Dr. Pan called the meeting to order at 1:30 PM.
The August 18, 2005 committee meeting minutes were approved as submitted.

**Student Technology Fee Proposal Procedures:** Prior to the meeting, the committee was presented documentation to review, including:

1) Corporate Memory from the FY2006 STF Committee
2) FY2007 Student Technology Fee Call for Proposals
3) FY2007 Stage 1 Proposal Form for IS&T
4) FY2007 Stage 1 Proposal Form for CBSAC and Planning & Facilities
5) FY2007 Stage 2 Final Proposal for the Use of Technology Fees
6) Dean / VP Transmittal Sheet

Dr. Pan’s Corporate Memory listed the recommendations made by the FY2006 Student Technology Fee Subcommittee (STFS) to the FY2007 STFS. The Committee discussed each topic listed in the Corporate Memory and reviewed the proposal forms.

IS&T will continue to work with the STFS to provide standard pricing for laptops, tablets, and PDAs. J. L. noted that a Volume Purchase Agreement (VPA) with Dell has been initiated, saving approximately 17% over standard cost. The window to take advantage of the VPA will open about the first of June, 2006. Dr. Pan suggested taking account of the 17% discount when planning your budget, if you want to take advantage of the VPA. Amy has initiated some VPAs for software; however, it will be determined after the awards are made which volume purchases are needed.

David commented about funding for construction: one of the issues they struggle with is identifying the non-technology fee prerequisite funding. Tom said there are basically two kinds of construction proposals: (1) Proposal based on non-student technology fee funding, without which it will not go forward, (2) Proposals that are not based on non-student technology fee funding. Since Board of Regents guidelines (Attachment 1, #8) states that “In almost no cases should technology fee revenues be used for administrative software or software implementation (such as BANNER), administrative hardware, research equipment, non-networkable specialized scientific equipment, space renovation, or other items or activities that do not have a direct and immediate impact upon students instructional objectives”, David suggested adding the rationale for construction costs if renovations are being requested.

Susan Easterbrooks suggested that a statement be added to indicate that the proposer has made an effort to ensure that the proposal is compliant with ADA requirements. This is not to impede awarding funds, but to show that the University is making an effort to meet ADA requirements at multiple levels. Tom suggested that Facilities could validate on their Stage 1 Proposal form that ADA compliance had been checked and verified. Susan said this is more an awareness issue than compliance.
With regards to **Issues with Requests to Replace Equipment** (Corporate Memory, page 2), David pointed out that the FY2006 STFS members recommended that the 2005-2006 ISAT Committee began evaluating the strategy for replacing equipment and to ensure that proposals are aligned with the University Strategic long-term goal of enhancing access to information technology resources by major expansions to the campus wireless network system. Some requestors are still not recognizing that money invested in wired-technology may be ill-spent.

Tom commented that a time-table for going wireless has not been discussed so people are still buying hard-wired equipment. J. L. said that the strategic direction and goal for the University is wireless; however, offering wireless pre-supposes that we have the network infrastructure to provision those services. This is an issue beyond the purview of the STFS. Tom said that more and more students have their own computers. He asked if the Registrar’s office could gather data from students to determine the percentage who have computers or computer access.

**Funding Staff and GRA Positions:** Discussed continuing the use of Student Technology Fees for funding staff and GRA positions. Tom said that they have asked the Provost for a plan to transition these positions in the past but it has not yet been presented. Tom recommended sending another query to the Provost for his phase-out plan. He suggested providing rationale for on-going positions, limiting the number of years of support for current staff/GRAs, and no funding for new positions in the spirit of interpreting Board of Regents guidelines. Also, suggestion was made to add that hourly work-study students are preferred and to justify requesting a GRA instead of an undergraduate student assistant. Susan Laury would like to see more clarity with reference to funding for GRAs as opposed to student assistants. Susan L. suggested revisiting these important issues at a later date and to return to the Student Technology Fee Proposal Procedures agenda item.

David questioned whether or not physical security is an appropriate use of Student Technology Fees. He also suggested adding a rationale for Consultant/Contractor proposals. These issues will be addressed; see pg. 3: