

Faculty Senate Minutes for February 17, 2012

President Jack Zibluk called the meeting to order at 3:00pm.

I. Minutes: Approval of the February 3rd meeting minutes was deferred to the next meeting.

II. Presentation: Mark Hoeting gave a presentation titled, "Analysis of Technology Fee Effectiveness" (see Appendix A). As part of the Chancellor's task force on cost containment Mark worked on a sub-committee that examined the technology fee. Currently 80% of the technology fee goes to technology infrastructure and the remaining 20% to desktop replacement. The problem is that the FTE formula being used does not account for student credit hours and classroom technology needs are not being met. Proposed changes by the committee include a reduction in technology infrastructure spending to 70%, eliminate the FTE formula, and convert to 15% for desktop replacements. The proposed allocation model consists of 15% of revenue going toward a newly created classroom technology and renovation funding category, 15% toward desktop replacement, and the remaining 70% to technology infrastructure. Two committees would be formed: a Classroom Renovation Committee and a Computer Replacement Committee. The classroom renovation funds should be paired with technology fee revenue allocated to classroom teaching and learning systems. The benefits of the proposed changes include: easier classroom technology upgrades and savings by combining existing building maintenance with classroom technology upgrades (it is easier to run wires and install technology if the walls and/or ceilings are already open due to other renovations); a streamlined ordering process and savings by using bulk ordering and acquisition through the proposed IT store; fixed percentages will eliminate hours of committee meetings for technology purchasing decisions; adopting a standard-purchase model will provide increased number of machines with greater capabilities at the same costs; and, lifecycle maintenance will guarantee faculty and staff a new computer every 36 months.

Following the presentation Mark answered questions about the proposed changes. Senator John Hall asked if the technology fee can be applied to technological needs other than computers (printers, scanners, etc.). Mark stated that the task force has not yet addressed this issue. Senator Hall requested that the committee consider the additional technological needs. Dr. Farhad Moeeni stated that there are so many different brands and models of printers and toner cartridges being used on campus that it would be helpful if the task force would consider finding standard or recommended printer models to be supported. Hoeting said he would like to offer dependable selections in the IT store. President Zibluk then asked about the plans for the campus IT store. Mark explained that the first phase of the plan is to have computer buying begin to occur through IT with the next phase being the creation of a physical retail store. The "Genius Center" idea is that the IT store would be located where students can rely on it as a support center. Long-term plans include the creation of a new computer lab in or near the support center and have the profits from the IT store offset the costs of the support center and lab.

III. President's report:

- A. Chancellor Search Update: President Zibluk reported on the ongoing Chancellor search and addressed rumors and perceptions that one candidate is a favorite or that the search process is a "done deal" regardless of what faculty or the search committee may advise. Jack stated that he has heard the rumors, too, but that he does not believe that any candidate is a "shoe in" for the job. He encouraged comments and feedback on the candidates and believes that the feedback will be considered by both the search committee as well as Dr. Welch. A decision is expected within a week.
- B. Intellectual Property Update: Meetings have occurred to discuss issues and concerns. The major bone of contention with the policy is the blanket statement that everything is the property of the university. President Zibluk spoke with Dr. Welch who stated that the issue will not go before the Board of Trustees before May. This means that there is time for further discussion and hopefully some sort of compromise without any need

to pursue it in the legal system. Senator Mooneyhan explained that he has been researching court cases dealing with intellectual property issues and gathering that information to provide it to those involved in making the final policy decision. He said that legal council has stated that the current policy cannot remain in effect due to lack of compliance. Zibluk explained that the issue is still being discussed and that the faculty want a policy with a middle ground instead of the all-encompassing policy that states the university owns all intellectual property. Several senators asked if having no policy is the best policy in a situation like this where the law is not entirely clear. Senator Mooneyhan asked if we need to come up with a policy that we feel is fair and legal. President Zibluk feels the issue should ultimately go before shared governance and that the issue is more a test of shared governance than it is of any particular policy. He will poll the rest of the committee and get back to the senate at the next meeting. Senators Rowe and Hall mentioned that the policy will be discussed at the upcoming ASU chapter of the AAUP.

IV. Old Business:

- A. Shared Governance 11FA-24 "Misconduct in Research" policy: President Zibluk explained that the issues have been postponed by shared governance indefinitely. Senator Hall expressed concern with a statement in the policy, "deviation from other accepted practices." He has had faculty express concern that methodological disputes which should be an issue of professional practices could be turned into issues of misconduct. He asked, "What if you are studying atypical practices or controversial practices?" Could it be seen as misconduct? President Zibluk stated that it is possible that such issue could come up. It was explained that the language in the policy is required by federal agencies. Senator Humphrey stated that those policies can't be made to fit a university environment and asked how other universities handle this requirement. Concerns were brought up with allowing an external entity to dictate policy for the university...especially if the accusations of "misconduct" could be driven by economic factors. Because a vote is not needed immediately the decision was made to table the issue for discussion at a later time.

