Student Fee Advisory Committee
October 30, 2013
12:15 – 1:45 pm
Meeting Minutes

Present: Ceril Fangon, Charlsie Chang, Clara Skaug, Justin Lardinois, Max Hufft, Peter Fabian, Alma Sifuentes, John Steele, Free Moini, Noora Almajid, Gabriel Pulido, Lucy Rojas, Brooklynn Ackerman

Absent: Lucy Carrillo, Faye Crosby, Erik Green, Denise Onitsuka, Tony Tsujisaka

1. Approval of Agenda and Minutes: Max motions to approve the agenda, Clara seconds the motion. Motion carries. Lucy will have last week’s minutes ready for review at the next meeting.

2. Announcements
   a. Check in question – tabled
   b. College Government/GSA/SAB/Provost/Dean of Students Announcements
      i. Alma explains that the campus is engaged in the development of a campus-wide strategic plan. Alma explains that she will be asking the SFAC to participate as a critical student group as a focus group.
      ii. Clara announces that the application to be student advocate to the regents is due tomorrow.
   c. CSF Campaign
      i. Ceril explains that he is the chair of the CSF campaign for referendum review and will be asking SFAC members for their assistance with the campaign.

3. Funding Proposal Review Process
   a. Learning Support Services
      i. Free explains that the way he read the proposal was that the campus is looking for a centralized system for the work, but that won’t happen for at least two years.
      ii. Peter says that he is curious as to why a lifetime license is being purchased given that the system may not be used for a few years? Justin responds that usually you have to purchase a lifetime license, and then you pay for server hosting on an annual basis.
      iii. Peter says that in the context of the other two proposals, the amount requested for this request is very low. What did the committee members think about the cause?
      iv. Justin says that he believes when it comes to the details, we should defer to the experts, for instance in this case – tutoring.
      v. John says he thinks that it’s a good think that the system will have a lifetime licensing component.
      vi. Clara explains that she likes this proposal because it will support infrastructure of the department and they may not secure the funding from any other source.
      vii. Justin asks John how technology is typically purchased on campus. Free asks whether the current LSS system is on the list of hosting applications that ITS recharges.
      viii. Email from Faye (Lucy R. Reads): “This request seemed very reasonable and very well argued. The request showed that many students make use of the ISS. It seems reasonable to have a sign-up system that is efficient and current. The proposal seems to have done all the right research concerning systems to use. I like the distinction between the set-up costs and the ongoing costs for a couple of years. If we need to shave, perhaps shave the ongoing costs. Personally, I would grant the entire request.”
      ix. Email from Lucy C. (Lucy R. reads): “LSS- I really like the set up of this proposal in general. It gave background information and facts about the tutoring/MSI services they provide. Gave a clear picture about how many students partake in the service provided. It is important to point
out the university as a whole is moving towards more "user friendly" (for lack of a better word) systems and it is quite apparent LSS financial need. (Well most units on campus have that financial need). However, I do feel that these services provided (MSI/Tutoring) are essential for the academic success of our students. I would feel comfortable in fully funding this program. However, I would like LSS to report back at the end of the second year and provide information on how the new system has alleviated initial concerns.”

x. Peter suggests a straw poll. Ceril responds that he would like to wait until all of the proposals have been reviewed.

xi. Erik asks why we don’t pay students to design the system? There are some very talented graduate students in computer engineering who may be able to do this. There are some expensive costs for ongoing costs, but the proposal states that it may be only used for a couple of years.

b. Academic Resource Center

i. The group discusses Denise’s suggestion that we consider why macs have been requested, instead of PC which are less expensive.

ii. Clara expresses concern about the voice recorders, as these services should be provided through DRC.

iii. Peter expresses that this was a great proposal, in that student feedback was included; this gave a different perspective to the proposal. Peter’s concern is that the department seems to be saying that students can’t be successful without a lap top. Peter asks about the laptops that are available. Justin responds that computer labs are physically located in the colleges and the library also checks out lap tops.

iv. Charlsie read the proposal as its intended for a student to check out a lap top for a week so they don’t have to be camped out at the computer lab for 12 hours at a time.

v. Gabriel adds that he understands why the work stations are needed at the ARC, to facilitate interaction between students and student interns who work at the ARC departments. So the work stations support the operations of the center.

