Present: Kareem Bishi, Faye Borthick, Murray Brown, Laura Burtle, Reid Christenberry, Tim Crimmins, Randy De Kler, James DeLisle, Bill Evans, Bill Fritz, Omar Hajsaleh, James Jones, Al McWilliams, Valerie Miller, Carla Relaford, Richard Welke, Patrick Wiseman


Also Present: Mary Jane Casto, Bill Paraska

Minutes were approved as distributed.

TLTS Committee Report: In Missy Cody’s absence, Bill Evans read highlights from the February 16 minutes. They discussed:

- University-supported software, including issues of uniformity and support. Questions were raised about decisions surrounding adoptions of Banner, Microsoft, and WebCT. There was also a suggestion that course evaluations might include questions on instructional technology use in classes.
- DeKler, chair of the ITSC, reported the ITSC has three goals: to develop policy recommendations; to detect and prevent security problems; and to develop an educational awareness of security issues and personal responsibility to reduce security risks. They are seeking a balance between “attack and Access.”
- Bill Evans reported All FY200 Category II tech fee proposals will be funded—some at a lower level than originally requested. An ad hoc committee is developing procedures for next year. Evans distributed a draft of recommendations and they were asked to send their comments to Reid Christenberry.
- They discussed the upcoming Tech Expo and potential presentations.

ITSS Committee Report:
This committee is reviewing policies that are already in place: the IT Security and Ethics. At their next meeting they will again review policies and bring pertinent ones to the ISAT Committee.

Banner Transition Team Report:
Bill Evans welcomed Bill Fritz to the first meeting of the Senate ISAT Committee. Bill Fritz distributed a paper “Banner Implementation Project.” This paper included information on the Project Management Team (Bill Fritz and Cherise Peters), the Teams and Team Leaders, and contact information for each. He highlighted the major Banner challenges, the seven stages of Banner Implementation (and major options), present and extended timeline, and major changes. He assured the committee that questions sent to team leaders will receive responses within two days. FAQ have been identified and will be on their web pages. He and others on the team have concerns about the building level of expectations by the university community and how to manage those expectations. He discussed extending the timeline and the costs associated with extending it. He projects Banner will be up and running in the Fall of 2002. He distributed a “Proposed Module Go Live Dates.” He talked about CAPP replacing PACE. He spoke of other universities that are NOT using CAPP. He is requesting that Georgia State be allowed to use its home-grown PACE system since this program is better than CAPP, Banner’s replacement. On the other hand, there is some economy in using
the same software throughout the University System—to being standardized. Georgia State has had its legacy system 30 years and is still tweaking it. Banner will not have the same level of proficiency and because of its steep learning curve; it will take the university community a short while to master it. Admissions will begin populating Banner in January of 2002. Their first challenge is to get students registered in May. For a copy of this presentation, call Dolores Waters at 1-3470, or e-mail her at Dolores@gsu.edu.

FY2002 Technology Fee Process
Call for proposals have been delayed to April 17. The members asked about 1) the shape of the tech fee committee, 2) saving time for Senate and Executive Committee discussions, and 3) some procedural issues (separate accounts, who decides what happens if money doesn’t come in at first of year, procedures before proposal is given). In response to some of the questions, Reid explained:

- That some units paid for their proposal out of their own accounts and were reimbursed by the Technology Fee.
- Queries were run by awardees to see if technology fee expenses followed the proposal.
- If equipment drops significantly in price, the difference should be reimbursed to the technology fee account.
- IS&T does an after-the-fact report to the Board of Regents regarding tech fee expenditures.
- Last year’s committee voted not to approve payment for personnel—but nothing done last year is precedent setting, including payment of staff—part time or full time.

Tim Crimmins suggested a continuous lifetime cycle for replacement of equipment. Reid is to develop a summary of handling/procedures to share with the committee.

Sparks Hall Renovations
CBSAC approved $1 million for four classrooms in Sparks Hall. They are moving forward with renovation and hope to be opened by fall. The four rooms will house 49, 24, 24, and 24 students respectively.

IT Strategic Plan
Once this committee approves the IT Strategic Plan, it will be forwarded to the Provost, and shared with the Deans and department heads for their review. The IT plan should reflect the University’s plan, and the members were asked to keep that in mind as they review the plan. ISAT Committee will forward the IT plan to the Executive and Senate Committees. Suggested topics for review were: 1) modifying language on GSAMS and 2) including verbiage about Banner. Bill Fritz will review and make appropriate changes to Number 5.4.3, and share changes with Mary Jane.

Wireless Access
In order to protect Georgia State’s resources, it is necessary to have people register for wireless access. Without this registration, anyone can enter Georgia State’s network. Registration will allow us to limit and control access to the network and reduce the possibility of interference. A question was raised about Blue Tooth and the response was that we are not supporting Blue Tooth on Campus. The committee approved the Wireless Access Standard proposal by Bill Paraska.

Meeting Adjourned at 4:18 p.m.

Next meeting will be an organizational meeting and will be held at 3:00 p.m.on April 19, 2001, room 718 General Classroom.