

## Student Fee Advisory Committee

November 14, 2011  
Meeting Minutes

Present: Justin Chung, Jack Williams IV, Elaine Won, Clara Schultheiss, Vikram Nayudu, Johnson Liu, Lowell Trott, Chris Dunckle, Jason Lee, Wonsup (Joshua) Hwang, Sandy Jones

Absent: Patrick Le, Aaron Tso

Staff: Karen Mizumoto

- 1) Meeting called to order.
- 2) Minutes from November 7, 2011 meeting approved.
- 3) eTech Fee Update
  - a) Johnson Liu met with Stephen Franklin (OIT Director of Academic Outreach) regarding forming a focus group to discuss how the eTech fee funds will be allocated and to get SFAC input on some of the technology priorities for students including issues such as what the best locations are for more wifi, plugs/outlets, and identifying student projects to help in educational technology.
  - b) Comments on student priorities:
    - i) AGS has discussed the need for a calendar to supplement the UCI Today calendar. There needs to be a functional mechanism for departments to add to campus events (i.e., announcements to the general campus for departmental guest speakers, etc.) to a general calendar for students across multiple disciplines to access. It would be helpful for students to have the ability to subscribe to a more detailed special events calendar. OIT has had talks with students regarding setting up a general calendar, but discussion needs to continue.
    - ii) Can there be a student survey on wifi priorities with optional questions regarding specific areas? It may be difficult to get students to respond to short answer questions on a survey. However if students have a vested interest, they might be more receptive to providing written answers (rather than answers to yes/no or multiple choice questions).
    - iii) It would be beneficial to have extra plugs in computer labs; there is not enough seating and plugs in Rowland Hall and Langston Library.
    - iv) Can the course registration process be improved/enhanced if more advanced registration software is developed? Student Government has started an initiative to look into making the course registration process easier and more streamlined. This could be one of the student projects that could be funded by the fee.

- v) Is there technology that can make student services better, more efficient and more responsive to students?
  - vi) Do undergraduates need a better roommate matching system? The system for graduate students works pretty well. Is this something Housing already does?
  - vii) Is there a better email system that makes it easier to get on and off email lists?
  - viii) Can there be a way for students to access labs after hours? One of the possible future initiatives is to look into moving towards virtual computer labs.
- c) Comments/questions on the eTech fee in general:
- i) What is the general plan on how to spend the eTech funds? Approximately half will go towards equipment refresh and restoring technology staffing that has been cut due to budget cuts; half will towards new initiatives such as wifi, plugs, technology enhancements, student project initiatives, etc.
  - ii) What % goes to support staff? Is there a plan on how funds will be spent? About 20% -30% will go towards staffing. There is more detail in the information Aaron emailed to the committee. Johnson can also ask for more information if the committee still has questions.
  - iii) Some students may not benefit from the fee as much as other students (i.e., art student labs are not supported by OIT). This is an issue that may be discussed after the campus wide technology needs are addressed. The eTech fee has been established primarily to try to address the educational technology needs of the campus as a whole, and to address the needs of as many students as possible.
  - iv) What happens if state starts providing funding again to UC? There is currently no “sunset clause” for the fee; the Chancellor has some discretion over establishing campus fees, so this may be something that the campus leadership will need to address in the future with student input and with feedback from the eTech advisory committee.
- 4) The intern application process is closed; three possible interns have been identified and their duties are to be determined. They may provide assistance/support to the subcommittees.
- 5) Subcommittees
- a) Additional subcommittee members:
    - i) Wonsup (Josh) will serve on the PR committee with Johnson and Aaron.
    - ii) Chris will serve on the CMSF subcommittee with Elaine, Jason and Clara.
  - b) The subcommittees broke into groups to discuss their subcommittee’s goals, objectives, timelines, etc.
  - c) Subcommittee chairs will need to provide updates to the committee at large at next week’s meeting.
- 6) Meeting adjourned.