vi. Max adds that he can see how the ARC is trying to be a second McHenry, in terms of the same kind of services that are offered.

vii. Justin adds that the proposal did not explain why they are seeking more expense hardware – Ipad instead of tablet, Mac instead of PC, etc.

viii. Gabriel expresses concern regarding the request for a large projection screen in the ARC. It was not really articulated why this is needed. Justin responds that it will be used for group tutoring sessions. Justin says to an extent, we should defer to the unit head’s judgment in terms what they need for their operations.

ix. Charlsie says that she doesn’t go to the ARC very often, and she is uncertain of security.

x. Clara is supportive of creating a destination space for students, so she is supportive of the work stations, she is skeptical about the I pads and laptops to check out. John adds that as an IT person, she is concerned about shared mobile devices like lap tops.

xi. Erik’s perspective is a little different. His sense is that there are a lot of computer labs on campus. He believes that it is more helpful to have devices that can be checked out. The work stations will probably be less useful. Erik would like to see a more scaled back work station format. Gabriel agrees with Erik.

xii. Ceril’s main concern is that the proposal did not mention how the student labor would be supported? Follow up question for unit head.

xiii. Brooklynn asks whether there is an option to fund one portion of the proposal? Response is yes.
xiv. Regarding the voice recorders, Gabriel mentions that the voice recorders are specified for English language learners.

xv. Free asks whether graduate students use the ARC? Erik responds that graduate students would primarily be using STARS for veteran student services, which is now at Kresge.

xvi. Erik asks whether ITS checks out voice recorders at learning technologies. Follow up question.

xvii. Brooklynn asks to what extent we can follow up with the proposal author. The group discusses the possibility of sending the questions to the author. Clara suggests that a sub-committee could be established to do follow up.

xviii. Faye’s Comment (Read by Lucy R.): “This request seemed very large. Most of the data provided were anecdotal, and there were few statistics provided. I certainly sympathize with the need that EOP students have for computers, but some of the anecdotes did not make sense to me. I did not see, for example, how the requests would save printing costs. Nor was it entirely clear to me how the transfer of STARS out of a space lead to the need for the computers. I would imagine that if we needed to preserve funds for the future, we might grant about half of this request.”

xix. Lucy C.’s Comment (Read by Lucy R.): “In the second paragraph the proposal states that the STARS computer lab was used by all students in ARCenter beyond STARS students. My question is do they have a way to track how many students used the computer lab aside STARS students? I would have really liked to see more data on this to have a clear view of how many students benefit. Also I would like to note the library already has an “ipad/macbook lending program” I have used it in the past and to me it seems to be a helpful and successful program. I'm just wondering whether or not that program has a high demand and that's why we need to offer the service somewhere else? On another note I would like to ask the graduate students how likely is it that they would use this service? (The proposal indicated it was open to both undergrad and grad students) In general I feel comfortable funding the 10 iMacs workstation they are asking for. I am questioning the 16 total iPads and 12 Chromebooks. I am concerned that this might be more of a luxury rather than a necessity? I'm also okay with funding the voice recorders (though I wish they would have included more information about the students who will be benefited by this) I do strongly believe DRC students need our support so that's why I'm okay with funding this.”

xx. Brooklynn agrees with Lucy C. that she would support funding part of the proposal.

xxi. Responding to Faye’s comment about reduction of printing costs, Gabriel responds that the savings if felt to the student directly because they don’t have to print out readings if they could read on an electronic device.

xxii. Erik asks whether the $2000 for the TV is needed?

xxiii. Charlsie says that she does not support iPads, but does support the lap tops. It’s unrealistic to expect that a student stay in a computer lab until 2:00 am, then there’s no bus service.

xxiv. Brooklynn asks for clarification on the process. Ceril responds that we are doing the technology call in a different way, and he would like to wait until we review everything in order

c. Career Center

i. Justin explains that he is concerned that the types of systems that are being requested are not appropriate for the types of work that will be conducted on them.

ii. Erik explains that macs are three times the cost and probably not completely necessary. Justin adds that macs are fine, but the type of system that is being requested is not necessary for activities such as MS Word, Photoshop.
iii. The group agrees that they were happy to see that some systems were being upgraded instead of replaced.

