Overview:

Following the 14 June kickoff meeting for Phase II of the Financial Sustainability Task Force, the working group for property and infrastructure held seven weekly meetings from 21 June through 2 August, 2023. The group was initially co-chaired by a staff and faculty member – respectively Stefan Dodd and Sean C. Goodlett – but due to shifting responsibilities at the University, Stefan joined another working group, and, on 26, July J.D. Head, the Assoc. Vice President for Capital Planning and Maintenance, became the staff co-chair. The working group members also included Mary Beth McKenzie (*ex officio*, as the executive cabinet's representative), Bradley Cohrs, Mike Desmarais, Cheryl Johnston, Matthew Lechter, Michael Letziesen, Diane Lucas, Nirajan Mani, and Angela Marini. (Ms. Lucas resigned from the committee in mid-July.) MSCA did not appoint a third member for the summer work.

In our summer weekly meetings, the group carried out a multitude of tasks with an eye toward fulfilling the charge of "developing specific and actionable recommendations to realize cost savings, increase revenues, and achieve greater efficiencies" (memo from Dr. Lapidus, 14 June, 2023). We first reviewed the Phase II charge and expected summer outcomes and then revisited the eight relevant bullet points in the Phase I report (on pp. 19-20) and three consolidated bullet points proposed by the executive cabinet. Working group members were also encouraged to consult the 2007 Fitchburg State Master Plan, 2020-2025 strategic plan, 2022 NECHE self-study, and Worcester State's 2022 Phase I financial sustainability task force report. In the ensuing weeks, we assembled data on physical or built structures as well as lands owned, occupied, or leased, software contracts, and hardware refresh cycles. We then utilized this data to determine our fall-term priorities. In the end, the group focused heavily on existing built structures, believing that most savings and new revenues are to be achieved here, but we agreed to continue our review of lands for potential sale or future use, and we vowed to return to the software contracts and hardware refresh.

In late October, after the several bargaining units reconsidered membership, the working group reconvened. AFSCME named Ms. Alecia Campbell to replace Ms. Lucas, but MSCA still did not supply a third member to the working group and only belatedly asked for the working groups to recommence their deliberations. This meant, then, that the working group for property and infrastructure operated with only ten members from June through December. Moreover, because we did not reconvene until 25 October, the working group had less than two months to complete its Phase II work. With this ambitious timeline before us, the members agreed to separate into four subgroups that would meet upwards of twice a week to develop separate recommendations on discrete issues; the full working group, meanwhile, came together every other week (or 5 times) so that the entire membership could be apprised of the progress of each subgroup. The four subgroups treated (1) information technology software contracts and hardware refresh rates, as well as grant-funded equipment purchases (Cheryl Johnston, chair); (2) the repurposing of existing built structures and lands (Matthew Lechter, chair); (3) the sale of the same (J.D. Head, chair); and (4) a handful of what we termed "priority properties," including, of course, the Recreation Center and the so-called Theater Block, as well as properties we both rent and lease (Sean C. Goodlett, chair).

The upshot of our deliberations was the development of eight recommendations with the potential for hundreds of thousands of dollars in annual savings and possibly several times this in new revenues. Unfortunately, much more time would be needed to calculate one-time profits from property sales.

Working Group Priorities:

After a careful review of the Phase I recommendations and the consolidated recommendations by the Executive Cabinet, in August the group settled on three priorities:

- Review select software contracts and hardware refresh rates for usage, redundancy, and fiscal and financial implications. Hardware refresh rates should take into consideration the lifecycle efficiency of devices and how often the Technology department encounters repair needs and hardware deficiencies.
- Review the current portfolio of University properties (i.e., built structures and lands) for highest and best use and fiscal and financial implications. Our preliminary review turned up roughly a dozen built structures in addition to select lands that will be our particular focus; the built structures we will focus on include (in alphabetic, not ranked, order):
  - Conlon IA and FA
  - 66 Day Street
  - Herlihy Hall
  - 164-174 Highland
  - 1191 John Fitch Highway
  - 150 and 152 Main Street
  - Mara 6 and 7
  - 185 North Street
  - McKay A and B Wings
  - 0 Pearl Hill Road
  - The Recreation Center
  - The Service Center
  - The Theater Block
  - Weston Hall
- Develop an inclusive planning process that annually reviews the portfolio of built structures and lands and makes recommendations for development, renovation, and sale or lease; such recommendations should comport with any strategic plan, the institutional vision, and the University's mission.

