittee was hesitant to fund proposals, which discouraged students from buying their own laptops. He saw such proposals as eating into the availability of funding for pioneering projects. He added that the growth in wireless access would make student-owned laptops all the more logical.

Dr. de Castro pointed out the same argument could be made against outfitting open labs with PCs since these also relieve students of the need to buy their own laptops. He noted the advantage of space-savings with laptops over PCs. Dr. Tai echoed this point regarding lack of counter space in labs for PCs. Dr. Kaminshine agreed laptops were in some cases the better option, but voiced opposition to providing laptops for student to check out. Dr. de Castro responded that it would be reasonable to have laptops for students to check out to use on the Library Plaza for on-line searches. He added that laptops could be loaded with specialized software, which students would not ordinarily have on their own laptops. He also noted concerns about spread of computer viruses
from student-owned laptops.

Dr. Henry indicated there would be follow-up with the Board of Regents concerning the limitations on Student Technology Fee funds for renovations and with the deans concerning cost sharing options.

Dr. Tai expressed gratitude to the subcommittee for its work on a very difficult job. Dr. Henry reiterated thanks to Dr. Fraser and the subcommittee.

Admission Application Fees

Dr. Fritz presented a proposal to raise admission application fees for undergraduate and graduate applicants to $50 from $25. He pointed out that Georgia and Georgia Tech currently have $50 application fees, and that the termination of Banner backfill funding would pose problems for the colleges and central offices in processing applications. He noted that waivers were historically given to needy applicants based on recommendations of high school guidance counselors.

Dr. de Castro asked about the status of on-line applications. Dr. Fritz replied that the feed from on-line applications to Banner was not yet working, but at least one college would be up-and-running within the week with the rest to follow shortly. Dr. de Castro asked about cost savings with on-line applications. Dr. Fritz replied that Banner did not translate into cost savings, rather to changes in way of doing business. Dr. de Castro observed a high percentage of acceptances could be handled directly by computer. Dr. Henry asked if this meant the colleges would not need backfill positions. Dr. de Castro answered that the bulk of the college workload would be for graduate students. Dr. Colarusso confirmed much of the Banner work for graduate admissions was at the college level.

Dr. Henry pointed to the need to rework business processes in handling applications. Dr. Fritz remarked that national trends were toward more involvement by people in admission decision-making rather than automated systems. Dr. Huss spoke for an approach to admit the best rather than all who meet admission minima. Dr. de Castro reacted that waiting to make admission decisions until the entire sample is in hand would be one way to accomplish this by computer. Dr. Huss injected that the decisions needed to take into account more than freshman indices. Dr. Henry stated that studies showed Algebra II as the best indicator of success.

Ms. Smith raised questions about the determination of $50 as the amount proposed. She cited $40 as the median of the application fees on the handout. Dr. Fritz replied that the handout did not reflect anticipated increases at the other universities and that there was also the intent to be consistent with the other research universities in the University System of Georgia. Ms. Smith expressed concern about the number of fee increases for FY2004 as well as the transcript fee instituted in FY2003. She noted students had not had an opportunity to comment on application fee proposal. She indicated she understood the rationale for the proposal, but was speaking on behalf of students who only saw the added cost to them.

Dr. Fritz commented that the application fee increase was also intended to decrease the number of casual applications, which were never completed, and to improve the quality of the incoming class. Dr. Moore pointed out the decrease in number of applications would affect the fee revenues.
Ms. Smith asked how the current application fees were used in the general fund. Dr. Henry answered that revenues were not tied to specific uses. He added that even with the increased fee, an argument could be made to add all to the general fund.

Dr. Moore asked about the change from regular state funds to fee-based funds for the Banner backfill staff. Dr. Henry replied that the current funding was from contingency funds, not continuing lines. He noted the fee-based funds would allow them to be on continuing lines. Dr. Kelley communicated support for the proposed fee increase. She added that the academic assistance offices where the backfill positions are located provided much more service to students than just processing of applications.

Dr. Henry pointed out 3 out of 4 applicants paying the fee would never enroll as students. Dr. Fritz commented that students were concerned about lack of services as well as fees. He reiterated the additional funds would be used to improve services.

Dr. de Castro stated his sympathy with students regarding rising costs. He observed public education stays public only as it is kept inexpensive. He singled out decisions at the state level as the driving force in progressive taxation of students. Ms. Smith agreed with this point, but reported the SGA office would still receive a lot of negative reactions from students.

Dr. Jacobs remarked that from a branding perspective it was not a good idea to be below Georgia and Georgia Tech. Dr. Huss asked if the fee was entirely a campus decision. Dr. Henry responded that the President was the final authority for fees of this type.

Ms. Smith asked about any guarantee that fee revenues would be used as outlined. Dr. Henry replied that it was an honor system. Dr. Moore assured the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies would be using the fee revenues to replace discontinued contingency funding for Banner backfill or else services would deteriorate.

Dr. Henry pointed out the full revenues would not be realized in the first year of implementation, and that actuals over the last four years were short of those shown in the proposal. He proposed backfill be guaranteed to the colleges from contingency funds pending flow of revenues. He said allocations could be made after actuals are known for the coming year.

Dr. Tai asked for clarification of how college shares were determined. Dr. Fritz responded that he started with one senior level position for the smallest colleges and then roughly followed distribution of applications among the colleges, but there was no formula per se. He noted some academic assistance offices processed both undergraduate and graduate applications.

Dr. de Castro suggested consideration of a lower fee for those applying on-line, perhaps $40. Dr. Fritz answered the objective was to go to all on-line admission applications and likewise for financial aid. Dr. Henry added that the problem was supporting materials for applications from high schools, etc. would still not be on-line.

Ms. Smith repeated her concern about student reaction to the fee increase. She urged consideration of a $40 fee instead of $50.
Dr. de Castro made a motion to recommend the $50 application fee as proposed. Dr. Jacobs seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Dr. Henry noted the fee increase when approved by President Patton would be effective for Spring Semester 2004 applications.
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