

**Western Washington University**  
**Associated Students/Information Technology**  
**Student Technology Fee (STF) Committee Meeting**

Friday, February 13, 2015 HH 122

**Committee Members Present:** Jaleesa Smiley (AS VP for Academic Affairs and Chair), John Lawson (Vice Provost for Information Technology/ CIO), Josie Ellison (student at-large), Chris Sandvig (faculty representative from Academic Technology Committee), Diane Bateman (committee staff)

**Absent:** Cristina de Almeida (faculty senate at-large representative), Patrick Eckroth (student at-large)  
[one student at-large vacancy]

**Advisor(s):** N/A

**Guest(s):** N/A

**MOTIONS - none**

**Jaleesa Smiley, AS VP for Academic Affairs, called the meeting to order at 8:17 a.m.**

**I. REVISION TO THE AGENDA**

A. Option for Abstract Prioritizing

Sandvig offered an alternate method for determining the initial priority of abstracts as the committee reviews them. Instead of the Low/Medium/High labels agreed to last week, he suggested using the labels 0, 1, or 2 (where 0 = “no,” 1 = “maybe,” and 2 = “yes”). It is more precise and creates an order to the abstracts as they are reviewed.

Committee members agreed to switch to this method for interim votes.

**II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – none**

**III. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

A. The Committee reviewed the second set of proposal abstracts listed below and assigned points to the preliminary voting. (A separate “Comments and Questions” document captures the discussion.)

1. Field Audio Recording Equipment
2. Fairhaven and CFPA Audio Tech Update
3. Textile Arts and Cultural Activism
4. Solar Editing Lab
5. Huxley College ITV
6. Submersible Fluorometer for Aquatic Ecology Research and Education

7. Research-Writing Studio Collaborative Technologies
8. Chromebooks for Education
9. GigaPan for Place-Based Learning through Time and Space
10. WWU ATUS Academusic
11. WWU MakerSpace

B. Abstract Format

Sandvig would like the abstract format to have more structure to enable the committee to more easily compare abstracts to each other. (Note: The format was purposely made “open-ended” when the abstract form was introduced last year. The idea was to make the abstract relatively easy to submit, thus encouraging more submissions, especially from students.)

C. Technology Funding Idea

Sandvig suggested creating a process for borrowing against future lab fees to fund current technology (equipment) needs; that is, a “loan pool” to borrow against. Lawson said he liked the idea, in general. Ellison suggested pursuing this idea before the next student vote on the Student Tech Fee (scheduled for spring 2018) since it represents such a substantial change in the funding process.

**V. ACTION ITEMS – none**

**VI. OTHER BUSINESS – none**

**THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 9:06 a.m.**