V. New Business:

- A. Listserv concerns: Darla Fletcher has been very responsive to concerns and has now made fixes to correct problems with replies going to the entire list. She has now changed it so that the default for replies is to send to the original sender rather than the entire listserv. President Zibluk expressed concern that the faculty who have chosen to unsubscribe from the listserv are going to miss out on important campus discussions and announcements. He suggested that a committee be formed to discuss options (including the possibility of the creation of a discussion board rather than using the listserv for all discussions). Lisa Bohn was chosen to chair the committee. The rest of the committee will be comprised of Larz Roberts, Farhad Moeni, Jollean Sinclair, and Darla Fletcher. The committee will come up with a plan and present the plan by the end of the term.
- B. Aggie Road housing: Although the issue seems to be a "done deal" several senators expressed concern about the housing evictions and short time given to faculty to vacate the faculty housing. Senator Hall stated that forcing the faculty in those houses to move on such short notice and doing so in the middle of the semester was very unfair. Other concerns were raised regarding the large and complex campus master plans. Senator Hall asked if we perhaps need to form a committee to look at the master plans. President Zibluk stated that all planning hearings are open and we have opportunities to give our comments and input. Al Stoverink has been very forthcoming with information and any comments or insight can be sent to Bill Hall.
- C. Senator John Hall moved for a resolution asking that the gate to reserved parking be left open to allow for a flow of traffic from the new overpass to the parking behind the library. Senators Mooneyhan and Rowe seconded the motion. The language of the resolution was discussed. The purpose of the motion is to ask Dr. Howard to allow faculty access to the gate so that they may drive through the reserved lot in order to access

the non-contract parking behind the library. The official resolution was decided to be directed to Dr. Howard: "To allow interested faculty one-way access through the parking gate near the administration building on Aggie Rd. which would therefore allow one to travel to the south side of campus." Senator Hall would like the issue to be addressed as soon as possible. All were in favor of the resolution and the motion passed.

- D. Announcements from the floor: Dr. Andy Sustich announced that a movie based on a comic strip, "Higher and Deeper" will be shown March 2nd in Lab Sciences East Room 219 at 6:30pm. Popcorn and soda will be available. Faculty and graduate students are encouraged to come. He offered flyers to anyone who was interested.

In the absence of further business the meeting was adjourned at 4:30pm.

Attendees:

Association officers:

President Jack Zibluk
Farhad Moeeni
Andy Mooneyhan

Agriculture:

Bill Humphrey

Business:

Faye Cocchiara
Farhad Moeeni (proxy for Richard Segall)
Jollean Sinclair

Communications:

Pradeep Mishra
Larz Roberts

Education:

Joanna Grymes
John D. Hall
Andy Mooneyhan
Ann Ross

Fine Arts:

Claire D. Garrard
Marika Kyriakos
Bill Rowe

Humanities and Social Sciences:

Alex Sydorenko

Library:

Wendy Crist (proxy for Tracy Farmer)

Nursing and Health Professions:

Deanna Barymon

Loretta Brewer

Bill Payne

Todd Whitehead

Science and Mathematics:

Hai Jiang

Bruce Johnson

Suzanne Melescue

University College:

Margaret McClain

Dean's Council Representative:

Andrew J. Novobilski

Visitors:

H. Steve Leslie

Appendix A:

Arkansas State University Analysis of Technology Fee Effectiveness February 14, 2012

At Issue

How can the technology fee and related planning process be better streamlined to improve the purchasing power of fee revenue and reduce overhead/complexities of the planning process?

Background

The technology fee was created in 2001 in order to fund the technology infrastructure that enables all activities of the university. At that point in time, students were paying an infrastructure fee that was used to outfit classrooms and other spaces that were dependent on technology. Departments were funding computers for faculty and staff. As the classrooms and other spaces were upgraded and improved, the gap between the edge of the network (where classrooms and other spaces are virtually located) and the capabilities of the infrastructure to support them was widening at a rapid pace with no consistent funding vehicle available to address the issue.