iv. John mentions that a mac mini is $600 and works really well.

v. Faye’s Comment (Read by Lucy R.): “I am not sure how the finances of the career center operate. Where does the money for salaries come from? Why has no money for computers come from that same source? But, good equipment does seem vital to the functioning of the Career Center and the Career Center has an important role that it can play for students. If we needed to shave some expenses rather than grant the entire request, about $1500 could be saved if the Center bought 2 IMACs rather than 3 and another $1500 might be saved if the workstations could have screens smaller than 27 inches. I am in favor of granting the entire request minus $3000.”

vi. Lucy C. Comments (Read by Lucy R.): “This proposal is very straight forward. I feel that upgrading software, computers, and workstation in general is important. As a student employee it is extremely frustrating to work in a very slow computer. A task that could have take 15 minutes at most ends up take half an hour or sometimes more. For this reason I feel comfortable funding this proposal fully one-time.”

vii. Subcommittee – Clara suggests waiting until we’ve reviewed all of the proposals to form the subcommittee.

viii. Next steps – Lucy asks the group how many proposals they would like to review for next week. Brooklynn suggests 2, Clara suggests all four. The general consensus is to review four for next week.

ix. Erik suggests doing a vote by line-item of each proposal item that’s being requested.

4. Review of Proposed Referenda - Fall Special Election
   a. Vanessa Morales is the author of the Fee to Increase Library Hours to 24/5. Vanessa provides an overview of the library referendum. She has been working with Elizabeth Cowell, Interim University Library and others who were part of the data collection.
   b. The fee would be for three years and one quarter; a temporary fee.
   c. Clara asks for clarification on what facilities in the library will be accessible? Vanessa explains that the first year there will be more costs associated with security upgrades, then additional facilities could be made available. **[Post meeting addition: Lucy R. confirmed with library that central campus will cover the start-up costs for the security and technology upgrades if the referendum passes, therefore, the entire referendum revenue will go toward staff and student labor costs].
   d. Justin asks why this should be a fee, instead of paid by tuition? Vanessa responds that that she is proposed a pilot program to see if need can be demonstrated.
   e. Ceril asks why Science & Engineering and not McHenry. Vanessa responds that it is a safer location. She is working with PD to see if escort services can be extended to the S&E Library.
   f. Charlsie asks about how staff and PD would access the space if we are using key access.
   g. Erik asks about what consultation has been conducted with graduate students. Vanessa responds that if graduate students don’t want to participate then they won’t be included and therefore will not have access to the service.
   h. Brooklynn asks about the pilot program. What happens at the end of three years? How will students push the responsibility off of themselves? Vanessa says that if the referendum passes, we can begin those discussions immediately about what we will do three years from now?
   i. Clara asks whether there will be enough funds to cover the expense if graduate students don’t pay? Vanessa says yes. The financial model is based on undergraduate student population.
j. Gabriel – why this length of time? Vanessa responds that two years is probably not enough time to get collect data to show the needs.

k. John asks whether there is a tool to track usage? Vanessa says that this can be tracked through key card access statistics, and also surveys.

l. Charlsie asks about advertising for this initiative?

m. Clara does not feel comfortable voting on anything and forming an opinion until a budget is provided. Brooklyn agrees.

n. Ceril suggests an access system similar to

o. Lucy C’s comments (via email): If we get to vote for the referendum this meeting I would like to cast my vote. No - on the library referenda. My reason I do no feel comfortable with the implications of the referenda. We are asking students to tax themselves so that S&E is opened 24/5 but it's not a guaranteed. "If the fee passes and no further reductions are made" library will be open longer hours "if fee passes and further reductions are made" the addition of hours of operation will be minimal and lastly "if fee does not passes and further reductions are made" we'll see erosion of the library hours. This is the part that I'm not okay with. This was mentioned in the first draft of the referenda I could not find it in the second draft. I was wondering as to why this was removed? An addition comment I do believe it is the administration responsibility to keep our libraries opened and functioning. Why should we the students tax ourselves for something that should already be a given as part of our education.

p. Discussion
   i. Clara suggests that next week we should focus on technology call and talk about the proposal
   ii. Max suggests that discussion seems rushed and perhaps we should consider expanding the meeting time.

5. Adjournment [need to add].