Data/Information:

Above and beyond the preparatory reading in the 2007 Fitchburg State Master Plan, 2020-2025 strategic plan, 2022 NECHE self-study, and Worcester State's 2022 Phase I financial sustainability task force report, the working group for property and infrastructure assembled and examined a large amount of data. For the purposes of this report, we have split these data into two chunks. For information technology, we assembled data on and/or reviewed carefully all software contracts, hardware failure rates (by device type, with a specific emphasis on Apple products), and past and present hardware refresh cycles; because hardware purchased with grant monies represented a special fiscal and financial burden, a review of existing University grant-writing policies was also necessary.

For built properties and lands, the working group assembled separate building and land catalogues. For the built structures, these included information on ownership – whether, e.g., by the Division of Capital Asset Management and Maintenance (DCAMM), the Massachusetts State College Building Authority (MSCBA), the Fitchburg State Foundation or its Supporting Organization, or public or private leasing agencies – the number of finished stories, total finished and gross square footage, space function, years of original construction and renovation(s), as well as debt service, rent paid, and revenue acquired through leasing. This data we supplemented with so-called "comp" prices when investigating potential sales, deferred maintenance and potential renovation costs, as well as debt loads for structures we considered selling. Similarly, for lands, the catalogue included, once again, ownership, the total and "improved" versus "unimproved" acreage, the current use of any lands, and all debt service. In the case of at least one property – approximately 120 acres located in Lancaster, MA – we also investigated covenants and bequest stipulations that would limit the sale or use of the lands. When it came to proposed renovations of the Recreation Center and the Theater Block, the working group also consulted

the 2012 Fitness Center Study, Landry Arena Master Plan, and an overarching Recreational Facilities Plan (all authored by Symmes Maini and Mckee Associates) and the 2018 Theater Block Feasibility Study (by Webb Management Services). These latter documents were then used to determine the feasibility and costs of both renovation projects. Last, a subgroup investigating the repurposing of properties met weekly to conduct on-site visits to each property delineated in its charge; the aim was to gain a comprehensive understanding of current usage, assess existing conditions, and contemplate potential future uses for the several properties.

Recommendations, Rationales, and Implementation Strategies:

Again, because time was short, each of the four subgroups developed recommendations that were then discussed and put to a vote before the full working group for property and infrastructure. In every case, the recommendations received unanimous support; below are the eight recommendations (with accompanying votes) and their respective rationales, implementation strategies, and analyses of the importance of the recommendations to the University and the broader City and region:

1. **Create a University-wide "Software Request Review Committee" (SRRC) that meets throughout the year to review redundant software (Vote: 8:0:0).**

   Rationale: The committee's ongoing task will be to review new and old software contracts in order to minimize unnecessary expenses. The committee also aims to streamline the software request approval process and leverage existing software assets before considering new purchases. (The committee's proposed charter appears in Appendix A.)

   Implementation Strategy: Implementation begins as soon as Trustees review and approve the financial sustainability task force recommendations. The hope is for the review process to commence in the fiscal year 2025. Thus, the steps taken here include:
   - Review of the Software Request Review Committee Charter document by the Board of Trustees;
   - Review of the same by the MSCA bargaining unit leadership, who will then provide the name(s) of the nominee(s) to serve on committee;
   - Review of the same by leadership of the other bargaining units (APA and AFSCME) as appropriate; request for additional committee member nominees.

   Importance: The SRRC will achieve cost savings by identifying redundancy as well as leveraging existing software before purchasing new. No cost savings have been estimated, as the proposed work is prospective.

2. **Lengthen the MacBook refresh rate from every 3 years to 4 (Vote: 8:0:0).**

   Rationale: Given the low percentage of repairs observed over the last three years, adjusting the refresh rate for MacBooks from every 3 years to 4 will not significantly impair performance. MacBooks can reliably operate for an extended period. The revised refresh rate is expected to generate immediate and recurring savings.

   Implementation Strategy: Implementation would begin in fiscal year 2025. The only step to take here is to reorganize the refresh schedule, where the oldest devices would continue to be refreshed first, but then subdivide the total pool into four (as opposed to three) groups.