For consideration

- Regular, consistent investment in the technology infrastructure and desktops has since kept pace with student and faculty demands for both technology and services.
- A committee is assembled each year, as per the board resolution, which recommends to Executive Council a technology fee budget plan for the upcoming fiscal year.
- Each year, the committee generally spends a substantial amount of time and energy in controversial conversations and debates, arriving at the same outcome: The same percentage of the budget allocated to critical or mandated technology infrastructure investments and the same percentage of the budget allocated to faculty desktop replacements.
- An improved process and updated principles are needed in order to reduce controversy in the planning environment, and to increase the purchase power of technology fee revenue.
- A study of five-year technology fee spending trends indicates that infrastructure expenditures consistently equate to 80% of the total technology fee revenue for each year.
- A study of five-year spending indicates that faculty desktop replacement consistently equates to 20% of technology fee revenue for that year.
- The 80% and 20% trend is in accordance with the original board resolution and presentation.
- Using current trends and projected needs, this 5-year trend will continue. The allocation amount of technology fee revenue to each category will remain consistent with anticipated institutional growth.
- Using the current model for computer replacements, the university currently purchases a total of 371 individual units annually with technology fee revenues.
- Using the current model for classroom upgrades, the university currently implements 5 technology-enabled classrooms per year.

Advantages

- Changing the planning process to use a fixed percentage will streamline the planning process by eliminating hours of committee meetings each year with the same outcome.
- Adopting a standard-purchase model, which is common at most institutions as well as in private industry, will provide a increased number of machines with greater capabilities, at the same cost currently expended.
- Lifecycle maintenance of the purchased computers will guarantee each faculty and staff member a new computer every 36 months.
- Pairing the existing classroom funding with Classroom Renovation Funds will decrease the cost of technology implementation in the classroom and provide for a more effective and well-suited technology-enabled teaching and learning environment. Significant savings are achieved when classrooms are outfitted with technology when the walls and ceilings are already opened for construction. Similarly, lighting and sound upgrades can be implemented at the same time. The recent Wilson Hall upgrade is an example of the success of this model.
- Purchasing computers through the ASU IT Store will position the university to receive a certain percentage of those purchase dollars back into the university.

Disadvantages

- Bulk purchasing of computers can create a backlog in central receiving and in IT. Purchases and distribution will have to be staged carefully.
- Initial perceptions will be that funding is being taken from various areas on campus. However, this is projected to be overcome after the first year when the impact of increased purchasing power is realized across the campus.

Analysis

The current and proposed effect of purchasing power is better understood by the analysis below.

| | <u>Current Model</u> | <u>Proposed Model</u> |
|-------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Total Personnel Covered | 371 | 500 |
| Computer Price Per Unit | \$ 1,620 | \$ 1,282 |
| | \$ 601,020 | \$ 641,000 |

The Total Personnel Covered is an estimate based on current enrollment and student credit hour production (SCH). As enrollment and SCH increases, total personnel covered by the plan would increase also. Simultaneously, the Computer Price Per Unit would decrease, since the quantity purchased would increase.

The price per unit drops substantially when like units are purchased together. The analysis below indicates how acquisition cost decreases and purchasing power increases when like-units are purchased in larger quantities.

| | <u>Current Model</u> | <u>Proposed Model</u> |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Price Per Unit under each model | | |
| Dell Desktop | \$ 1,255 | \$ 924 |
| Dell Laptop | \$ 1,627 | \$ 1,281 |
| Apple Desktop | \$ 1,598 | \$ 1,281 |
| Apple MacBook | \$ 2,000 | \$ 1,642 |

A proportionate allocation model to accomplish Classroom Renovation, Technology Infrastructure renewal, and faculty/staff Computer Replacements would be structured as follows:

| | | |
|------------------------|---------------------------|-----|
| Proportionate Analysis | Classroom Renovation | 15% |
| | Desktop Replacement | 15% |
| | Technology Infrastructure | 70% |

Recommendations

- Streamline budget planning through a proportional model.
- Require any initiative funded by the Technology Fee to have a permanent funding source identified within a maximum of four years, although the least number of years should always be selected if possible.
- Create a Classroom Renovation committee comprised of the Provost, the Vice Chancellor for Finance & Administration, Facilities Management (2), and Information Technology (1) to prioritize classroom renovation schedule.
- Create a Computer Replacement Committee of Faculty (1), Academic Deans (1), Information Technology (1), and Student Affairs (1) to advise on computer configuration and catalogue options for purchasing and lifecycle replacement.
- Fifteen percent of technology fee revenue will be allocated to classroom teaching and learning systems. This will be paired with Classroom Renovation Funds in Facilities Management in order to reduce the cost of technology renovation to classrooms and to make each implementation more effective for teaching and learning. Funds will only be spent on the classroom renovation schedule established by Classroom Renovation Committee.
- Fifteen percent of revenue will be automatically allocated for computer/lifecycle replacement through bulk purchases. The Personal Computer Committee will complete recommended configurations by April of each year. Each participant will select his or her system from Campus IT Store Catalogue in May of the preceding fiscal year. Each program participant will receive his or her new computer by August 1 of each year.
- Seventy percent of revenue will be allocated for the Technology Infrastructure. Prioritization will be coordinated through the Chief Information Officer, the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration, the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, and the Provost.
- Transition current "continuing costs" over 3 years beginning in FY 2012-2013 to permanent E&G sources.