The Student Technology Fee Subcommittee has completed its review of proposals for the FY 2005 Student Technology Fee (STF) funds.

Eighty-two proposals were submitted, requesting a total of $6,834,880 for FY 2005. 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 January 20, 2004 for FY 2005 STF funds necessary to continue in FY 2005 staffing positions that were funded by FY 2004 STF funds but could not be moved to other revenue sources, as recommended by the FY 2004 STFS, in FY 2005
given the state budget situation. This request for pre-award, off the top funding, totaling $586,715, was for the staffing and related supplies for the Digital Aquarium, the staffing and related supplies for the Alpharetta Campus classroom and computer lab, and for the staffing and fees for license and maintenance of Student E-mail System. Overall, the subcommittee considered a pre-award request and proposals that seek $7,421,595 in FY 2005.

The subcommittee recommends that 57 of these 82 FY 2005 proposals be funded, at least in part. Additionally, at its February 19, 2004, organizational meeting, the subcommittee voted funds, totaling $586,715, for the pre-award request. In voting in the Provost’s request for pre-award off the top funding for the staff positions, however, the FY 2005 STFS requests that next year the Provost provide a written plan for moving these staff positions out of the STF along with any request for pre-award, off the top funding for staff positions and related supplies.

The Call for Proposals for FY 2005 STF awards is reproduced below, as Appendix C. This document provides criteria used by the subcommittee to evaluate proposals. The Stage 1 proposals (called “Pre-proposals” in FY 2004) were reviewed by UCCS (IS&T) and Facilities. The subcommittee found the information in the Stage 1 was important to its considerations and speeded its deliberations. Important issues related to pre-proposals appear later in this report.

A list of subcommittee members is included as Appendix B. The subcommittee met four times, for a total of 22.5 hours. The procedure by which the subcommittee evaluated proposals was similar to the procedure used by the FY 2004 STFS. Each proposal was placed into one of three categories: “Category 1” proposals are accorded the highest funding priority; “Category 2” proposals are deemed worthy of support as funds are available; and “Category 3” proposals are not recommended for funding at this time. An abbreviated spreadsheet (a Microsoft Excel document) is attached as Appendix A that shows the category into which each proposal was placed. It also shows the amount of the final recommended funding, if any, for each proposal. There are 57 proposals in Category 1. As the spreadsheet shows, the subcommittee recommends partial funding for many proposals (see the “Comments” column in the spreadsheet and in Appendix A). Also, during the course of its deliberations, the subcommittee voted to hold harmless from further cuts four of the 57 proposals receiving some funding. The four hold harmless proposals are: 1.1.4, 1.2.2, 1.3.2, and 1.3.3.

According to current projections, FY 2005 Student Technology Fee (STF) revenues will total at least $4,500,000. The pre-award funding of $586,715 and the administrative costs of $4,500 reduce this total projected STF revenue to $3,908,785. The STFS voted to apply $50,000 of the rollover FY 2004 sweep in-hand to FY 2005 proposals, making the total projected FY 2005 STF revenue $3,958,785. The proposals that the subcommittee placed in Category 1 exceeded the total projected STF revenues by $19,102, which is approximately 0.5% of the total recommended award to the 53 proposals in Category 1 that are not held harmless. The subcommittee felt that this over-budget amount posed low risk to next year’s process and was acceptable.
The FY 2004 STFS recommended that excess Technology Fees be allocated to FY 2004 proposal 1.3.6 to be used to extend wireless access to as much of the campus as possible. On September 16, 2003, $100,000 in excess fees was distributed to the FY 2004 1.3.6 proposal. On February 19, 2004 the FY 2005 STFS voted an additional $100,000 from the STF sweep to the FY 2004 1.3.6 proposal. With these funds, UCCS (IS&T) took on the costs of the wireless components of FY 2005 proposals 2.1.1, 2.1.6, 2.1.8, 2.1.15, 2.2.3, 2.3.9, and 2.4.1. In turn, this gave more flexibility to the FY 2005 subcommittee in developing its funding recommendations.

Midway through the subcommittee’s deliberations, the subcommittee learned that the cost of the “standard PC” was reduced from $1,600 to $1,406. This allowed PC costs to be correspondingly reduced on proposals 2.1.2, 2.1.3, 2.1.7, 2.1.9, 2.1.10, 2.1.11, 2.1.14, 2.1.19, 2.2.1, 2.3.3, 2.3.8, 2.6.2, 2.6.3, 1.1.2, 1.1.6, and 1.4.2.

