INFORMATION SYSTEMS AND TECHNOLOGY (ISAT)
COMMITTEE MEETING
THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 2004
1:30 – 2:50 PM
718 GENERAL CLASSROOM BUILDING

In Attendance:

J. L. Albert  Mary Jane Casto  Nancy Floyd  Bill Fritz  James Jones
Dan Benardot  David Cheshier  Marty Fraser  Doug Goans  Steve Manson
Amy Bruni  Carolyn Codamo  Teryl Frey  Chip Hill for Beth Jones  Tom Netzel

The August 26, 2004 minutes were distributed prior to the meeting; motion was made to approve the minutes as submitted, seconded, and carried.

Discussion and Vote on Nine FY05 STFS Proposals:

Nine recommendations concerning the Student Technology Fee process were given to the Senate ISAT Committee at the August 26, 2004 meeting. These recommendations to improve the STF process are based on the report of the FY05 STF Subcommittee to FACP last April. Marty sent 3 draft proposal forms (developed by Marty, Mary Jane and Amy) to the committee via email today’s meeting. He also sent the Nine Policy Proposals from FY05 STFS and Proposed Responses to help relate the nine policy requests to the changes on the forms. He received one reply in detail which he used as a guideline to isolate the handled quickly, in order to maximize the number that the committee could get through today. This ISAT committee has only the September and October meetings to vote on these changes to Stage 1 and Stage 2 forms and to the Call for Proposals must go out before the end of October. The proposals were discussed in the following order, numbers 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 9 (A List) and numbers 4, 8, 7 (B List).

Proposal Number 1: The wording regarding deadlines will be clarified on the FY2006 Call for Proposals form in order for CBSAC and Planning and Facilities to review Stage 1 Proposals. New wording will state that the minimum of 25 business days between the date received and the date it will be returned to proposer by CBSAC and Planning Facilities. Due date deadlines are stated on the form. Marty called for a motion to approve Proposal Number 1 (as amended). Motion was made, seconded and carried.

Proposal Number 2: This concerns inconsistencies between Stage 2 and Stage 1 Proposals. In part this was due to the work order spreadsheets from Facilities and Planning not being returned to proposers with their Stage 1 proposals, and so through to Stage 2. The STFS recommended that the wording correlating Stage 2 budget items and Stage 1 be strengthened. On page 2 of the proposal form, in the space For CBSAC and Planning & Facilities Use Only, the phrase including itemized spreadsheet will be added. This phrase is also added to the Stage 2 (Final) Proposal form, Item 16: Space Availability and Impact on Facilities. Carrying the spreadsheet forward to the Stage 2 form allows the STFS detailed information about itemized cost of each construction request. Multiple items will not be lumped together as one total cost but will be broken down into individual items (for example: Nancy said that if they asked for 3 doors, Facilities and Planning may list it as “construction: $5,000”, instead of cost per door.) Equipment and construction must not appear in Stage 2 budget lines unless it has gone through Stage 1 review process by IS&T and Facilities. Marty called for a motion to approve Proposal Number 2 (as amended). Motion was made, seconded and carried.

Proposal Number 3: The Stage 1 Proposal Form for IS&T (changed from UCCS because more units in IS&T may be asked to review the packages) addresses the need to include proposed software purchases and licenses required for each product, and cost-savings by bulk-buying. If several proposers want the same product, grouping requests together will allow for best price. This will ensure that university pricing is followed and will allow for savings through university-wide site license. Item #12 has been added to the form stating: What software will be requested for the
Proposers should be as specific as they can; listing Product, Vendor, State Contract Price (or best quoted price if they want), the exact version that they want, or state "most current" version. A quantity column and cost per quantity column will be added. Marty called for a motion to approve Proposal Number 3 (as amended). Motion was made, seconded and carried.

Proposal Number 5: As past STFS have done, the FY2005 STFS recommended that the university minimize the \textit{total number of staff positions}. The STFS recommended that Stage 2 Proposals requesting Technology Fee funding for GRAs be required to provide detail in itemized in the budget. A column will be added for \textit{Hourly Rate}. A statement will be added to Item #15: \textit{Justify the hours worked by graduate student assistants}. Marty called for a motion to approve Proposal Number 5 (as amended). Motion was made, seconded and carried.

Proposal Number 6: Marty noted that in the past two years, in particular, people have become concerned about the \textit{cost of physical security (cameras, key pads, swipe cards, etc.)}, and funding requests for security are growing. Requests have been approved that are more than the cap; for example, a proposal is brought to the committee with a higher security figure than the 2% of proportion for the project, but is actually buying security for the overall facility or lab. Would the committee look favorably on a one-time expenditure to secure an overall lab or facility? He is concerned that the wording would prevent circumstance needs. In the Stage 2 Proposal, Item #9 \textit{Justification of Funding Requirements for Fiscal Year 2006} will be added and Marty will change the wording of the instructions to read: \textit{Note: Costs normally can not exceed 2.5% total requested amount.}

Proposal Number 9: The STFS recommended a policy be developed that specifies criteria and limits for use of technology fee revenues be used for...space renovation, or other items or activities that do not have a direct and immediate impact upon students instructional objectives. Discussion brought out the fact that including these kinds of requests in proposals may not be funded—puts the need out front and will help obtain funding from departments. It also helps with utilization and ways to use the space more effectively. Marty called for a motion to approve Proposal Number 9 (as amended). Motion was made, seconded and carried.

Proposal Number 4: The STFS noted that line item spreadsheets did not coincide or relate to project descriptions, and the STFS to manipulate the spreadsheets when they needed to make cuts. They asked that instructions be added to the spreadsheet instructions in the Stage 2 Proposal form to allow the STFS to manipulate the spreadsheets coincide with the explanations of different functionality given in the text of the proposal; and to use the spreadsheet lines as in the explanations in the text of the proposal. Nancy would like to see a warning that proposing a budget that is not followed will result in losing all funding for their proposal if instructions are not followed. Mary Jane said that there is a stipulation in the instructions on the Stage 2 Proposal form that states: \textit{Please note that incomplete proposals or variations from the requested format will be denied consideration of your proposal.} The following sentences will be added to the spreadsheet instructions in the Stage 2 Proposal form: You must use the same terminology as in the project description to allow it to be traced back to the items and functionality appearing in the project description. Failure to do so will negatively affect consideration of your proposal. Marty called for a motion to approve Proposal Number 4 (as amended). Motion was made, seconded and carried.

Proposal Number 8: Attachment 2 of the Stage 2 Proposal form provides standards for PCs purchased with tech fee funds that are more than the standard desktop, should be specified in the budget. IS&T has produced list of accessory items that can be added as standard configurations. Non-standard requests for laptops, PDAs and tablets should be established as well as for PCs. Any accessories, devices, or equipment (such as batteries, memory cards and wireless capabilities), or PCs that are more than the standard desktop, should be specifically justified. Three new areas have been added to Attachment 2 of the Stage 2 Proposal form: \textit{Standard Laptop}, \textit{Standard PDA}, and \textit{Standard Tablet}.
Standard Tablet. The instructions on page 1 of Attachment 2 will be revised to state: “The following desktop systems are the standard technology for tech fee budgeting purposes. Desktop systems exceeding this capability must be specifically justified.” The instructions on page 2 of Attachment 2 will be revised to state: “Use of the following equipment must be specifically justified in the project description. The following configurations are the standards for budgeting purposes; any deviation from these must be further justified.” Amy gave prices for equipment for budgeting purposes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard PC</td>
<td>$1,419.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laptop</td>
<td>$1,911.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDA</td>
<td>$455.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tablet</td>
<td>$2,174.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAC</td>
<td>$1,520.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tom said the question of when should students buy and when should the university buy ought to be addressed. He Fee funds could be used for expensive equipment (such as PDAs, desktop PCs, printers, wireless routers, and professional software) that students may not be able to purchase for a GSU course. Once a trial or test period was determined to be successful, students could purchase the equipment, rather than STF. Marty said that students use the going lab settings…not just as an experiment or trial, but part of normal class instruction. Marty called for a motion to approve Proposal Number 8 (as amended). Motion was made, seconded and carried.

Proposal Number 7: The STFS recommended that a policy be developed to address the re-use of computers replaced by Tech Fee fund purchases. The main purpose is to determine how to properly handle machines purchased with Tech Fee funds. If possible, the used machine fulfillment the current year’s proposals. Tom’s concern is whether the course of action will be voluntary or mandatory. process used at his former institution. At first, the committee wanted to see all the equipment to be re-used, but much for them to handle. He then installed a whiteboard in his office listing all the available equipment which students’ needs always taking precedence. On the Stage 1 Proposal form, Item 13 Virtual Inventory Spreadsheet has been added in response to the STFS’ recommendation. Mary Jane will revise Proposal Number 7 response and send via email to ISAT for consideration and vote.

Draft Notification Policy

J. L. discussed the proposed Notification Policy regarding allowable use of GSU’s technology resources, including equipment, software, and communications infrastructure. Many GSU students are minors, and may have access to inappropriate materials. To safeguard the university, the notification policy must be specific enough to satisfy legal requirements and must be determined.

With no further business, meeting adjourned, 2:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted this 30th day of September, 2004
Carolyn Summerlin