University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well
University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

12-4-2013

ASSC minutes 12/04/2013

Academic Support Services Committee

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/ac_supp

Recommended Citation

Minutes for the ASSC Meeting from 12-4-2013

Present: Matt Johnson, Rose Murphy, Sam Daniewicz, LeAnn Dean, Jim Hall, Roger Boleman, Nancy Cheeseman, Sylke Boyd

Guests: Sam Fettig, Mike Cihak

Absent Joel Eisinger, Joseph Beaver, Taylor Barker, Lisa Harris

1. **Minutes** from 10-25-2013 were approved.
2. Sam Fettig reported on proposed changes to the **Student Tech Fee guidelines**, as discussed in MCSA. The changes target clarifications and a sharpening of rules for fundability. Attachment A contains the current version with modifications highlighted in yellow. The changes became necessary due to requests for maintenance of existing technology through tech fee and the use of tech fee for the improvement of campus infrastructure (wireless upgrades). The new language is clarifying the only new projects will be funded, and evidence of a plan for technology maintenance must be submitted. Also new is that a consultation about the appropriateness for Tech fee with an MCSA member must be held before the final submission. Jim Hall voiced some concern about the work load of reviewing the more than 100 proposals per year before the submission. Sam Fettig assured that these consultations do not need to be face-to-face , and that 15 members of the Resources and Operations committee will be available to review a proposal before submission. Only administrative and recognized student organizations may submit proposals funded by tech fee. General student organizations must partner with an administrative unit on campus. Roger Boleman asked about the transfer of ownership to the signing department. Sam affirmed that there is a separate form included in the application. The existence of this form should be mentioned in the guidelines.
MCSA will approve the new guidelines in the beginning of next semester, and tech fee applications will be due on Feb 21.With that crowded timeline in mind, Sam assured that an announcement of the changes will be sent out to campus before the end of the semester. Rose Murphy emphasized that these changes are overall good and necessary, and contribute greatly to the clarity of the process.
3. LeAnn Dean reported on **the library budget** and the outcome of her conversations with Colleen Miller. The attached document does not contain the figures for salaries but for other operating costs for the library. Some mapping of the accounts varied over the years. Institutional revenue sharing is already subtracted from the figures. The apparent carry-over through the fiscal years is not real, but already planned or spent at the time of the turnover of the year. The subscription increases are not all due to inflation, but there is a substantial increase since publisher have introduced surcharges and minimum fees. The journal Science, for example, has increased from $370 to $2700 per year over the time covered in the data. The Dean's office has provided $15,000 per year in soft money over the recent two years, to cover the necessary software licensing for things such as the Digital Well and Endnote. However, this is money that can not be

budgeted since it is not guaranteed. Online resources have increased significantly in cost, and now take up a large fraction of the library's budget. Most of the online access contracts are 1 year contracts and annually renewable, with a few exceptions of 3-year contracts. The Mintex consortium helps to exchange between libraries. The committee discussed the goal of the request to the dean. It is unlikely to recover the budget losses of $50,000 incurred between 2002 and 2013. Part of these cuts were encountered by all university units. If ASSC is to send a request to the Dean for a stabilization or productive support of the library budget, a coherent, simple and convincing list of arguments about the unique position of the library must be established:

a) The library directly supports the academic mission of the liberal arts college by providing access of
   a. Students: research projects, reference, learning materials, access to academic content
   b. Faculty: research, teaching quality, reference
b) The library is facing the following challenges:
   a. Finding balance between online access and hard copies
   b. Online resources are most likely to be used by students and faculty
   c. Online resources do not build library inventory but must be renewed regularly
   d. Interlibrary loans increasingly fill in where hard copies are not available locally, but accrue costs.
   e. Certain expensive software licenses have fallen under the budget of the library; their maintenance should be part of planned expenses.
c) Support with graphs about online access numbers, hardcopy check outs (?), cost of interlibrary loans and numbers of requests.

Jim Hall proposed to consolidate a request together with IT. The committee will formulate definitions and refinements.

