Date: April 28, 2006

To: Ron Henry
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    Roy Bahl  
    Faye Borthick  
    Mary Jane Casto  
    Carol Clark  
    Ron Colarusso  
    Bill Fritz  
    Charlene Hurt  
    Fenwick Huss  
    Steve Kaminshine  
    Carolyn Kee  
    Susan Kelley  
    Ralph Kahl  
    Tom Lewis  
    Fred Mote  
    Robin Morris  
    Karen Oates  
    Bill Paraska  
    Nancy Peterman  
    Bill Prigge  
    Jerry Rackliffe  
    Jim Rutledge  
    Hazel Scott  
    Rebecca Stout

From: Yi Pan

Re: Report of the FY 2007 Student Technology Fee Subcommittee (STFS)

The Student Technology Fee Subcommittee has completed its review of proposals for the FY 2007 Student Technology Fee (STF) funds.

Eighty-eight proposals were submitted, requesting a total of $7,144,159 for FY 2007. These proposals are available online, at http://www.gsu.edu/techfee. In addition, before beginning the award process, the STF subcommittee considered a request from Provost Ron Henry made on February 17, 2006 for FY 2007 STF funds necessary to continue in FY 2007 staffing positions that were funded by FY 2006 STF funds. That funding had not been moved to non-STF revenue sources in FY 2006, as recommended by the FY 2006 STFS, because of the FY 2006 budget situation. This request for pre-award, off-the-top funding, totaling $1,048,826, was for the staffing and related supplies for the Digital Aquarium, the staffing and related supplies for the Alpharetta Campus classroom
and computer lab, student printing infrastructure, student printing, Symantec Antivirus software license, Anti-Spam license, and for the staffing and fees for license and maintenance of Student E-mail System.

It is the FY 2007 STFS request that the Provost provide the university’s transition plan to the FY 2008 STFS to move the pre-award requests into non-STF funding.

In voting to fund the Provost’s request for pre-award off-the-top funding for the staff positions, however, the FY 2007 STFS strongly recommends to the AY 2006-2007 Senate ISAT Committee and to IS&T that IS&T prepare itemizations, equivalent in detail to the 100% spreadsheet found in the Stage 2 form, for each of the pre-award requests the Provost makes to the FY 2008 STFS. The itemized requests should be prepared in time to be distributed with the call for the organizational meeting of the FY 2008 STFS. These itemizations of the Provost’s pre-award requests will provide the subcommittee with Stage 2-level information about the non-staff funding components that are part of the Provost’s pre-award, off-the-top requests. The FY 2007 STFS felt it needed this itemized breakdown when considering not only the Provost’s requests but also when it considered FY 2007 Stage 2 proposals from IS&T that had possible overlaps with the Provost’s requests.

The Call for Proposals for FY 2007 STF awards is reproduced below, as Appendix C. This document provides criteria used by the subcommittee to evaluate proposals. The Stage 1 proposals were reviewed by Facilities and UCCS (IS&T). The subcommittee found the information resulting from the Stage 1 proposals was important to its considerations and speeded its deliberations. Issues related to pre-proposals appear later in this report.

A list of subcommittee members is included as Appendix B. The subcommittee met three times, for a total of 18 hours. The procedure by which the subcommittee evaluated proposals was exactly the same as the procedure used by the FY 2006 STFS.

According to current projections, FY 2007 STF revenues will be $5,068,840. The rollover from FY 2006 is $400,000. The FY 2007 STFS voted that the FY 2007 pre-award request for wireless expansion be fully funded at $390,000. The pre-award funding of $1,048,826 and the administrative costs of $4,500 reduce the total projected STF revenue to $4,294,640. A spreadsheet (a Microsoft Excel document) is attached as Appendix A that shows the category into which each proposal was voted. It also shows the amount of the final recommended funding, if any, for each proposal. As the spreadsheet shows, the subcommittee recommends at least partial funding for the 69 proposals in Category 1 (see the “Comments” column in the spreadsheet in Appendix A). The subcommittee recommends these 69 proposals receive a total of $4,425,433. The committee has over-allocated $130,793 of the budget (about 3% of the total awarded) to the FY 2007 proposals. The committee plans to make the money up from the FY 2006 remaining balance as well as from the swept funds in FY 2007. Since, the total funds from the FY 2006 sweep are currently around $400,000, the committee believes that the over-allocation can be remedied.
The cost of certain “standard priced equipment” (see Stage 2 proposal form, p.7) dropped in the time from the publication of the Stage 2 form to the subcommittee meetings. The “standard reductions” are: Standard PC (Dell Optiplex) $238, Standard Laptop (Dell Latitude) $124, Apple Macintosh desktop (iMac) $22, Apple Macintosh laptop (iBook) $45, and Tablet computer (Gateway) $199. The FY 2007 STFS voted to use these left-over monies to fully fund awards 1.2.3 and 1.3.2, both awards are for new PCs in the open-access labs and classrooms and in the University Library respectfully.