Importance: The estimated average annual savings are approximately $23,424. (This figure is based on current inventory and purchase price.) Altering the refresh rate, moreover, helps to offset the increased cost of choosing a MacBook instead of a Windows laptop. It will also assist with efficiency: the Help Desk will issue fewer MacBooks per year, and end users will be able to maintain their device for another year; after all, having a laptop refreshed can hinder an end user's efficiency and productivity until they get "settled" into their new device.

3. **Develop a practice of funding the refresh and replacement of relevant IT equipment within grant proposals. Additionally, consider the establishment of a revolving fund for such purposes (Vote 8:0:0).**

   Rationale: This recommendation aims to optimize software usage, reduce unnecessary expenses, and allocate resources efficiently when refreshing hardware, ensuring financial sustainability and technological advancement at the University.

   Implementation Strategy: The Grant Center will work internally and with grant writers to develop the practice of including language in future grant proposals for refreshing relevant IT equipment. (See Appendix B for a draft of the Technology Equipment Replacement Policy.)

   Importance: Establishing these practices ensures adequate funding for replacement of grant-funded IT equipment, creating opportunities for future savings. No cost savings have been estimated, as, once again, the proposed work is prospective.

4. **Repurpose all or parts of the following built structures to achieve cost savings, generate new revenues, and/or increase efficiencies: 185 North Street, 340 Highland Avenue, Herlihy Hall, Mara 6 and 7, and the Klondike Service Center (Vote: 8:0:0).**

   Rationale and Implementation Strategies (where possible): The various properties each have distinct potential for repurposing:

   A. *185 North Street:* This property presents a strong revenue-generating opportunity, particularly as potential housing options for faculty, staff, and graduate assistants or students. Based on an initial walk through of the building, the current configuration of six apartments allows for family rentals and/or individual bedroom rental opportunities. Costs of retrofitting these spaces and thus potential for revenue is unknown, given needed "behind-the-walls" maintenance and deferred maintenance due to underutilization in recent years. At full capacity, annual revenues are likely to top $100,000.

   B. *340 Highland Avenue:* As with the previous property, this stand-alone house presents a strong opportunity for revenue generation. Institutional Research has already begun the process of moving to Sanders; only a small renovation project is needed to prepare the house for occupancy by faculty or staff. Given the location in the main "propeller" of campus, moreover, it is critical that the building remain in good condition and kept as an asset.

C. *Herlihy Hall:* This structure is a prime candidate for repurposing to office space or other uses. This would entail moving the building from the Housing & Residential Services (MSCBA) portfolio and over to DCAMM. It would also require the settling of debts for any renovations on the structure, a process that will be complicated by the comingling of borrowed monies across multiple MSCBA properties. The following are two scenarios that we considered:

> *Plan A* – Creation of a daycare facility in one half of Herlihy Hall; Financial Services and Upward Bound Math & Science would remain in current occupied spaces.

> *Plan B* – Removal of all offices and equipment from the Service Center (Klondike) facility. CPM and Environmental Services staff would be dispersed between Herlihy and Dupont. At the same time Housing staff would move to Herlihy from Mara 8, which could be repurposed for furniture storage. Financial Services & Upward Bound would once again remain in Herlihy. Added considerations include:
> - o Potentially moving salt and sand sheds to Elliott Field. (This might not be necessary with the current management of grounds being provided by a vendor.)
> - o Utilization of 1st floor of Dupont by material management, while the top floor becomes Print Services.
> - o Relocating continuing education to Dupont or Herlihy depending on specific department needs and space utilization.

D. *Mara 6 and 7:* With only minor adjustments, these dormitories could represent significant revenue generating opportunities. Students are increasingly prioritizing "singles." As with Mara 1-5, upgrades here would include full-size beds and single-bedroom opportunities. It is important to note that Housing & Residential Services successfully occupied the other five Mara spaces, retaining sophomores, juniors, and seniors on campus as residential students. Thus, the proposed usage for these two spaces is a "Premium Single with Full-Size Bed," accommodating as many as 46 residents at annual rates of roughly $10,000 per room.

E. *Klondike Service Center:* Depending on the repositioning of offices and services elsewhere on campus, parts or all of this space represent significant opportunities for rental or even sale at market rates. At a minimum, the University will want to consider renting out the office space recently vacated by Financial Services. N.B.: Currently, the Klondike facility affords space to a wide variety of offices and functions, including Print Services, CPM (Academic Trades, Locksmith and Grounds), Materials Management, Environmental Health Services Hazardous Waste, and Universal/Electronic Waste; the facility also provides campus-wide storage and has one of the few loading docks.

