College of Micronesia – FSM
Minutes Reporting Form

Meeting Group:	ICT Committee

Date:	Time:	Location:
September 28, 2021	3:00-4:00PM Pohnpei/Kosrae Time 2:00-3:00PM Chuuk/Yap Time	Zoom

Members Present:

Titles/Representative	Name	Present	Absent	Remarks
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		✓	
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	✓		
NC Faculty Rep	Dennis Gearhart	✓		
NC Faculty Rep	Mike Dema	✓		

NC Staff	Chris Gilimete	✓		
NC Staff	Tetaake Yee Ting	✓		
LRC Rep	Juvelina Recaña	✓		
SBA Rep				

Additional Attendees:	

Agenda:

https://comfsm.zoom.us/j/5075428310
Meeting ID: 507 542 8310

1. Review of Tech Fee (BP8000)
2. Other matters

Agenda/Major Topics of Discussion:

1. Review of Tech Fee (BP8000)

- Chair started the meeting at exactly 3:08 pm by presenting the agenda.
- Petrus does the roll call.
- Reading of the previous minutes of the meeting.
- Chair presents the copy of the present BP 8000 to the members and suggests that it needs to review and revise.
- He also presents a copy of the BP8000 revised and approved by the Committee on its November 24, 2020, meeting. The revised BP 8000 is not yet presented to the Board.
- Chair presented the following goals in revising the BP 8000;
  - Prevent possible abuse from non-intended usage (e.g. new AC for a lab).
  - Or appropriating exorbitant percentage to non-primary although valid items (e.g. Internet subscription)
  - Not too rigid or at least flexible but with some parameters.
  - Forward-looking.

- He also reminded the committee that the revision will not be done in one sitting or one meeting, it could even take up the whole semester.
- Everyone's participation is highly encouraged especially in reading assignments and more importantly contributing ideas.

- Chair present policies on Tech fee of different Colleges;
  - University of Washington Tacoma
  - University of Wisconsin Milwaukee
  - Loyola University of Chicago
  - University of Wisconsin System
  - Louisiana Tech University

- o The City University of New York
- o Roseman University
- o UOG
- o Guam Community College

- Chair gives a summary of the different definitions, policies, purposes, and appropriate and inappropriate use of tech fees in the aforementioned Colleges including how the student representatives were all involved in crafting plan for the use of Tech Fee.
- The first seven Colleges provide specific information on their Tech fee policies. The link for the presentation is provided below:

  (https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1yFqfz5cP277kOfXDlYZF1n7s62PyW_7i/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=105601752210051458986&rtpof=true&sd=true)

- UOG and GCC provide only the amount they spend for specific items.
- Chair emphasizes the active involvement of students in the different Colleges but the final decision is still with the administration and Board of Regents.
- He informed the ICT Committee that he called and send an email to the Student Services as well as the Student Life to provide a student representative to the ICT Committee but he did not receive a single response from both.
- After presenting the Tech fee policies and guidelines of the different Colleges, the Chair gives the salient point on those guidelines and policies;

  - o **Student Involvement:** Majority of the colleges if not all, students are actively involved in formulating, planning, and reviewing the use of Technology Fee.
  - o **Well-defined Appropriate and Inappropriate use of Tech Fee** – Most of the colleges have outlined what is appropriate and what is not appropriate to use, Technology Fee is for.
  - o **Monitoring of usage** – A lot of them monitors the allocation of usage of Tech Fee.
  - o **No percentage of allocations mentioned** – There is not a single Tech Fee that mentioned what percentages should be allocated on what.
  - o **Others?**

- Nel suggests placing the Tech fee in a restricted account be include in the salient point. The chair agrees with the suggestion.
- Dennis points out that there is a separate committee on the different Colleges for tech fees. He asks if the Committee is moving in that direction. Chair responded that the committee could be going in that direction and thus affirming Dennis' point.
- Nel again suggested having a student representative from each campus.
- Chair agrees with the suggestion by Nel and presented options that can be a model for COM;
  - a) Rigid allocation of percentages per category.
  - b) No allocation of percentages per category.
  - c) Monitoring of usage of the tech fee
  - d) A mix: Some have percentages and some don't have.
  - e) Others.
- Chair asks the committee members to select from the options presented.
- Rhoda through chat selected letter B or No allocation of percentage per category.