The following table shows the distribution of Category 1 funding by Georgia State unit:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Funds in Category 1</th>
<th>Percentage of Category 1 Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems and Technology</td>
<td>$ 1,783,809</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>$ 1,295,048</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education</td>
<td>$ 170,110</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson College of Business</td>
<td>$ 653,180</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Health and Human Sciences</td>
<td>$ 154,210</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Young School of Policy Studies</td>
<td>$ 21,397</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Law</td>
<td>$ 195,263</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Library</td>
<td>$ 145,881</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>$ 6,535</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,425,433</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The subcommittee recommended $2,489,208 (56.2% of the total) for proposals submitted by colleges and schools. The table below shows the distribution of those Category 1 funds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Funds in Category 1</th>
<th>Percentage of Category 1 for Academic Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>$ 1,295,048</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education</td>
<td>$ 170,110</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson College of Business</td>
<td>$ 653,180</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Health &amp; Human Sciences</td>
<td>$ 154,210</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Young School of Policy Studies</td>
<td>$ 21,397</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Law</td>
<td>$ 195,263</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,489,208</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As the Student Technology Fee Subcommittee ends its seventh year and looks forward to its eighth year in FY 2008, the subcommittee recommends that the FY 2008 subcommittee be issued a summary sheet that will show allocations of Technology Fees by department (in addition to major unit) across all the previous years of Technology Fee awards. Such a summary sheet was issued to the FY 2005, FY 2006, and FY 2007 STF Subcommittees. The FY 2007 subcommittee believes this information is useful as a general framework for reviewing past awards. The FY 2007 subcommittee further recommends that the Senate IS&T Committee prepare a summary to provide a corporate memory of this year’s operations and recommendations and attach it to the Call for Proposals for FY 2008.

The members of the FY 2007 STFS reacted particularly strongly to the following issues:

Adherence to the Stage 1 and Stage 2 Proposal Process

Like the FY 2006 STFS, the FY 2007 STFS voted in its organizational meeting on February 24, 2006, not to consider any Stage 2 proposal without both Stage 1 proposals and reviews (one Stage 1 proposal is reviewed by UCCS (IS&T) and the other is reviewed by Facilities). One positive note - no FY 2007 proposals were missing a Stage 1 review.

Like the FY 2006 STFS, the FY 2007 STFS found that the information on the Stage 1 proposals provided needed information that facilitated its considerations. The FY 2007 STFS, like the previous three subcommittees, most strongly recommends that the AY 2006-2007 Senate IS&T Committee continue the Stage 1 proposals and work with IS&T and Facilities to continue to integrate the Stage 1 proposals with their Stage 2 proposal into a unified proposal process.

The FY 2007 STFS recommends that the AY 2006-2007 Senate IS&T Committee work with IS&T and Facilities to continue refining and clarifying the wording and formatting of the Stage 1 proposals.

The FY 2006 subcommittee encountered proposals that lumped items together, making it unclear exactly what was to be purchased, or used different terminology in the spreadsheet lines than they did in the text of the Stage 2 proposals. The AY 2005-2006 Senate IS&T Committee worked with IS&T and added instructions for the spreadsheets to remedy these problems:

1) “You must use the same terminology as in the Project Description (page 2, #4) to allow each itemized line 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.”

2) “Itemize and total the following categories of expense. If necessary, add lines to the table below corresponding to accounting objects of expense.”

