

Georgia Southern University

## Digital Commons@Georgia Southern

---

Faculty Senate Index

Faculty Senate

---

3-6-2006

### University Student Technology Fee

Michael Moore

*Georgia Southern University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Moore, Michael, "University Student Technology Fee" (2006). *Faculty Senate Index*. 452.  
<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index/452>

This motion request is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Index by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu).

*Approved by the Senate: 4/18/2006*

*Not Approved by the Senate:*

*Approved by the President:*

*Not Approved by the President:*

# University Student Technology Fee

Submitted by Michael Moore

3/6/2006

## **Motion:**

---

I move that the Faculty Senate appoint an ad hoc committee composed of an SEC member as Chair, faculty, an appropriate administrator, and the the SGA President and SGA Vice President for Academic Affairs to study the collection and distribution of the University Student Technology Fee in order to determine if the University Student Technology Fee Committee's membership and procedures operate in the best interest of our students, faculty, staff and administration.

## **Rationale:**

---

The following explanation is why I feel the motion should be considered by the Senate: The University Technology Committee was formed in 1997 when Georgia Southern received permission to assess our students each semester a \$24 technology fee. In less than ten years, this fee has more than doubled to \$57. Then-Provost Harry Carter proposed a committee structure, plan and process for dispersal of these monies. The "Tech Fee" Committee was modeled after the Student Affairs Activity Budget Committee where units submitted proposals for these fees and a committee prioritized need and funded these requests accordingly. Since 1997, the Board of Regents has required that six students must serve on our Tech Fee Committee. Two Requests for Information (RFIs) that I submitted to the Senate Fall 2005, revealed that the six students are the SGA President, SGA Vice President and four other students appointed by the SGA President. This method of student member selection does not ensure college representation. For instance, until Fall of 2005, the College of Education did not have a student representative. The other six non-student Tech Fee Committee members include our Provost, the Acting Chair of Info Systems, the Librarian, the Head of Administrative Technology Services, the Systems Analyst and an Associate VP for Academic Affairs. One difference between the Student Affairs Activity Budget

Committee and our Student Technology Fee Committee is that Student Affairs Activity Budget Committee has two faculty members on the committee.

A response I received to one of the RFIs that I submitted said, "Two key criteria for the disbursement of technology fee dollars are the number of students being served and the learning outcomes achieved by the use of technology." According to Dr. Carter, this was not part of the original plan because the committee wanted to be able fund key requests that might not serve the most students, especially requests from smaller units. Regardless, colleges currently have no consistent student or non-student representation on this committee. Serving as an individual case, prior to Fall of 2005, the COE had received only .0112% of the money that its majors were compelled to contribute. In the Fall of 2005, the COE had its first student representative appointed to the Tech Fee Committee, and perhaps not coincidentally the COE received \$85,000 in money to upgrade its Instructional Resource Center. Including Fall's disbursement to the COE, the percentage of monies allocated to COE student fees collected over the life of the committee is a disappointing .1104%.

Much has changed since 1997. Individual colleges now have technology committees that are much more knowledgeable concerning each college's needs. Yet, some colleges have no student or faculty representation on the key Tech Fee committee. Additionally, some colleges have received a very small, inequitable amount of money from the committee in proportion to the money generated by its students.

An ad hoc committee appointed by the Senate might well consider, in addition to the Committee's membership structure, whether each college might receive a dedicated percentage of funds proportionate to each college's student contribution. Such guaranteed rate of return would be more equitable and also facilitate technology planning within each college. The money generated by its students may be used to better consider for each unit the "learning outcomes achieved by the use of technology." Since we have all recently completed performance-based assessment outcomes, colleges are now in a better position to determine its individual needs. Allowing a dedicated percentage to each college would violate neither of the "Two Fundamental Principles" listed in the Student Technology Fee Guidelines. Additionally, a proportional distribution arrangement may protect the University from future lawsuits alleging that the current distribution system violates a non-benefiting student's Equal Protection rights. At the very least, an ad hoc committee would examine faculty input into an important area where we have had no input other than filing requests for money.

## **Response:**

---

5/4/2006: From Pat Humphrey You should recall that at the March Senate meeting, the Senate voted to form an ad-hoc committee to investigate the student technology fee committee structure and appropriations policies and procedures. I received the following response from Dr. Grube yesterday about our motion.

Pat H again - Based on the last sentence, my interpretation is that the ad hoc committee is dead until at least after the June meeting. It will be interesting to see that the students have to say.