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>$1,472,268</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>$1,082,105</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education</td>
<td>$181,389</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson College of Business</td>
<td>$635,925</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Health and Human Sciences</td>
<td>$180,435</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Young School of Policy Studies</td>
<td>$28,500</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Law</td>
<td>$272,329</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pullen Library</td>
<td>$51,288</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Services</td>
<td>$3,148</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>$70,500</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,997,887</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The subcommittee recommended $2,578,802 (65% of the total) for proposals submitted by colleges and schools. The table below shows the distribution of Category 1 funds recommended for colleges and schools.
As the Student Technology Fee Subcommittee ends its fifth year and looks forward to its sixth year in FY 2006, the subcommittee recommends that the FY 2006 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 2004 and FY 2005 STF Subcommittees. The FY 2005 subcommittee believes this information will help it better keep track of which units have enjoyed Technology Fee funding in previous years. The FY 2005 subcommittee also 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 2006.

The members of the FY 2005 STFS reacted particularly strongly to the following issues.

**Adherence to the Stage 1 and Stage 2 Proposal Process**

The AY 2003-2004 Senate IS&T Committee noted that the FY 2004 STFS had encountered 11 proposals in which there was no pre-proposal. As a remedy, in fall, 2003, the IS&T Committee renamed the pre-proposal and final proposal the Stage 1 proposal and the Stage 2 proposal, respectively, to better integrate them into a single proposal process. The FY 2005 STFS voted in its organizational meeting on February 19, 2004, not to accept any Stage 2 proposal without two reviewed Stage 1 proposals (one Stage 1 proposals is reviewed by UCCS (IS&T) and the other is reviewed by Facilities). No FY 2005 Stage 2 proposal was submitted without its Stage 1 proposals, a definite improvement over FY 2004.

The FY 2005 STFS found that the information on the Stage 1 proposals facilitated its funding recommendation deliberations. There was some confusion over deadlines by which the reviewing organizations will return Stage 1 proposals. The FY 2005 STFS recommends that the AY 2004-2005 Senate IS&T Committee work with IS&T to further...
clarify the wording in the FY 2006 Call for Proposals concerning deadlines by which the reviewing organizations will return Stage 1 proposals, depending upon the date that Stage 1 proposals are submitted to the reviewers.

The FY 2005 STFS noted another problem with the Stage 1 and Stage 2 proposals that, if corrected, could add value to the proposal process. Some networked equipment and facilities items on the Stage 2 proposals were inconsistent with the Stage 1 proposals. The subcommittee recommends that the AY 2004-2005 Senate IS&T Committee develop wording for the Stage 2 proposals that strengthens the correspondence between the Stage 2 budget items and the Stage 1 proposal. Equipment that needs to be on the university network and construction should not appear in Stage 2 budget lines unless the equipment and construction underwent the Stage 1 proposal review process by UCCS and Facilities, respectively.

Many proposals requested the same software packages. The FY 2005 subcommittee also suggests that proposed software purchases 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.

Finally, the FY 2005 subcommittee frequently found it difficult to correlate the explanations in the Stage 2 proposals with the spreadsheet lines. Some of the proposals lumped items together, making it unclear exactly was to be purchased. Other proposals used different terminology in the spreadsheet lines than they did in the text of the Stage 2 proposals. The subcommittee recommends that the AY 2004-2005 Senate IS&T Committee add instructions to the spreadsheets: (1) to separate line items in the spreadsheets to coincide with the explanations of different functionality given in the text of the proposal; and (2) to use the same terminology in the spreadsheet lines as in the explanations in the text of the proposal.

**Funding Staff and Graduate Student Assistant Positions**

Of the $4,564,602 recommended in pre-award funding and in Category 1, $285,448 (6.25%) would pay for staff positions (salaries and fringe) and approximately $66,500 (1.4%) for graduate student assistants. (These allocations for graduate student assistants could change in the final budgets of the awardees.) In their reports, the FY 2002, FY 2003, and FY 2004 STF Subcommittees strongly recommended that the university work to minimize the use of Technology Fees to support staff positions. The FY 2005 STF Subcommittee also warns that this use of Technology Fees reduces the innovative application of technology to student instruction and research acts to decrease the chances that new, pioneering Student Technology Fee proposals will get adequate funding.