Importance: Reexamining our usage of the above spaces is critical to achieving efficiencies and improving day-to-day operations. Some built structures are currently sitting vacant and/or underutilized. As we plan for the future, we should continue to search for revenue-generating opportunities, particularly when it comes to the vacant housing options; doing so could help us meet the affordable housing needs not just of students but faculty and staff. We also need to continue to think about space utilization and building for the needs of tomorrow. (On this latter, see under "future considerations," where we raise the prospect of a campus-wide "space

committee.") The working group members all felt that Herlihy Hall represents the strongest potential for rethinking space utilization.

5. **Engage with real estate consultants to advise on the value and explore the sale of 66 Day Street and the multifamily housing unit at 164-174 Highland Avenue (Vote: 9:0:0).**

   Rationale: 66 Day Street is a property owned by the Foundation Supporting Organization and was purchased for $50,000 dollars. The building is not habitable at this time. Currently this property is not earmarked for any specific long-range purpose. Similarly, the 164-174 Highland Avenue structure is owned by the Foundation Supporting Organization. It was purchased at a total cost of $559,800, with 164-168 Highland costing $389,900 and 174 Highland $169,900. Both the Day Street and Highland properties would require significant capital investments to make them functional. One estimate for the Highland structure places the costs at $7 million or more. When considering the sale of these properties, one should bear in mind that comparable properties sold in the past year at an average price-per-square-foot of $98.51: see, for example, 119-121 Day Street, 4-12 Holt Street, and 15-25 Lunenburg Street. These two properties could best be described as commercial/residential apartments and are currently in livable condition. N.B.: "Comps" are not exact matches, and our properties are not livable in their current state.

   Implementation Strategy: The committee recommends that stakeholders research and identify a reputable and experienced real estate consultant with a proven track record in property valuation and sales. Once selected, a preliminary meeting should be scheduled to discuss the objectives and expectations for the specific properties in question. Clear communication of the property's unique features, recent improvements, and any relevant market trends will enhance the consultant's understanding of the assets. Collaboratively setting realistic goals and timelines for the valuation process is essential to align expectations. Providing comprehensive access to relevant data, such as property documentation, recent appraisals, and financial records, will enable the consultant to conduct a thorough assessment. Regular check-ins and open lines of communication should be established throughout the valuation process to address any emerging issues or considerations.

   Importance: The evaluation and potential sale of properties at 66 Day Street and 164-174 Highland Avenue carry significant importance for the university's financial landscape. The divestiture of these structures has the potential to alleviate some of the University's (Supporting Organization) debt burden.

6. **Renovate the existing Recreation Center on North Street, refurbishing the pool, locker rooms, racquetball courts, classrooms, and recreational exercise facilities (Vote: 7:0:0).**

   Rationale: Despite the completion of construction in only 2000, the Recreation Center requires extensive renovations. In fiscal year 2020, based upon usage statistics and cost, the president made the decision to close the facility's swimming pool. This has left a literal hole in a large part of the building. Prior to the 2018 renovations (costing $4.2 million) at the Landry Arena, which now houses a strength-and-conditioning center and an indoor fieldhouse for our student athletes, the University had conceived of placing some facilities (e.g., the strength-and-conditioning center) within the existing footprint of the Rec. Center where the empty pool now sits. To that end, in late 2012, the University hired the architectural firm, Symmes Maini & McKee Associates, to create conceptual drawings of several options for renovating the pool

space, the locker rooms, as well as the second-floor recreational exercise facilities, racquetball courts, and classroom spaces. In terms of design, the project is as advanced as the so-called theater block.

Implementation Strategy: The architects' preferred option for renovations would increase and improve recreational fitness spaces, increase the visibility of athletic and wellness activity, improve the image of the Center and its relationship to the campus, as well as enhance the overall student experience. At present, the University has no other revenue streams for the renovation of the Recreation Center than borrowing. The original cost estimates fell between $5.5 and 6.5 million; assuming a 6% annual rise in construction costs since, these figures would now approach somewhere between $11 and $13 million. (Market rate for borrowing costs are currently ~$85,000 of debt service for each $1 million if borrowed over 20 years or $75,000 for each $1 million borrowed over 30 years.) The original 1997 note for $6 million will be retired in the fiscal year 2024, and a second note (from 2019) to cover the cost of roof repair that ran $1.1 million has an anticipated retirement date of 2039, although we have deferred payments on this loan due to Covid and other reasons, so the payout may be extended. Of course, with the construction of the strength-and-conditioning area and fieldhouse space in Landry, the renovation of the Recreation Center could be scaled back considerably, with accompanying cost savings. We might also reexamine how the campus utilizes Recreation Center space and alter the designs accordingly.