From Dr. Grube:

"It is my understanding that the Student Government Association has expressed its satisfaction with the process by which the Technology Fee Committee is conducted and with the manner in which Technology Fee dollars are distributed in a letter to Senator Michael Moore. As you know, the Technology Fee is supported solely by students, and the Student Government Association is the officially recognized voice of the students on this campus.

"The students are reportedly planning to submit an agenda item for the next Faculty Senate meeting on June 21, 2006. I understand they wish to formally share with the Senate information about the current process and their reasons to support the process. In light of what is being proposed, it appears premature to act on this motion at this time."

Minutes: 3/27/2006: Michael Moore submitted an agenda request for a motion relating to the student technology fee committee's membership and procedures. That is item number 10 on today's agenda.

Motion: University Student Technology Fee, Michael Moore (COE): I move that the Faculty Senate appoint an ad hoc committee composed of an SEC member as Chair, faculty, an appropriate administrator, and the SGA President and SGA Vice President for Academic Affairs to study the collection and distribution of the University Student Technology Fee in order to determine if the University Student Technology Fee committee's membership and procedures operate in the best interest of our students, faculty, staff, and administration.

The motion was seconded.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Discussion? Michael as maker you get the first floor.

Michael Moore (COE): Okay thanks. This fee began in 1997. We were allowed to assess it, and we assessed our students \$24. Then-Provost Harry Carter modeled the Technology Committee on the Student Affairs Activity Committee, and since 1997 the Board of Regents has required that six students serve as the Tech Fee Committee. Two requests for information last fall that you may remember that I submitted to the Senate reveal that the six students are the SGA President, SGA Vice President, and four others appointed by the SGA President, and this method of student member selection does not ensure college representation. For instance, until fall of 2005, College of Education did not have a student representative. The other six non-student Technology Committee members include a Provost, Acting Chair of Information Systems, the Librarian, Head of

Administrative Technology Services, a Systems Analyst, and Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs. One difference between the Student Affairs Activity Budget Committee and the Student Technology Fee Committee is that the Student Affairs Activity Budget Committee has two faculty members on the committee.

Serving as an individual case, prior to 2005, the College of Education had received only 1% of the money that its majors were compelled to contribute. In the fall of 2005, the COE had its first student representative appointed to the Tech Fee Committee, and perhaps not coincidentally, the COE received \$85,000 in money to upgrade the Instructional Resource Center. Including Fall's disbursement to the College of Education, we are now at 11%.

Much has changed since 1997, however. The System has changed since December; however, a trip to the web site does not document the change. If you ask around, proposals are no longer requested. Previously, the Technology Fee Committee functioned in the same way as the Student Activity Fee Committee, but that is not the case now. Things have changed to the extent that administrators, including chairs and staff responsible for IT, are contacted by Leann Ransbotham, and technology needs are discussed. These folks in each college are asked to fill in a spreadsheet that asks for a description, cost to implement, student learning outcomes, and the students affected per week. In previous days, in the proposals, the student learning outcomes were a big part of it; now they are simply bulleted items. A scoring guide for requests starts with life safety, whether or not the equipment's failing, whether it needs to be refreshed, upgraded, or whether in fact it is already new. This spreadsheet thing goes to the committee. So rather than reading proposals, the committee looks at the spreadsheet and can see how each request has been scored. My chair told me she had such a visit, but she did not know at the time what the information that they were discussing during this visit was about. In fact, I did not know about it and none of the faculty in my department knew anything about it. I am not sure what role, if any, that faculty have in this process, and I did not become aware of changes until I started digging around. I think the need for such a committee is stronger now than ever. I cite the Faculty Handbook, in two places. On page 18, in Section 108, Part 1, "Faculty therefore have a role in developing policies including at the appropriate level, strategic planning, academic and curricular policies, and committee establishment and appointments." And it goes on, and then also I want to cite 203.02, #3, Faculty as Participants in the Shaping of University Policies. "That we have a right to criticize and to seek alteration of both academic and non-academic university regulations and policies, whether or not they are directly affected..." So I use those two as a means of making this motion. David Alley (CLASS): Mike, what exactly would the ad hoc committee be charged with doing?

Michael Moore (COE): In the motion I asked that the committee study the collection and distribution of the University Student Technology Fee, in order to determine if the membership and procedures operate in the best interest.

David Alley (CLASS): Okay.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): There is one thing that I am not sure I totally get, which is the following: so far the College of Education has received 11.4% of the money collected.

