Present: David Barrett, Douglas Barthlow, Tim Bartness, Murray Brown, Laura Burtle, Guantao Chen, Reid Christenberry, Conrad Ciccotello, Martin Fraser, James Jones, Zhongshan Li, Steve Manson, Thomas Netzel, Scott Owen, Cherise Peters, Cherian Thachenkary, Susan Walcott

Also Attending: Mary Jane Casto, Carolyn Gard, Bill Paraska

Minutes:
Thomas Netzel requested the minutes of January 16 be clear in the amount of funding available for reallocation, and suggested that minutes reflecting the Technology Fee Funds discussion be changed to read:

**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 passed; remaining funds should be allocated by the FY04 Tech Fee Committee.

The committee agreed with the suggested change.

Selection of Faculty Members of the Search committee for the Associate Provost—IS&T:
Sid Harris and Marty Fraser are the co-chairs of this committee. Ron Henry has asked the Senate ISAT Committee to elect five people to serve on this committee. In addition, two college IT support staff, two IS&T IT support staff, and one student from the ’04 tech fee will be asked to serve on this search committee. Marty suggested members nominate candidates to represent the colleges, and he would call the nominees to ask them to serve. The first five to agree to serve will be the candidates Marty will send to Ron Henry. Those nominated were: Bill Nelson, A&S; Patrick Wiseman, Law; Dick Welke, RCB; Dan Benardot, HHS; Laura Burtle, Library; Amy Lederberg, CoE; Steve Harmon, CoE; George Pullman, A&S; and Fay Borthick, RCB.

Consideration of the Mission for the Combined Subcommittee “Information Technology Security and Support Subcommittee”:
“The Proposed Mission Statement for the Combined Subcommittees” was distributed. Both subcommittees have primarily the same members but meet at different times. When the chair of the IT support subcommittee resigned, it was deemed an appropriate time to consider combining the subcommittees into one. The mission statement is an amalgamation of the two mission statements. (Both of the original statements were also distributed.) Thomas Netzel moved to accept the proposal. A question was raised about the development and recommendation of policies, since the security subcommittee was working on combining security policies. Reid Christenberry explained the CIO of Georgia State University has been charged with being the steward of IT policies. Therefore, subcommittees should not originate policies, as IS&T is charged with constructing and forwarding policies for approval. Originally the security subcommittee acted in an advisory role to Tammy Clark and it was a formal way to articulate within units. Before new software was rolled out, IS&T and the IT support subcommittee worked together to ensure smooth implementations. During the meeting, the Amalgamated Proposal was corrected to read:

The Information Technology Security and Support Subcommittee is a standing subcommittee of the Senate IS&T Committee. The subcommittee will respond to specific charges from the Senate Committee to review capabilities, policies or procedures that relate to the mission of the subcommittee. The mission of Information Technology Security and Support Infrastructure Subcommittee is to assist in the development and review of policies, guidelines and standards to enable the continued functionality, availability, security, integrity, and support 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 will also serve as a forum for discussion of issues relevant to supporting information technology activities at all levels within the university. The subcommittee will assist in developing and refining procedures to improve the coordination of work activities between local support technicians and the Information Systems and Technology unit. The subcommittee may study issues related to information technology and its mission of support, security and integrity and make recommendations to the Senate IS&T Committee for possible implementation as university-level policy.

Email Directory Policy/Draft, January 13, 2003:
This draft policy had its first viewing with the Senate ISAT Committee in January. Discussion raised the question of: is the current choice for an Email address the best? Would firstname.lastname@gsu.edu be a better choice? (The response was Novell has a limitation for campus Ids, and that the discussion today is about this particular policy.) It was indicated that a person can change the default assigned to another choice. This policy addresses the fact that “a single directory of official institutional email addresses is maintained, and any requirement for official institutional email addresses must use this singular source.” It was suggested that the second paragraph, last sentence be changed to read: “Individual users are responsible for complying with this policy and its associated standards that follow.” Under the paragraph headed “Activation of the Official Georgia State Email Address,” the NOTE: will include the URL address to the student page showing how they manage e-mail. A motion was made and seconded to accept this policy with suggested revisions.

Security and Surveillance Camera Systems Connection Policy:
This policy was distributed for a first reading. Questions should be directed to Bill Paraska.

Meeting adjourned.

Next meeting, March 20, 1:30, in 718 General Classroom.