Importance: Students and parents "shop" for first-rate recreational facilities. A strong potential for a renovated Recreation Center to attract new students, in short, exists. It is also well established through national data that students who take part in recreational programming on campus report higher GPAs, are more likely to remain a student on that campus, and report greater benefits to their psychosocial health ([NIRSA Recreation & Wellness Benchmark Survey](#), Spring 2019). Our Recreation Center, moreover, lies in the original "propeller blade" of the main campus (an area designated in the 2007 Master Plan that runs along North Street and Highland Avenue, where the Hammond Building forms the center of the "propeller.") Given the goals identified by Symmes Maini & McKee and the retirement of most of the debt on this facility, as well as the prominence of the building in our gateway (North Street) entrance, the University must consider this project a priority. It is also the case that renovating the Recreation Center will cost half what a standalone "black box" is predicted to cost, with possibly similar amounts of borrowing.

7. **Construct the proposed "black box" theater within the existing footprint of the original 1910 theater (Vote 7:0:0).**

Rationale: The University has a tremendous sunk cost in the so-called Theater Block project, not just in dollars, but also in public pronouncements. Since 2015, expenditures for property acquisitions and renovations on this project have totaled nearly $9 million. The main theater and storefront properties were acquired for $350,000 in 2016. In the first phase of renovations, we built out the IdeaLAB and game studio above the storefront properties at a cost of $3.8 million, and in subsequent years we conducted stabilization and infrastructure repairs on the main theater and adjacent properties at a cost of $2.2 and $2.4 million, respectively. In 2019, the University acquired the former Fidelity Bank building at 675 Main Street, at the corner of Grove Street; at the time, it had an assessed value of $616,000. At the opposite end of the block, the University acquired a property, on which a proposed parking deck is scheduled to be built,

and this land came with a nearly $500,000 liability due to environmental cleanup needs. In the end, bringing to fruition the existing conceptual plans to construct what is being called the TheaterLAB (also known as the "black box" theater) and to renovate the main theater (originally built in 1910) will cost somewhere in the range of $75 million at current market rates: the cost for a standalone "black box" is roughly $23 million, whereas the main theater is currently projected to cost $52 million. However, siting the "black box" within the footprint of the original theater has the potential to save tens of millions of dollars.

Implementation Strategy: In the case of the "black box" theater, the University has a variety of potential revenue streams to cover the cost. For instance, we have an earmark in the Massachusetts state budget for $3 million (see the press announcement [here](#)), which must be expended by the end of calendar year 2024. Along the same lines, the federal government has awarded the project a $2 million grant that expires on a similar timeline ([here](#)), and the National Endowment for the Humanities has awarded us $750,000 with a 4:1 fundraising match requirement; these NEH funds must be expended fully by July, 2027. Furthermore, in its 2022 estimates for revenue sources, the University has anticipated fundraising at least $5 million dollars, even as, depending on the presence of state and federal monies, the University might have to borrow as much as $10 million or more to bring a standalone "black box" project to completion. (Borrowing costs would be the same here as stipulated above for the Rec. Center.) The revenue sources for the main theater project are as yet inchoate, and accordingly realization of the larger project is many years away. Whether we wish to pursue a standalone "black box" theater or one situated within the footprint of the 1910 theater, the timeline to act is short. We would need to move beyond the design development drawings to full construction drawings early in fiscal year 2025.

Importance: Given the high-profile nature of the University's commitments to revitalizing downtown, the $9 million in expenditures already made on Main Street properties, as well as the presence of nearly $6 million in one-time monies from the Commonwealth and the federal government, it is hard to conceive of our not carrying out at least the construction of the "black box" theater within the footprint of the larger (1910) theater. Conversely, leaving this project unfinished and returning the state and federal monies could significantly damage the University's reputation and town/gown relations.

8. **Consider ending the leases of 150 and 152 Main Street (Vote: 7:0:0).**

Rationale: With the repurposing of Herlihy Hall and other built structures, a significant potential exists to relocate both the Center for Professional Studies (CPS) and the Crocker Center and end the leases at the Montachusett Regional Transit Authority (MART) "intermodal" station.