The AY 2003–2004 Senate IS&T Committee noted the rising objections of the STF Subcommittees and re-ordered the budget templates in the Stage 2 proposals by placing personnel lines last with a cautionary note. Laudably, the FY 2005 STFS approved no new staff positions to be paid from Technology Fees. However, members of the FY 2005 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 2005 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 2006.

The FY 2005 STFS further recommends that the AY 2004-2005 Senate IS&T Committee require that FY 2006 Stage 2 proposals that ignore the sentiments of prior STF Subcommittees and persist in requesting Technology Fee funding for graduate student assistants, be required to provide the hours worked by each graduate student assistant that is requested. Hours worked by each student assistant requested should also be included along with the standard justification that goes with all parts of the request.

Funding for Security

Seven proposals requested funds for security items, up from five in FY 2004. The subcommittee noted that funding requests for security was growing. As in the case of requests for funding personnel, funding requests for security reduces the innovative application of technology to student instruction and research and acts to decrease the chances that new, pioneering Student Technology Fee proposals will get adequate funding. The FY 2005 STFS recommends that a policy be developed that allows an allotment up to a cap for security. Proposal 2.1.14 was particularly heavy in funding for security and was recommended for partial funding due to the special circumstance of prior theft explained in the proposal.

Funding Student Printing

The appropriateness of continuing to use STF funds to subsidize a portion of student printing costs was discussed several times in FY 2005 STFS meetings. There was some sense that some level of funding should be continued because the funding had been started by an earlier committee. Some subcommittee members strongly expressed a sense that subsidizing student printing was appropriate because students were directly benefited from their fees. The sense of the majority was that the subsidy was only tangentially related to technology and should be curtailed to recommend adequate funding for innovative curriculum using technology and for technology required for program accreditation.

Re-using Computers

Many proposals involved replacing existing computers (PCs, laptops, workstations, etc.). In deliberating such proposals, the FY 2005 STFS found that it did not have information on if and how the replaced computers would be re-used. The subcommittee found it could recommend the re-use of existing computers for proposals 2.1.17 and 2.1.19. If there was a policy on re-use of machines replaced by the proposal process, that pool of equipment could be tapped for routine replacements. The FY 2005 STFS recommends that a policy be developed to address the re-use of computers replaced by the STF.
proposal process in meeting equipment requests in current STF proposals.

**Funding for Laptops, Tablets, and PDAs**

Eleven proposals in Category 1 request funds for laptops or tablets for various student uses. Also, three proposals requested funds for palm pilots for student use. The sentiment was expressed by the FY 2005 subcommittee that such proposals raise expectations that laptops, tablets, and PDAs will be provided by the university, rather than encouraging students to buy their own. The subcommittee recommends that the Senate IS&T Committee develop a policy specifying criteria and limits for the use of STF funds for these machines. A standard price for laptops, tablets, and PDAs should be established just as is provided for PCs. Accessories, such as carrying cases, memory cards, and wireless capabilities, should be specifically justified and broken out in the budget.

**Funding for Construction**

The FY 2005 subcommittee notes that 23 of the 82 proposals requested funds for construction or renovation, including air conditioning. The subcommittee recommends that the Senate IS&T Committee develop a policy specifying criteria and limits for the use of STF funds for construction or renovation.

**Summary**

The FY 2005 subcommittee notes that the Student Technology Fee support for graduate student assistantships increased this year. It was stated earlier in this report that of the $4,564,602 recommended in Category 1, $66,500 (1.4%) is for graduate assistants, a modest increase over FY 2004. The FY 2005 subcommittee was persuaded that these assistantship positions were necessary to support the projects. But, as the FY 2004 subcommittee cautioned, the FY 2005 subcommittee points out 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. Although staff funding was down this year over last year, both in dollar amount (down $83,913) and percentage (down 1.85 percentage points), there is still need for vigilant evaluation of personnel funding. After all, graduate student funding decreased last year (over the FY 2003 level), but increased this year. The FY 2005 subcommittee recommends that these 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 wise use of funds. It is important that requests for any personnel funding be well justified and not just added onto a proposal without explanation.