**Minutes**

In Attendance:

Chris Goode (Chair), Matthew Adjin-Tettey, Jacobus Boers, Amy Bruni, Brendan Calendra, Joyce Carroll, Kris Clark, S Floyd, Denise George, Krista Graham, Mark Graves, Glenn Harrison, Kevin Hsieh, Jidong Huang, Mo Ivory, Jeffrey Mahr, Robert Maxwell, Ewa McGrail, Martin Norgaard, John Redmond, Nancy Schafer, Anthony Serpico, Karen Simmons, Phil Ventimiglia, Pey-Shan Wen, Yongsheng Xu, Ying Zhu

**IIT REPORT**

Phil Ventimiglia addressed a question about intermittent issues surrounding single sign-on services, which appear to be resolved.

**HISTORY OF STUDENT TECHNOLOGY FEE ALLOCATIONS AND COMPETITIVE PROPOSAL REVIEW**

Chris Goode reviewed the mandatory fee structure of the Atlanta and Perimeter campuses, as well as the current allocation percentages and how they were originally determined in 2012. They were reviewed in 2019, compared with students served as well as credit hours (by their respective academic units) and left unchanged.

Excepting the IIT and Institutional Mandates funds, STF are awarded via a competitive proposal process. ALL STF expenditures including IIT and IM are reviewed and approved by review committees comprising at least 50% students.

The Senate Committee reviews these committees' recommendations in April, and then makes a recommendation to the Fiscal Advisory Committee to the President.

Chris then answered questions about the student technology fee review process:

- Discretionary funds at Perimeter campus are much smaller than on the Atlanta campus (2% vs. about 45%). One reason is software requirements for special programs, which would be covered by their Institutional Mandates fund. They also charge a lower fee.

- Those percentages likely predate consolidation, and some of the 98% goes toward shared Institutional Mandates. Review packets from FY2022 will go out with these minutes.

- How is the process related to unspent funds? Those unspent funds are likely to be left behind by funded academic unit proposals. In the past they cover outstanding costs like classroom equipment refreshes. We also have the option to return unspent funds to the
units that didn’t spend them, or back to be redistributed according to the allocations discussed above. We also discussed moving unspent funds to the innovation fund.

• Some awardees are still unaware their proposal was funded!

• Phil answered a question about Zoom licenses. Currently his office is reviewing how many licenses are purchased by academic and other units to see if cost savings can be achieved with a site license. No unit would pay more than they are currently paying if a site license is pursued.

• A suggestion was made to give unspent STF funds back to the unit that didn’t spend them. We still have a motion on the table from Krista Graham for those funds to be redistributed according to the allocations set forth in the estimates that went out to the review committees for FY22.

• A discussion ensued over how to communicate need for more technology funding to FACP, likely as a recommendation along with FY23 STF proposals/mandate recommendations in April, but Joyce Carroll cautioned that if there is a large amount of unspent funds, that recommendation might not be seen in the best light.

• Joyce then reminded everyone of the deadline for proposals of 2/4/2022.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,
Chris Goode