Is that money collected from College of Education students or from the overall pie?  
Michael Moore (COE): That would be money generated by the majors in the College of Education.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): Okay, you have so far gotten 11% of that.

Laurie Markle (SGA): I am on the Student Technology Fee Committee as a student representative to it. That is what my position does. The initiative to add greater representation on the Student Technology Fee Committee from all colleges is not an idea that would be opposed by the Student Government Association at all. As a general rule, we like additional students on committees, but SGA does feel that issues that have been expressed do not need a committee and can be handled by a faculty member, such as Dr. Moore, by contacting myself, as well as Jonathan Buckner, who is Executive Vice President of the Student Government Association, who also oversees the Constitution, and just adding more students. Funding from the Student Technology Fee Committee does not just go straight out to colleges. It also helps students in various other areas on campus, so perhaps in addition to that 11%, the students were also benefiting from funding that went to the Library, as well as the addition of different bandwidth on campus to allow students to receive courses and class and still maintain. There is a lot of concern about students not getting enough bandwidth on campus to sustain classrooms during high peaks of the day. That being said, money gets allocated to different areas that are not even necessarily within a specific college. Also, there actually was not a College of Education Senator on the Student Technology Fee Committee meeting this last fall. She was sick and was replaced. So I personally feel as though use of the Student Government Association as the allocation of funds is pretty fair. We work hard to remain unbiased; however, if you would like to add more college representation, it would not be a lot of work to just get another student on there. I do not think putting more students on there requires an ad hoc committee.

Linda Bleicken (Provost): Point of clarification. I think last fall when we talked about this committee, there was a concern about the fact that one of the people who had been initially a faculty member was appointed Acting Chair of Information Systems. The Acting Chair then became a full-time chair, and I asked whether it seemed reasonable to appoint someone who would be a full-time faculty member. I took that suggestion very seriously, and we have appointed a full-time faculty member and that person is Christine Ludowise. So there is a statement in here that is not fully correct.

Lisa Spence (Director of IT Services): I would also like to make a small correction in my title because I am not head of the Administrative Technology Services; I am head of IT Services, and a part of this committee. We support, actually, directly seven of the colleges on campus and three of my areas provide direct support only to academic areas. So we do have quite an academic focus. I would also point out that one of the

things that happened in the fall with the College of Ed requests, is that they had a very strong orientation to support that was needed to prepare for the NCATE visit, so that was one of the things that really directed our attention to those particular requests in terms of their importance to the committee. Thank you.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): Before you go, Lisa, are you saying that when the proposal seems to have merit it gets funded? In other words, when it has sufficient merit and weight, it gets funded?

Lisa Spence: Well, I think, we would hope so, within the bounds of the funding that we have. A couple of the items that have been mentioned that are pieces of information that we look at are the number of students that are supported and the student learning outcomes. The student learning outcomes is a direct reflection on the emphasis on the evidence-based decision making and the assessment that we have been looking at recently. We assess whether the request is something that references the fact that a program or a piece of technology is failing; whether a piece of technology is not working; or whether there is a risk to a program because we do not have a technology. The other thing that is looked at is just the general description of the request on the form. All of those pieces of data have been available on the Technology Fee Request Form in the past. They have been translated into the spreadsheet as Dr. Moore said, but they all came across pretty much in that same format, i.e., you have the opportunity to enter those same pieces of information. The ability that we have with the spreadsheet is an efficiency improvement, because our view is that we will collect information about all technology needs on campus. We will try to highlight those with the agreement of the program that are technology fee eligible, and then we do not have to ask multiple times for technology needs. We can ask for your needs, we can basically pull out those that are technology fee eligible and we can make that all one process rather than going through multiple needs assessment or needs request processes. That is the reason we changed the process this year to work with the spreadsheet. In the future, and we are already in development on this, we are going to use a web front end to a database that will help us do a better job of collecting and administering that information. So we are hoping that we are making gradual improvements with the process itself.

Michael Moore (COE): If you look at the motion, I am not asking you to change the committee. I am asking that a committee make recommendations and one of the recommendations that may come from the committee is that it is functioning fine--everything seems to be working well and the current structure should be maintained.

However, they may also come back with other representation, and I give a couple of suggestions that they may want to also consider, but the motion does not ask for a change in the membership; it does not ask for changes in the composition of the committee either.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: The motion is to form a committee to study the process and composition of awarding student technology fee money.

The motion was approved by voice vote.