Present: Evelyn Babey, Kareem Bishi, Faye Borthick, Laura Burtle, Reid Christenberry, Tim Crimmins, Bill Evans, Omar Hajsaleh, James Jones, Al McWilliams, Scott Owen, Carla Relaford, Shirley Tastad, Richard Welke

Also Present: Randy De Kler, Hammad Muhammad

Minutes: Approved as distributed

TLTS Committee Report: As Missy Cody was not present, Bill Evans reported the TLTS has reconstituted and the next meeting is 9:00 a.m., October 27, on 11th floor of Commerce Building.

ITSS Committee Report: James Jones, as the new chair of this subcommittee, reported on the discussions of their meeting, which included:

Information Technology Security Subcommittee
(See http://www.gsu.edu/~wwwits/10-17-2000a.htm for copy of proposal)

WinZip site license and $8,000 cost (Reid will follow up on this)

University Cold Fusion/ASP server (looking for replacement for Novell, which will be discontinued after April 21)

Wireless Sub-committee interest (Security Officer asked them to hold off until security issues are addressed)

Technology Fee Committee Report:
Scott reported on the 2-hour meeting with FAC-P. They suggested some modifications and caveats, he said. They are:

- Proposed three-year replacement of lab computers be changed to four-year replacement. (ISAT committee members expressed many concerns over this suggestion, one being the cost of maintenance for older machines.)
- Proposal 1.1.3 for $197,000 be moved from Category 1 to Category 2 (FAC-P was concerned about the 50% cost for renovation.)
- Move from Category 3 to Category 2, the two ADA compliant proposals, as the Regents reversed their decision about use of student tech funding for these kinds of proposals.
- FAC-P questioned the legality of the copy fee proposal. (Reid will discuss this with Katherine Johnston.)
- Move from Category 3 to Category 2 the Graduate Lab proposal for Arts and Sciences.

If the cost of a proposal is less than submitted, the unit will not be given more than is expended. The unexpended funding will be given toward another proposal, Scott said. He further reported that FAC-P said that decisions made this year will not be precedent setting, and proposals that require multi-year funding will need to be re-submitted each year. He also solicited input for revising the process.

A discussion on a wireless solution ensued and universities that had gone entirely wireless were named. The thought was that a wireless solution would eliminate the cost of open access labs. Reid brought up the topic of universal computer ownership, saying this should be re-addressed, and James Jones countered before that can happen, the infrastructure must be in place. Omar reported in his conversation with Clayton State SGA,
he found they were unhappy with the laptops they received. Omar will poll students at The Village about who has PCs, laptops, and/or Macs. Tim pointed out several things: What does the university want to use as a standard? What is the best way of structuring labs? What is the best way to extend legitimate proposals within the amount of available funds? IS&T should look at the functionality of machines as a basis for replacement rather than the age of machines.

**Banner Transition Team Report:**
Evelyn distributed a “Go! Banner!” brochure that related Banner’s vision, the reason Banner was chosen, ways users may provide input into the implementation, and training plans on Banner 2000. She outlined the organization and their various members and functions. Interest sessions of like groups will be scheduled and everyone is encouraged to attend. A trainer has been hired to do training and documentation and that person will be on board November 1. They are working with TeamWeb to create a web site. James Jones stressed the importance of getting IT people trained.

**University IT Security Process and Procedures:**
Faye suggested this be a standing committee that reports to ISAT from time to time. One person from the ISAT committee should serve on this committee. Bill Evans will talk with Bill Paraska for suggestions of people to serve on this committee and will run the names by Deans for their affirmation or alternate suggestions.

**Discussion of Internet Advertising Issues:**
A proposal was electronically distributed previously. Reid pointed out this issue is a subset of a larger issue. Is it ethical for a unit within the University to use University resources to make money for its unit? He said Steve Langston added Continuing Ed into the original proposal. An ad hoc small group to discuss the issues and to do some brainstorming was suggested. Names suggested were Randy De Kler, Patrick Wiseman, Bill Evans, and Carla Relaford. John Marshall, Media and Development Relations, and student representatives should also be included. An informal open meeting with a facilitator will be scheduled.

**Draft Student E-mail Policy**
There is a dependency on the student tech fee income to purchase software before a policy for the mandatory use of e-mail for all students at Georgia State can be put into effect. Some changes of wording in the policy were suggested. The committee agreed the revised version needed to be reviewed by legal affairs before it goes forward for the Deans to review. A student’s “bill of rights” was suggested. And also there is a need for an “upsell” of student support saying this is the preferred way of communication. Faye asked for a rationale of the motion. Bill Evans will compose a revised version and share it with the SGA and Legal Affairs and it will be forwarded to APACE and Admissions and Standards Committee of the Senate for review and approval.

The next ISAT committee meeting is November 16, 2:00 p.m. in the Golden Key Executive Board room.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.