

**College of Micronesia – FSM  
Minutes Reporting Form**

<b>Meeting Group:</b>	<b>ICT Committee</b>
-----------------------	----------------------

<b>Date:</b>	<b>Time:</b>	<b>Location:</b>
November 30, 2021	3:00-4:00PM Pohnpei/Kosrae Time 2:00-3:00PM Chuuk/Yap Time	Zoom

**Members Present:**

<b>Titles/Representative</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
Chair	Edper Castro (NC)	✓		
Vice-Chair	Petrus Ken (FMI)	✓		
Secretary	Danilo Ibarrola (CTEC)		✓	
CTEC Faculty Rep	Phyllis Silbanuz	✓		
CTEC Faculty Rep	Nelchor Permitez	✓		
CC Faculty Rep	Atkin Buliche		✓	Sick Leave
CC System Spec.	John Dungawin	✓		
NC Admin Services	Eugene Edmund		✓	
KC Staff	Renton Isaac		✓	
KC Faculty Rep	Hiroki Noda	✓		
KC Faculty Rep	Penina Tulensru	✓		
FMI Staff	Lee Rus		✓	
YC Faculty	Rhoda Velasquez	✓		
YC Staff	Berton Miginigad	✓		
NC OARR	Vasantha Senarathgoda		✓	Sick Leave
NC Faculty Rep	Dennis Gearhart	✓		
NC Faculty Rep	Mike Dema	✓		

NC Staff	Chris Gilimete	✓		
NC Staff	Tetaake Yee Ting		✓	
LRC Rep	Juvelina Recaña		✓	Health issue
SBA Rep	JR Sasao	✓		

<b>Additional Attendees:</b>	Shaun Suliol
<p>Agenda:</p> <p><b>Here is the link:</b></p> <p><a href="https://comfsm.zoom.us/j/5075428310">https://comfsm.zoom.us/j/5075428310</a></p> <p>Meeting ID: 507 542 8310</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Review of Tech Fee (BP8000)</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Agenda/Major Topics of Discussion:</b></p> <p><b>1. Review of Tech Fee (BP8000)</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Chair started the meeting by presenting the agenda.</li> <li>2. Chair shares a copy of the newly proposed BP Tech Fee and gives thanks to the members of the committee for their comments and suggestions.</li> <li>3. One of the questions he encounters is on the amount of the Tech fee.</li> <li>4. Chair share Juvel's suggestion. She asked if it is possible to base the amount of Tech fee on the number of credits and uses of technology resources of each student per semester. She said that the mandatory tech fee can be charged based on the number of credits like: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Students registered for 6 or more credits: \$100 per semester.</li> <li>b) Students registered for 1 to 5 credits \$50 per semester</li> </ol> </li> <li>5. Chair comment that It would be very difficult if there would be different tiers of payments not just in terms of credits but usage. And thus, very difficult to monitor and will affect the operations and expenses allotted for the Tech fee. Also, the number of students that we have are rather small compared to other colleges which could not compensate for our operations if we make it smaller. He is suggesting to maintain the Tech fee to \$100.00.</li> <li>6. Chair asks the committee for their comments and there is none.</li> <li>7. Chair continue with the appropriate expenditures items and ask the committee for comments again members agree with the given items.</li> <li>8. Chair proceeded with Tech fee Ad-hoc Committee and said he received a comment that it is just a duplication of the ICT Committee's function, in which he agrees. He suggested that to have an oversight of the Tech fee, ICT committee should set aside one or two</li> </ol>	

meetings intended only for the Tech fee and ask report from the Business office the usage of the Tech fee for the last semester or the whole year.

- a) Phyllis agrees that the Ad hoc is just a duplication of the committee and suggested creating a sub-committee to handle the Tech fee.
  - b) Chair agree to the creation of the sub-committee and said it must be included in the ICT committee TOR.
  - c) Phyllis asked if there is a set time for the policies to expire or a new one to change.
  - d) Chair asked for a clarification from Phyllis.
  - e) Phyllis replied, any policies and followed it up with a question “Why do we need the advisory committee. Is it because the responsibilities are too much for the ICT committee? Why don't we just do ad hoc committee to address any additional research or assignments instead of creating this advisory committee?”
  - f) Chair said that the committee can do the job but it needs to be specified in the TOR and students’ voice on the Tech fee utilization is needed.
  - g) Phyllis added that if the committee is going to discuss the Tech fee every year it depends on the agenda set by the committee officers.
  - h) Both chair and Phyllis agree that students’ participation in the Tech fee utilization is needed.
  - i) Chair asked the committee members for comments and if they want to remove the Tech fee Ad-hoc.
  - j) Dennis wants to clarify if the committee wants to create a separate committee with student on it that will decide where to spend the money or to approve/disapprove the expenditures.
  - k) Chair explains that in a way it is a separate committee with a student in it, but they will have no power to approve or disapprove. They will just recommend how the Tech fee will be used by the College.
  - l) Dennis explains that if the new committee will have no voice or voting power at all they will not voice out their opinion and if their concern is not counted why bother asking them.
  - m) Chair agrees with Dennis.
  - n) Chair explains that students’ reps have a voting right to the committee and there is always a student representative to the committee.
9. Student representative to ICT committee JR Sasao introduces himself to the group.
10. Chair agrees and scraps the recommended Tech fee Ad-hoc as it is already part of the committee’s responsibility. But insist in some form of oversight.
11. Chair shows the IT Director’s recommendations and asks for comments from the committee members.
12. Chair asked the committee members if they agree to change the TOR to specifically mention that one meeting will be dedicated to the Tech fee discussion and students and the Business office will be involved in the meeting.
- a) Dennis thinks that there is no need to review the Tech fee policy once a year if there is no complaint about it. If people are complaining then it needs a review.
  - b) Student representative RJ and Nel agree with Dennis’ opinion.
13. Chair read the IT Director’s comments and asked for members’ comments.
- a) Rhoda recommended instead of putting percentage, allot an annual maintaining balance.
  - b) Nel explains the purpose of the percentage allocation.

