

STUDENT TAB MEETING

MINUTES, MARCH 28, 2015

605 HODGES LIBRARY, 3:30-4:45

ACTION ITEMS

- Follow up on change in Tech Fee bylaws to allow funding of technology in registrar-controlled classrooms.

ATTENDING

- Mark Alexander, Jennifer Gramling, Larry Jennings, Steve Mangum, Leigh Mutchler, Drew Nash, David Ratledge, Joel Reeves, Catherine Schuman, Liam Wingerd

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR FEBRUARY 2015

- Alexander moved, Wingerd seconded, motion passed, minutes are approved.

CLASSROOM TECHNOLOGY FUNDING

- Current Tech Fee Usage Policy: Student Technology Fees cannot be used to fund
 - Departmental staff salaries
 - **Registrar-controlled classroom upgrades such as projectors, Smart Boards, etc.**
 - Unused Tech Fee funds may not be carried over.
- Current status
 - Currently funded by Facilities Fee, 225 rooms at about \$500,000 year. About \$25k per room for the complete stack of technology.
 - Big hit on customer satisfaction survey – the item “Having technology within classrooms or other meeting areas that enhances the presentation and sharing of information.” dropped from 7.80 to 6.88 (out of 9).
 - Technology is not consistent – some rooms are registrar controlled, some are department controlled – and doesn’t always work.
 - Instructors don’t necessarily know how to use technology.
 - Proposed nationalization of an additional 200+ rooms.
- Proposal
 - Remove restriction on Tech Fee funding registrar-controlled classroom technology.
 - Seek to supplement existing Facilities Fee classroom technology investment and instructor training with Tech Fee funds.
- Comments:
 - Alexander – recent meeting with SGA representatives about student fees. Technology Fee hasn’t changed in 16 years. Facilities Fee wasn’t originally intended for classroom technology. Trying to be more transparent about what fees cover. Their thought was that Tech Fee could cover technology in classrooms, where Facilities Fee would cover buildings. Considering increase in Tech Fee to realign.

- Reeves – that’s not the only fee they’re considering increasing.
- Gramling – if that were to happen, would that allow OIT to ensure more consistency and a schedule? Reeves – we’d have to develop a plan; it wouldn’t happen in one year. Some of these things may not have been touched since installation. Some people might question a \$5000 document camera, but they work and they’re durable. The “hundred dollar solutions” break down much more often. We have a 10-minute response time to classrooms, but looking at 400 classrooms compared to 200.
- Nash – what other things were brought up regarding classroom technology? Reeves – inconsistency and unavailability. Smart Boards vs. screens and projectors, no tech at all in some rooms.
- Alexander – instructors’ comfort level with technology. Reeves – that is a definite issue. May put out information about a workshop, might get faculty from very distinct disciplines. Does the technology apply to all the disciplines the same way? Maybe not.
- Alexander – makes sense that Tech Fee would deal with classroom technology.
- Nash – thought that restriction only applied to departmental funding. Reeves – department-controlled rooms can apply for Tech Fee money for equipment. Registrar-controlled rooms cannot.
- Alexander – does anyone think Tech Fee should NOT be used for nationalized classrooms? Gramling – surprised this hasn’t come up in 16 years. Very surprised Tech Fee assessment hasn’t changed. Alexander – was used heavily for infrastructure in beginning; then only needed maintenance and were able to use for other things; time to look at infrastructure again.
- Mutchler – all the more reason to align Tech Fee with technology.
- Alexander – would like to remove that restriction. Mutchler – there would have to be a plan. Reeves – would you like to see a plan first? Gramling – if you’re talking about some classrooms being high end and others nothing... Reeves – our rooms are pretty standard, just a difference between Smart Board or a screen. Some complaints about stacks not being HDMI compatible; we could buy adapters for the faculty or for the rooms (but how many would go missing?). Some very large classrooms have multiple screens, but we have a pretty standard stack.
- Alexander moves to remove stipulation. Nash seconds. Motion passes; will strike the language and come back with a plan.
- Alexander – question about how the fee was created? Does the Board of Trustees have to approve this change? Reeves – pretty sure that the Board didn’t create the charter, but will check before taking action.

CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY 2015

- 13 core items – perceived service level significantly greater than minimum needs in 10 items; other 3 did not differ significantly.
 - Not enough information to compare with other schools yet.
 - We appreciate the feedback. We are providing the core items at a rate greater than what you need to get work done. On a scale of 1-9 everyone wants everything to be an 8.8.
- Significant service increases noted in
 - Adequacy of cellular coverage – we know some buildings are not adequate and are looking at investing some Tech Fee money in that
 - Having campus web sites and online services that are easy to use.
 - Having technology services available that improve and enhance my collaboration with others.

- Items of note
 - Wireless performance noticeable better
 - Wireless coverage **areas** still a concern
 - Acknowledgement of improvements to MyUTK
 - From comments, Lynda and Zoom are VERY popular
- Comments / Questions
 - Alexander – people more likely to comment on negative experiences

COLLEGE AWARDS IMPORTANT DATES

- April 1 – deadline for funding requests
- April 25 – TAB reviews at April meeting – budgeted about \$500,000 to \$1,000,000
- Early May – colleges / units receive award verification and purchase reimbursement guidelines
- July 1-March 31 – colleges / units place orders with vendors
- July 1-March 31 – reimbursement for expenses following standard guidelines

HOPE METER FOR MYUTK

- Will start work in April.

OTHER BUSINESS

- Please contact Joel with any items for next month.

MEETING ADJOURNED