Missy Cody reported on a recent conference that she and others from Georgia State attended. At the 6th Annual TLTR Summer Institute, July 13 – 17, 2000, in Phoenix, the TLT Group presented the Tom Creed Compassionate Pioneer Award to Patrick Wiseman. Missy reported that the TLT Group representative said that Wiseman was the “hands down” winner, with no other nominee close to meeting his standards. The award is given to one who exhibits teaching excellence and who has pioneered the use of technology to enhance student learning. At the workshop, 20 countries/50 institutions were represented and there were 10 well-received presentations. (Learn more about the Tom Creed award at http://www.tltgroup.org/creed/)

Randy De Kler reported on the ITSS and discussed the Draft Remote Access Policy, keeping in mind that this still a policy document, not procedure. There is a question as to who approves access. GSU's new Information Security Officer, Tammy Clark, gave a presentation at the ITSS meeting on July 19, detailing her immediate plans for addressing GSU's network security. Clark also shared a slide show from a presentation she will be making to the Dean's Group and handed out a draft strategic plan for information security. Clark announced the formation of a task force to look at and address GSU network security issues. The committee will elect a new chair at the August 2000 meeting.

Clark’s presentations may be accessed at http://www.gsu.edu/~wwwits/07-19-2000m.htm

Scott Owen reported on the Technology Fee working group meeting held at Indian Creek on July 19, and said that a large amount of work was accomplished. The Tech Fee proposals were divided into three categories:

#1 Recommended immediate funding in Fall Semester, 2000
#2 Recommended further consideration for FY 2000-2001
#3 Recommended no action during FY 2000-2001

Funds allocated for Fall = 1.6 Million
Funds allocated for Spring = 1.6 Million
Funds allocated for Summer = 900 Thousand

The Tech Fee working group agreed to group the individual proposals based on the 5 criteria developed during the meeting. These criteria were: university versus college/department; one-time funding versus continuing; funding of student assistants versus staff; new versus existing technology; new experiences for students versus enhancing existing experiences; balanced distribution across requesting constituencies; and ADA requirements.

To merit inclusion in Category 1, proposals needed a two-thirds majority of the votes (10 out of 14). Similarly, proposals were placed in Category 3 if a two-thirds majority agreed that the proposal should not be funded this year. Proposals that could not garner a two-thirds vote were placed in Category 2.
Category 2 proposals are undergoing further review by the Tech Fee working group. Some category #2 proposals may be partially funded, funded at a lower cost, or funded in stages. For instance, the Digital Aquarium – lower cost equipment can replace the high-end equipment. Missy Cody asked that the proposals that will be viable without full funding be identified. Reid Christenberry suggested that those who submitted proposals now in Category 2 be asked: “If your proposal cannot be funded at the requested level, can you accept 25%, 50%, 75%?” or “Do you prefer to withdraw your proposal and resubmit it next year?”

Christenberry suggested that “life cycle” proposals for replacing one-third of equipment should be further clarified by identifying the actual machines in question by date of purchase, identification number, and so forth. Equipment purchased with technology fee funds must be counted as such and, if it is a candidate for the three-year replacement cycle, it will be so identified.

Laura Taylor noted that some proposals seemed similar to Quality Improvement Fund (QIF) proposals that had recently been submitted. Before the Tech Fee working group brings it recommendations before the full committee, it must be determined if QIF funding has been obtained to support these proposals. Christenberry will send out a notice to all those who submitted proposals currently in Category 1 or 2, asking that they identify any funds already provided by QIF or any other source and to amend their budget request accordingly.

Owen would like to see promotion for equipment purchased by technology fees. Perhaps a distinctive sticker with a logo designed by a student can be placed on the equipment so they can readily see where their money goes. A contest for the students to submit designs for the logo was suggested.

It was emphasized that the Board of Regents guidelines will be followed in evaluating the proposals.

Christenberry asked for any additional input from student representatives about the process. Omar Hassaleh, one the student representatives, stated that the students are pleased with the process to this point.

Valerie Miller reported that the subcommittee for review of university IT needs had spent several hours in meetings with representatives of various IS&T units, reviewing the budgets and responsibilities of all units. Bill Evans expressed thanks to Christenberry, Carolyn Gard and Bill Paraska for arranging and participating in these meetings. Miller reported that she will soon distribute to her subcommittee a draft document for its review.

Christenberry requested that Paraska represent him at the next Deans meeting on August 9. Both Christenberry and Gard will be attending an out-of-state conference.
The next IS&T meeting is scheduled for August 17th, 2000, at 3:00 p.m., at a location to be announced. The full forty-eight-member council that is to make recommendations regarding the Tech Fee proposals will convene at this meeting. Evans warned that the meeting will likely run longer than the typical IS&T Committee meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 3:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted July 25, 2000
Carolyn Summerlin