- c) Chair points out to the specific comment of IT Director limiting to no more than 50% of Tech fee will be used in paying for internet, software, and hardware to support the operational budget of student learning.
- d) Rhoda asked if the 50% percent is the amount collected annually or the accumulated Tech fee amount.
- e) IT Director clarifies that the 50% is the accumulated amount and it is not necessarily 50% it can be higher or lower.
- f) Chair asked the members to vote if a percentage is needed to limit the usage of the Tech fee.

With Percentage

Nel  
Dennis  
John  
Mike  
JR  
Chris  
Hiro  
Berton  
Petrus  
Penina

No Percentage

Phyllis

- g) Chair asked the members how much will be allotted or wait for the business office report on the Tech fee usage.
  - h) Berton would like to see the Tech fee usage first.
  - i) Chair asked Shaun if he can provide the information to the committee.
  - j) IT Director agrees to provide the information before the next meeting. He added that the Tech fee is not only used to pay for software and internet all the time. He also agrees with Phyllis's idea of not restricting the usage of the Tech fee. Shaun also explains that the percentages are patterned after the GCC's allocation for their Tech fee usage and it is clear for the students where their Tech fee is going.
  - k) Director also suggests putting the percentage right now.
14. Chair asked the members for their input on the limitations of Tech fee usage.
- a) For the above appropriations the college should not use beyond (% to be determined later) annually of the accumulated Tech fee.
  - b) Shaun agrees with the limitations but added that Cabinet's input is also needed before finalizing it.
15. IT Director answered Phyllis's inquiry about the students' laptops. There will be a third application for the We Care Funding laptop. This third application is for students who have not applied yet and attending next semester. Students who applied on the last two rounds need not re-apply. The first batch of 500 laptops will arrive on the week of Dec. 13 and the next batch will be in January.
16. Staff and employees will also be given new computers funded by CARES Act.
17. IT Director also clarifies that IT is only the distributing office in We Care laptop for student needs. Application is handled by Financial Aid and a special committee.
18. Berton asked if the new IT Student Support Staff can help other programs. IT Director said that if they have COM students, they can if none they cannot.

19. JR asked what will happen to the laptop of those students who applied and then graduated before receiving them. IT Director said that they will still receive their laptop. Students who applied on their campuses but staying here in Pohnpei will receive their laptops here.

20. John asked, “If the student already applied can he apply again.” Shaun said that if it is already approved there is no need. But if it is denied, students can apply again. Notification of approval will come from the Financial Aid office.

21. Chair asked the meeting to be adjourned. Phyllis moves to adjourn the meeting and JR seconded.

**Comments/Upcoming Meeting Date & Time/Etc.:**

**Handouts/Documents Referenced:**  
<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1hAGPHz5M2WkMXNbaqQqZW17GoZppojB0p2dSWBaYiVk/edit>

**College Web Site Link:**

<b>Prepared by:</b>	Danilo S. Ibarrola	<b>Date Distributed:</b>	12/3/2021
---------------------	--------------------	--------------------------	-----------

<b>Approval of Minutes Process &amp; Responses:</b>				
<b>Name</b>	<b>Aye</b>	<b>Nay</b>	<b>Remarks</b>	<b>Date voted</b>
Edper Castro (NC)	✓			12/3/2021
Petrus Ken (FMI)				
Danilo Ibarrola	✓			12/3/2021
Phyllis Silbanuz	✓			12/3/2021
Nelchor Permitez	✓			12/3/2021
Atkin Buliche				
John Dungawin	✓			12/3/2021
Eugene Edmund				
Renton Isaac				
Hiroki Noda	✓			12/3/2021

Penina Tulensru	✓			12/3/2021
Lee Rus				
Rhoda Velasquez	✓			12/3/2021
Berton Miginigad	✓			12/3/2021
Vasanth Senarathgoda	✓			12/3/2021
Dennis Gearhart	✓			12/3/2021
Mike Dema	✓			12/3/2021
Chris Gilimete	✓			12/3/2021
Juvelina Recaña				
Tetaake Yee Ting				
JR Sasao				

<b>Summary Decisions/Recommendations/Action Steps/Motions with Timeline &amp; Responsibilities:</b>				
<b>Action by President:</b>				
<b>Item #</b>	<b>Approved</b>	<b>Disapproved</b>	<b>Approved with conditions</b>	<b>Comments</b>