The minutes of April 19-20 were approved with one correction.

Technology Fee Awards for FY2007

Dr. Pan presented the recommendations from the Student Technology Fee Subcommittee of the University Senate Committee on Information Systems & Technology for FY2007 funding of technology fee proposals. Dr. Pan noted the Board of Regents approved only $10 of the requested $25 increase in the technology fee, which had necessitated revisiting the original recommendations of the committee. He pointed out that the printing credit for students was one of the items affected by the reduced increase in the fee with the credit reduced proportionately from $7.50 to $3 per semester ($2 in the summer). Dr. Pan added that the committee had over-awarded FY2007 projected fee revenues by $130K under the assumption that unexpended FY2006 revenues would be available to cover the difference.

Dr. Tai asked about continuation of the practice of charging personnel to the technology fee. Dr. Pan replied that the committee repeated its advice to Dr. Henry that personnel costs should shift from the technology fee to the regular budget in the future. He continued that the committee had deleted funding for student assistantships from the FY2007 awards. Dr. Nelson spoke to the need for technology fee support to fund student assistants in labs. Dr. Tai also urged flexibility for graduate assistants.

Dr. Thachenkary stated concern about the proposal process. He noted 40% of award dollars went to IS&T and 30% to the College of Arts and Sciences. Dr. Kaminshine pointed out that the IS&T proposals were for university-wide projects, which benefited all students. Dr. Henry cited the Digital Aquarium, the campus wireless network, and the Alpharetta Center as examples of funded proposals from IS&T. Dr. Pan added that the success rates for the colleges relative to funding requested were similar. Dr. Thachenkary suggested a formula basis for distributing the balance of funds to the colleges. Dr. Henry reminded that the Board of Regents specified that a committee with at least 50% student representation would make the allocation recommendations and set forth guidelines for how the funds could be spent. He cautioned that future distributions would have to take into account equipment which had become outdated after being purchased in the early years of the technology fee.

Dr. Nelson commented that the current process, which includes prioritization at the college level, encourages a strategic look at technology needs. He asked for flexibility in order to allow use of a portion of the awarded funds for request 2.1.7 for student assistants.

Dr. Kaminshine made a motion to accept the recommendations presented by Dr. Pan with the modification for 2.1.7 to allow support for student assistants. Dr. Tai seconded the motion. Dr.
Kaminshine commented that he was making the motion while sensing the matter of 2.1.7 should have been presented to the Student Technology Fee Subcommittee. Dr. Alberto urged that the modification not be treated as precedent setting. Dr. Hudson observed that equipment without people to oversee its use would be paperweights. Ms. Casto pointed out that the Student Technology Fee Subcommittee had felt more strongly about graduate assistants because of the additional cost of waivers. The motion passed.

Dr. Henry thanked Dr. Thachenkary for his service on FACP.

Prepared by Edgar Torbert
Approved on July 26, 2006