- Before everyone can answer, Nel asks the Chair what is his choice from the given options and what is the purpose of the percentage?
- Chair selected also letter B or No allocation of percentages per category. But he added that there should be;
    - Identification of what is high priority among items/categories for Tech Fee usage. For example Laboratory replacement of computers would be a high priority compared to Internet subscription.
    - Appropriate/Inappropriate guidelines on the use of Tech fee;
    - Involvement of students; There should be a student representative per campus; and
    - Monitoring of usage of Tech Fee.

- He added that the percentage that was agreed from last year is to prevent abuse from using the Tech Fee for other purposes.
- Nel agrees with the chair and added that the percentage is from the suggestion of the IT Director. There is nothing wrong with assigning a percentage for the appropriation of the Tech fee. This way the Administration will have a clear view of where to spend the Tech fee. Nel further suggests that if the percentage will be omitted, it is better to place the Tech fee in a restricted account to protect it from inappropriate spending.
- Vas mentioned as his per own experience there is normally a low student participation in formulation of Tech Fee policies. He suggested appointing two student representatives to the Committee to assure attendance in every meeting.
- Nel ask the Chair if the Internet Fee will be included in the Tech fee appropriation. Chair answered yes, but said it should not be the highest priority for Tech Fee usage.
- Nel again asks if the student is paying the Tech fee per semester or annually. Chair said he is not sure and will have to ask the Admission and also the ICT Director Shaun.
- Tetaake also said that their office receives questions from parents regarding the Tech fee. If they are going to pay the Tech fee since their children are attending online classes and they are using their gadgets and internet. Chair appreciates the input from Tetaake and noted that it is a very valid question that needs to be answered by the College.
- Chair said other inputs will be tackled next meeting because of time constraints and adjourned the meeting
- Nel move to adjourn the meeting and Rhoda seconded. The meeting is adjourned at 4:06 pm

Comments/Upcoming Meeting Date & Time/Etc.:

Handouts/Documents Referenced:
ICT Committee Monthly Meeting Presentation – Sept. 28, 2021 (https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1yFqfz5cP277kOfXDlYZF1n7s62PyW_7i/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=105601752210051458986&rtpof=true&sd=true)
BP8000.pdf
BP8000.pdf (revised)

College Web Site Link:	
http://wiki.comfsm.fm/@api/deki/files/5788/=ICT_Revised_TOR.pdf http://www.comfsm.fm/Policy/Board-Policy/Chapter-8/COMFSM_BP8000.pdf	

Prepared by:	Danilo S. Ibarrola	Date Distributed:	9/292021

Approval of Minutes Process & Responses:

Name	Aye	Nay	Remarks	Date voted
Edper Castro (NC)	✓			9/29/2021
Petrus Ken (FMI)	✓			9/30/2021
Danilo Ibarrola	✓			9/29/2021
Phyllis Silbanuz	✓			9/29/2021
Nelchor Permitez	✓			9/29/2021
Atkin Buliche			Did not vote	
John Dungawin	✓			9/29/2021
Eugene Edmund			Did not vote	
Renton Isaac	✓			9/29/2021
Hiroki Noda	✓			9/30/2021
Penina Tulensru	✓			9/29/2021
Lee Rus			Did not vote (New Member)	
Rhoda Velasquez	✓			9/30/2021
Berton Miginigad	✓			9/30/2021
Vasantha Senarathgoda	✓			9/29/2021
Dennis Gearhart	✓			9/29/2021
Mike Dema	✓			9/29/2021
Chris Gilimete	✓			9/30/2021
Juvelina Recaña	✓			9/29/2021
Tetaake Yee Ting	✓			9/30/2021

Summary Decisions/Recommendations/Action Steps/Motions with Timeline & Responsibilities:				
Action by President:				
Item #	**Approved**	**Disapproved**	**Approved with conditions**	**Comments**