Present: David Barrett, Douglas Barthlow, Tim Bartness, Dan Benardot, Laura Burtle, Guantao Chen, Reid Christenberry, Marty Fraser, Bill Fritz, Steve Harmon, James Jones, Zhongshan Li, Steve Manson, Thomas Netzel, Cherian Thachenkary, Neven Valev, Susan Walcott

Also Present: Mary Jane Casto, Bill Paraska, Liz Talamas, Amy Bruni

Minutes: The November 21, 2002, minutes were approved with the exception of the misspelling of Dan Benardot’s last name. There were no December minutes as the December meeting was cancelled.

Email Directory Policy: A draft policy dated January 13 was distributed. At the impetus of the discussions in the November ISAT meeting, Reid met with his staff to rethink the draft of the E-mail as an Official Means of Communications to University Employees policy. It became clear that following through with this policy would require provision of training and access to computers for all Georgia State University employees, as ISAT members had pointed out in the November meeting. These activities are the purview of the user promoting the use of E-mail as the official means of communications to university employees, and they should also be the ones to advocate the mandatory requirement. A new draft was then composed proposing that a single directory of official institutional E-mail addresses will be maintained and any requirement for official institutional E-mail addresses must use this single source.

Discussion included adaptability of Person Registry to colleges/how students learn about their assigned Email addresses/forwarding capabilities/will this be creating an alias or is it a real Email address (concern related to listservs)/how Campus Pipeline will change the complexion of technology on campus/retention of Ids/ and State Gratuity Laws as it relates to provision of Email.

ISAT members are to review the policy, send suggested revisions to Mary Jane Casto, and this is to be included on the agenda in February.

Unallocated Tech Fee Funds:
Mary Jane Casto distributed and reviewed a document titled “FY03 Student Technology Fee Awards—Money Saved.” This document reflects the 1) request number assigned, 2) major unit and 3) department making the proposal, 4) the title of the proposal, and, 5) the awarded amount. The amount of unused funds returned totaled $143,153. The FY03 amount awarded by the Technology Fee Committee was $4,110,456. Mary Jane explained that the units that were awarded funds voluntarily returned unused funds from their proposal. This week it was discovered the collected tech fee funds were more than anticipated, and F&A anticipates there will be approximately $542,244 more available. The total amount of unspent funds now equals $685,397, which will be swept at the fiscal year end if not reallocated.

Many members objected to tech fee money being swept, but expressed their desire that the funds be used as they were intended—for the students. This brought up the question of how to distribute the balance of funds this year AND follow the intent of the FY03 tech fee committee, which recommended funding 2.1.10 at 50% and all category ones at 100%: A motion was made that: 1) $124,976 be given to fund request number 2.1.10 at 50%, 2) $280,918 to fund all FY03 Category 1s at 100% (originally these were funded only at 80%), and 3) $195,138 to fund 1.1.5, Classroom Technology Improvements, at 100%. This motion allocating $601,032
Nomination Process for the Student Tech Fee Committee:
Marty distributed a list of Senate ISAT Committee members and copies of Section 18. B of the Faculty Handbook Guide/Bylaws that states the ISAT committee “provide(s) faculty membership for its Student Technology Fee Subcommittee as set forth in paragraph C.” From the ISAT membership list, he requested members send him nominations for the Student Tech Fee Committee (from Arts & Sciences and Colleges of Business and Education) by Monday, January 20th. He will then submit their nominations, in response to Provost Henry’s Email of January 16 calling for recommendations for 11 faculty members to serve on the tech fee committee.

Proposed Mission Statement for the Combined Subcommittees to be called Information Technology Support Subcommittee (ITSS):
James Jones invited Liz Talamas to join him in support of their joint proposal for the security and support subcommittees being combined into one subcommittee since both subcommittees have the same memberships. They proposed the following Mission Statement for the combined subcommittees:

*The mission of the Information Technology Support Subcommittee is to develop and recommend policies, guidelines, and standards to enable the continued availability and integrity of the computing and network infrastructure at Georgia State University (GSU). The subcommittee will assist in educating and enlisting the cooperation of students, faculty, and staff in the use and protection of GSU’s information and technology resources. This subcommittee should also serve as a forum for discussion of issues relevant to supporting information technology activities in local, or distributed units and at all levels within administrative and academic units.*

Since the chair of the Information Technology Support Subcommittee recently resigned, it seemed an appropriate time to suggest combining these two. Discussion included questions such as: Is there anything in the bylaws that would prohibit ISAT from doing this? (The response was no.) Is there sufficient reference to security? Does the statement “Integrity of the computing and network infrastructure at GSU” sufficiently cover security? It was suggested that integrity has a broader meaning than security alone and should be retained. Has Tammy Clark, Information Security Administrative Manager, had input into this proposal; as previously the subcommittee was supposed to provide “articulation” to her and the IS&T staff?

Marty will check the Senate bylaws about combining the two subcommittees and will include this topic in the agenda for February. During the meantime, Reid will wordsmith the mission statement to enhance security and liaisons and will communicate the revision for review and discussion in February.

Technology Fee Calendar: The committee approved the calendar as presented. There is an organizational meeting scheduled on February 19, 1:30-5:00 in the Sterne Room of the Commerce Building. Reid will send reminder note to the Deans that proposals are due March 3. In response to a question about Reid contacting faculty and staff directly, it was pointed out the Deans have expressed a preference about sending all communication to them, and they will propagate the information to their staff.

Meeting Adjourned: 2:55 p.m.

Next Scheduled Meeting: February 20, 1:30 p.m., 718 GC.