Present:

IS&T Committee Members:
Evelyn Babey, Al Baumstark, Faye Borthick, Murray Brown, Laura Burtle, Reid Christenberry; Kelly Davis, Bill Evans, Al McWilliams, Valerie Miller, Bill Nelson, Carla Relaford, Laura Taylor, Patrick Wiseman

Also Present:
Dan Bernardot, representing Missy Cody

Students: William Adkins, Omar Hajsaleh, Shehab Hashim, Amanda Hatcher, Hammad Muhammad, David Giguere, Terrance Manion, Adila Syeda, Katie Elwart

Faculty: Steven Kaminshine

Administrative Staff: Bill Paraska, Carolyn Gard

Since this meeting was scheduled primarily to discuss and to accept or reject the recommendations of the Technology Fee subcommittee, Bill Evans, Chair of the Senate ISAT Committee, said the only other topic on the agenda was the approval of the minutes from the July meeting. The minutes were approved as distributed, and Evans asked Scott Owen, Chair of the Tech Fee Subcommittee, to lead discussions of his subcommittee’s recommendations.

Owen outlined the process the subcommittee used in arriving at their recommendations. He explained that the more than seventy proposals requested a total of nearly $8 million, much more than would be received in technology fees. The subcommittee had several meetings (including an all-day meeting at Indian Creek Lodge) and several rounds of contact with the people and units who submitted proposals. The Tech Fee proposals were separated into three groups:

Category One: These were recommended for immediate funding at level indicated.
Category Two: These were recommended for funding, possibly after spring semester’s enrollment figures are in, at the level indicated, if funding is available.
Category Three: These were not recommended for funding this fiscal year.

Owen moved the recommendations by the subcommittee be accepted.
At this point, a question was raised about the request for lab and classroom devices for the physically challenged, as there will be more than 600 students that cannot use some of the equipment in labs and classrooms without special devices, and they will be charged the fee. The response given was that there would be many students that would pay the fees and would not be using the equipment in the classrooms (they may have their own laptops). In addition, the required equipment would necessitate having many specially trained assistants designated to help these students use the equipment. Carolyn Gard pointed out that Request 2.2.2 was funded, enabling the replacement of the Assistive Technology Lab in the College of Education.

Carla Relaford asked what would happen in the event a request was approved under Category One, but for whatever reason, the purchase could not be made during the time frame. Reid Christenberry explained that
these projects are funded through Fund Code 10, which implies that, if awarded, a proposal must commit the funds during the current fiscal year. If the proposal submitter cannot guarantee this, they should withdraw the proposal and resubmit in future years. Regarding when projects can commence, it was stated that some adjustments may need to occur because of timing issues or changes in requirements. If necessary, a mid-course review could be conducted to assess required changes. Reid Christenberry was asked to contact all category 1 and 2 proposals to determine if the submitters are aware of timing issues for commencement of their projects. Also, Christenberry will have UCCS identify any technology infrastructure issues that could affect the timetables of proposed projects.

After very little discussion, the majority approved the proposals by the raising of hands. These proposals will be sent to FACP for its review and then forwarded to the Provost. Once he has given his approval, Category One expenditures may begin.

To view the approved proposals, go to: http://www.gsu.edu/~wwwstf/docs/index.html.

Meeting Adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

Next scheduled meeting is September 21, 3:00 p.m., 718 General Classroom.