These instructions produced some overall added clarity in the completed spreadsheets, but the FY 2007 subcommittee nevertheless encountered ambiguous proposals that did
not provide requested information, such as quantities and unit prices, that did not itemize breakdowns to allow traceability of the items back to the functionality in the project description.

The FY 2007 STFS again strongly recommends that the AY 2006-2007 Senate ISAT Committee continue to work with IS&T and Facilities to develop instructions that significantly explicate and strengthen the warning, “Failure to do so will negatively affect consideration of your proposal,” which was placed in the Stage 2 proposal form this year. The FY 2007 STFS recommends that the AY 2006-2007 Senate ISAT Committee work further on the wording of the warning on the Stage 2 proposal form to sharpen the consequences of failing to link clearly and explicitly the itemizations on the Stage 2 spreadsheets to the Stage 2 project descriptions.

Funding for Construction

The FY 2006 subcommittee recommended that the AY 2005-2006 Senate ISAT Committee develop a policy specifying criteria and limits for the use of STF funds for construction or renovation. The AY 2005-2006 Senate ISAT Committee worked with IS&T to group costs on the Stage 2 spreadsheets for construction, networking, physical security, and other related expenses under a cautionary heading containing a statement quoted from the Board of Regents Guidelines, which says: “In almost no cases should 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.” The FY 2007 STFS did not encounter as many difficulties with proposals in these areas as in the past. However, construction did become an issue for the subcommittee for proposals that requested construction but did not itemize construction costs as stipulated. The FY 2007 STFS recommends that the AY 2006-2007 Senate ISAT Committee work on the wording of the instruction “Itemize and total the following categories of expense” for each of the spreadsheets in the Stage 2 proposal form to stipulate the itemizations needed for construction costs and to add clear consequences of failing to itemize requested construction costs.

Leveraging High Volume Software Purchases

Many proposals requested the same software packages. The FY 2007 STFS recommends that proposed software purchases continue to be included in the Stage 1 proposal process to ensure university pricing is followed and to explore the possibilities for savings through bulk-purchase or a university-wide site license. The subcommittee further recommends that IS&T contact each awardee, who made requests for software, to obtain firm licensing quantities in order to pursue volume discounts and/or site licenses.

Issues with Requests to Replace Equipment

The FY 2007 STFS members variously questioned several practices involving equipment replacement. The FY 2007 STFS recommends that the AY 2006-2007 Senate ISAT Committee start to work on evaluating the strategy for providing and replacing lab and
classroom computers, prioritizing the acquisition of stationary and portable computing devices and transitioning to a wireless environment, while maintaining consistency with the Campus Master Plan. The subcommittee recognizes that a balanced workable strategy may take time to define and implement, but it is in everyone’s interests to begin discussions on this strategic issue.

**Funding Staff and Graduate Student Assistant Positions**

Of the $4,425,433 recommended in pre-award funding and in Category 1, $300,068 (6.8%) pays for existing staff positions (salaries and fringe). In their reports, the FY 2003, FY 2004, FY 2005, and FY 2006 STF Subcommittees strongly recommended that the university work to reduce and minimize the use of Student Technology Fees to support staff positions. This year again new staff support appeared in a proposal, which the subcommittee resisted. The FY 2007 STFS joins with its predecessors in warning that using Student Technology Fees to support staff positions reduces the innovative application of technology to student instruction and student research and acts to decrease the chances that new, pioneering Student Technology Fee proposals will get adequate funding. Funding for personnel also does little to make permanent infrastructural improvements to the campus computing system.

Laudably, the FY 2007 STFS approved no new staff positions to be paid from Student Technology Fees. However, members of the FY 2007 subcommittee did vote, with much reluctance, to recommend continuation of the funding of the staff positions committed to by prior STF Subcommittees and did recommend new graduate student assistant funding. Nevertheless the FY 2007 subcommittee, like its predecessors, strongly recommends that the university administration to make timely, effective plans to handle continuing staffing and support without STF funds starting with FY 2008. In this regard, it is also worth repeating that the FY 2007 STFS strongly recommends to the AY 2006-2007 Senate ISAT Committee and to IS&T that IS&T prepare itemizations, equivalent in detail to the 100% spreadsheet found in the Stage 2 form, of each of the pre-award requests the Provost makes to the FY 2008 STFS in time for the FY 2008 STFS organizational meeting. These itemizations of the Provost’s pre-award requests will provide the subcommittee with Stage 2 proposal-level information about the non-staff funding components that are part of the Provost’s pre-award, off-the-top requests. The FY 2007 STFS felt it needed this itemized breakdown not only when considering the Provost’s requests but also when it considered FY 2007 Stage 2 proposals that had possible overlaps with the Provost’s requests.