4. LeAnn reminded the committee chair that a request be made to the membership committee to officially change the bylaws such that the director of academic success and disability services, Nancy Cheeseman, becomes an ex-officio member of the ASSC.
5. Roger Boleman noted that he is retiring in January, and that Mike Cihak will be taking his place on the ASSC beginning in next year. After due congratulations, and some discussion of the term "ex officio emeritus", the change was welcomed warmly by all present.
6. Nancy announced that she received a formal charge from the Dean for the formation of a Technology and Instruction Access working group to identify barriers and goals for this campus in terms of accessibility hardware and software for all students, and to formulate a long-term plan to address problems. The committee charge is attached in C. Nancy will report to ASSC in the later part of the spring semester.
7. Meeting was adjourned.

Minutes submitted by Sylke Boyd, 12-13-2013

Attachment A

Morris Campus Student Association (MCSA) Technology Fee Guidelines

I. To Qualify for MCSA Technology Fee Funding, Proposals:
   a. Must be for technology: for example, hardware, software, networking, access, support services, and data.*
   b. Must provide direct, visible benefits to UMM students.*
   c. Must make new investments in technological infrastructure, equipment, and services. "New" may, at the discretion of MCSA Forum, be interpreted to include the expansion of existing investments; however, such expansion shall not cover budgetary gaps in violation of guideline 1.e.*
   d. Must fall inside the parameters of technology that is supported at UMM, as determined by expert consultation (see 2.c.).*
   e. Shall not be used to supplement budget gaps; examples of such a gap may include failure to plan for expected maintenance or upkeep costs (see guideline 2.b.). Rather, projects funded shall serve to enhance student technology experience on campus.
      i. At the discretion of MCSA Forum, exceptions to this guideline may be made based on the degree to which proposals provide substantial benefits to a substantial number of students. However, such benefit must be exceptional and clearly demonstrated, and guideline 1.e.i. exceptions should not be presumed.
   f. Must show efforts to purchase energy efficient or sustainably designed models of technology to support UMM's efforts to reduce energy consumption and to decrease effects on the planet.

Recommended projects should provide maximum benefits to the maximum number of students.* Proposals that will benefit a small number of students are welcome if the impact on students will be significant.

II. To Be Considered for MCSA Technology Fee Funding, Proposals:
   a. Shall describe actions taken to locate other source(s) of funding for the project.* Proposals submitted without prior attempt(s) made at sourcing alternate funding will not be disqualified, but shall be considered with discretion by the MCSA Forum.
   b. Shall include detailed plans for the maintenance and upkeep of funded technology in the future, beyond continued Technology Fee funding. Proposals lacking detailed plans for funding maintenance and upkeep shall make a reasonable effort to demonstrate potential avenue(s) for such funding.
   c. Must be preceded by campus expert consultation(s) regarding logistical upkeep/maintenance concerns, compatibility with existing systems, and accessibility and overall appropriateness of requested technology. Recommended contacts for such consultations shall be found within the Technology Fee application, or may arise through guideline 2.d. consultations.

d. Must be preceded by consultation(s) with one or more members of the MCSA Resources & Operations committee regarding appropriateness of submission and to ensure completeness of proposals.

III. To Be Eligible for MCSA Technology Fee Funding, Student Organizations:
    a. Must be either a University Campus Life Program (CLP) or University Recognized Organization (URO) as defined by the University's "Classification of Student Organizations on the Morris Campus" policy.
        i. Organizations classified as an Independent Student Group (ISG) may seek Technology Fee Funding if an eligible student organization — or other eligible body of the University of Minnesota Morris Campus — is willing to manage the Technology Fee funds on behalf of the ISG. MCSA can advise ISGs on possibilities for such collaborations, but it is the responsibility of the concerned group to coordinate any such partnerships prior to application.

IV. Technology Fee Funding Allocations
    a. Allocations will be decided using a singular dollar amount determined by MCSA Forum rather than per item, as listed on the proposal.
        (Ex. A student organization submits a proposal for funding 2 items: a new computer for $700 and a CD player for $90. The forum determines an allocation of $700. With that $700, the student organization may use those funds for either/both items from its proposal; they could purchase the computer for $700 or a less expensive computer for $610 and the CD player for $90).

Attachment B

Briggs Library Budget SE&E funds	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014
Access Services	$ 4,850	$ 3,650	$ 3,333	$ 2,200	$ 1,900	$ 2,200	$ 2,400	$ 2,100	$ 2,500	$ 2,369	$ 2,500	$ 2,500	$ 3,500
Administration	$ 20,250	$ 18,810	$ 16,114	$ 13,500	$ 14,100	$ 15,800	$ 13,150	$ 17,000	$ 25,820	$ 24,729	$ 12,400	$ 12,400	$ 12,000
Interlibrary Loan	$ 13,650	$ 13,350	$ 21,532	$ 21,300	$ 23,000	$ 17,250	$ 5,210	$ 20,000	$ 20,000	$ 18,952	$ 20,500	$ 20,500	$ 20,500
Technological Support	$ 24,000	$ 30,300	$ 20,318	$ 16,600	$ 10,200	$ 2,400	$ 8,100	$ 8,500	$ 12,000	$ 11,719	$ 11,600	$ 11,600	$ 11,000
Online Resources								$ 200,000	$ 212,000	$ 211,633	$ 235,000	$ 235,000	$ 260,000
Technical Services & Processing	$ 14,750	$ 12,250	$ 13,760	$ 7,600	$ 8,000	$ 4,300	$ 5,200	$ 7,500	$ 7,107	$ 7,107	$ 7,200	$ 7,200	$ 7,000
Materials (Single purch. & serials)	$ 370,000	$ 354,140	$ 347,743	$ 356,730	$ 361,330	$ 376,126	$ 384,626	$ 163,416	$ 123,432	$ 123,432	$ 110,241	$ 110,241	$ 85,441
Archives	$ -			$ 700	$ 800	$ 850	$ 400	$ 600	$ 300	$ 300	$ 300	$ 300	$ 300
Total	$ 447,500	$ 432,500	$ 422,800	$ 418,630	$ 419,330	$ 418,926	$ 419,086	$ 419,116	$ 403,159	$ 400,241	$ 399,741	$ 399,741	$ 399,741

IRS fees subtracted to show expendable amounts; IRS fees increased from 2.5 to 8% in early 2000s.

Archives added in 2005 with no funding

Fines and lost book payments tracked in auxiliary fund, but repl. paid from SE&E

Inflation rate: (approximate)
Books: 5% year
Databases: 6-8% year

Carryover needed because most purchases aren't encumbered in EFS; need CF to pay for materials ordered before July 1st but paid after July 1st of new fiscal year

Attachment C

Recent court rulings and the on-going work of assessing whether our instructional practices are meeting the needs of all of Morris students argue for the creation of a working group to ascertain the steps needed to ensure web-based instructional material and the technology delivering on-line and/or digital content for Morris courses are as accessible as possible to all students. Office of Academic Success Director and Disabilities Services Coordinator Nancy Cheeseman, at my request, created an informal working group this Fall to address these concerns. It is my understanding that you have been a willing participant. I am now asking if you would contribute to the Technology and Instruction Access working group to achieve a set of needed outcomes.

Specifically, the expected outcomes for this working group include:

1) Identifying barriers to student access to instructional material, prioritized by first identifying the non-accessible hardware &/or software that are likely to impact the greatest number of students.
2) Generating a list of achievable goals to reduce these barriers over the next 12, 24, and 36 months.
3) Creating a plan to realize these goals that includes the necessary sequence of needed steps and a recommendation regarding the academic service provider that should take responsibility for each goal.

My expectation is that the group will meet monthly and the work will be completed before the end of the 2013-14 academic year.

Ultimately, I expect to ask the Steering Committee to share your report with the Academic Support Services Committee and ask that the responsibility for any on-going work in this area be brought under their purview. The Academic Support Services Committee charge includes making recommendations regarding academic support provided by the Briggs Library, Computing Services, and Instructional and Media Technologies. I suspect that most, if not all of your recommendations will involve these support areas.

Thank you for your willingness to serve the campus in this needed role.