The FY 2007 STFS further recommends that the AY 2006-2007 Senate ISAT Committee continue to require that FY 2008 Stage 2 proposals ask for the hours worked by each student assistant and graduate student assistant that are requested. Hours worked by each student assistant and graduate student assistant requested should also continue to be included along with the standard justification that goes with all parts of the request.
Student Printing

The pre-funding request from Provost Henry for printing credit is $465,185. This request is contingent on Tech Fee increase. The figure is based on the assumption that each student can use at most $7.50 in printing and only half of the students will use the printing service. During the Tech Fee Organizational Meeting on February 24, 2006, we discussed and approved the pre-funding request. Hence, if the Tech Fee increase is approved, the printing credit will be restored this year.

During an ISAT meeting on March 23, 2006, Dominique Huff, Executive Vice President of the Student Government Association (SGA), along with Brant Barber of the SGA, presented a resolution approved by the SGA for “Reserving Funds for Print Credits.” The resolution stated that the SGA is in favor of the Provost mandating that student print credits be funded annually as a recurring expense to be classified as an on-going institutional student technology fee project. It also calls for a review every four years by the Mandatory Fee Committee to ensure that the service continues to be available to students. The ISAT Committee discussed the SGA resolution, and the motion “The Senate Information Technology Committee recommends to the Student Technology Subcommittee that the student printing subsidy be reinstated at the highest level previously funded” was made and approved by the ISAT Committee. This motion was honored by STF Subcommittee when the pre-funding request by the provost was discussed.

Due to the Board of Regents’ approval of only 40% of the requested tech fee increase, the printing credits were reduced to $186,074.

Re-using Computers

Many proposals involved replacing existing computers (PCs, laptops, workstations, etc.). The stewardship policy that is implemented establishes a “virtual inventory” – an itemized list of equipment proposed for replacement that the STFS could use to meet needs of proposals – through the proposal forms (see item #12 on the IS&T Stage 1 proposal form and Attachment 3 to the Stage 2 proposal form). The intent is that a proposal provides specified information about STF funded equipment to be replaced and the STFS can designate this equipment from the current “virtual inventory” to meet needs of other proposals. (See item #12 on the IS&T Stage 1 form for full details.) Equipment from this year’s “virtual inventory” was used to meet in part equipment requests by proposals 2.1.17, 2.1.18, 2.1.19, 2.1.20, 2.1.21, 2.1.22, 2.1.23, 2.3,13, and 2.6.8. Positive use of STF funded equipment now slated for replacement appears to be emerging, and the FY 2007 STFS recommends that the “virtual inventory” be continued.

Summary

Fortunately, staff funding from STF ($300,068) actually decreased for FY 2007 in dollar amount (down $10,196). The FY 2007 subcommittee notes that the Student Technology Fee support for graduate student assistantships decreased this year.
The FY 2007 subcommittee was persuaded that these assistantship positions were necessary to support the projects. But, as the its predecessors, the FY 2007 subcommittee cautions that graduate assistantship positions typically award tuition waivers, so there may be hidden costs to the university associated with the use of Student Technology Fee funds to create graduate student assistantships. Staff funding was down this year in dollar amount, but the need is still present for continued vigilant evaluation of personnel funding. The FY 2007 subcommittee recommends that personnel costs continue to be carefully and prudently considered by those who will submit Student Technology Fee proposals in the future. While funding staff positions is of great concern, funding student assistants, who can be let go at any time, and graduate students, who generally are promised only one semester, can be a wiser use of funds. It is important that requests for any personnel funding be well justified and not just added onto a proposal without explanation.