Implementation Strategy: Investigate the possibility of relocating both offices either to Herlihy Hall or another built structure within the "propeller" of North Street and Highland Avenue.

Importance: While the combined leases for the CPS and Crocker Center total just $38,000 per annum, relocating their offices to the main campus would not only achieve modest savings, but raise the profile of both Centers, and it has the potential to improve town/gown relations by bringing more visitors to campus.

Future Considerations: [unfinished]

The working group for property and infrastructure had a variety of items that it deliberated on but ultimately deferred to a later discussion. Among these are the following:

- *An inclusive planning process that reviews on an annual basis the portfolio of built structures and lands and makes recommendations for development, renovation, and sale or lease.* Most campuses have so-called "space committees" that bring together all stakeholders. At Fitchburg State, opportunities for input on the use or repurposing of space are rare at best. Again, such space usage recommendations should comport with any strategic plan, the institutional vision, and the University's mission.
- *The addition of a dollar threshold to the Software Request Review Committee Charter.* In its discussions, the working group did not have time to establish such a threshold, but we believe one is necessary, as smaller grants will have little impact on overall technology purchases.
- *An evaluation of the vacant properties at 1191 John Fitch Highway and 0 Pearl Hill Road for possible repurposing or sale.* The first of these lands currently consists of approximately 12 acres of undeveloped land owned by DCAMM. It is wooded, on a fairly steep grade, and a portion of the property is bisected by a perennial brook. The 0 Pearl Hill Road property consists of approximately 41 acres and is also owned by DCAMM. The property is forested with some variable sloping grades, and is accessible by two 20 ft wide swaths or paths off of Pearl Hill Road. These properties have value beyond their assessed cash value: both are large carbon sinks (with the carbon sequestered in forested spaces) and undisturbed, and as such they contribute significantly to environmental sustainability. Importantly, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is expected to begin to hold public entities responsible for their carbon levels. Retaining these properties as offsets could therefore be very valuable to the University in the near future, while retention of forested spaces presents a unique strategic value. Holding onto these forested lands not only aligns with ecological responsibility, but also provides the University with long-term value and flexibility, tapping into the growing importance of sustainable practices in land management. Balancing the financial gains from property sales with the environmental benefits of retaining forested areas is essential in crafting a holistic strategy that aligns with the sustainability goals of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts as described in Executive Order 590 as well as 815 CMR 6.00.

<div align="center">

Appendix A

Software Request Review Committee Charter

</div>

1. Purpose:

The Software Request Review Committee (SRRC) is established to ensure the efficient and effective evaluation, prioritization, and decision-making process for all software requests within Fitchburg State University. The SRRC's primary purpose is to assess the value, feasibility, and alignment of software request, including software as service requests, with the organization's goals, policies, and resources.

2. Scope:

The SRRC is responsible for reviewing all requests for new software, software upgrades, and software integrations submitted by Fitchburg State University departments or individuals.

3. Responsibilities:

The SRRC shall have the following responsibilities:

a. Evaluate software requests based on their alignment with the organization's strategic goals, security and compliance requirements, and available resources (Financial, Training, Technical Support)

b. Define the specific learning objectives and outcomes to be achieved by integrating software into the curriculum. (This should be provided by requestor.)

c. Assess the technical feasibility of software requests, including compatibility with existing systems and infrastructure.

d. Evaluate the availability of the necessary infrastructure, such as computer labs, electrical/power, devices, and internet connectivity. Ensure that students and instructors have access to the required technology. Determine if the software license terms are being violated in any way (i.e. installing software in a VDI lab w/access from off campus - does the license agreement allow this?)

e. Review the budgetary implications of software requests and make recommendations to the finance department.

f. Communicate decisions to requestors, along with explanations and next steps.

g. Monitor the implementation and progress of approved software requests.

4. Committee Composition:

The SRRC shall consist of the following members:

a. Chairperson: [Name of Chairperson]
- Responsibilities: Preside over committee meetings, coordinate the review process, and ensure timely decision-making.

b. Members: [List of Members, to include 1 faculty, 1 staff]
- Responsibilities: Actively participate in the evaluation and prioritization of software requests.

c. IT Representative: [Name of IT Representative]
- Responsibilities: Provide technical expertise and assess the feasibility of software requests.

d. Legal and Compliance Advisor: [Name of Legal Advisor]
- Responsibilities: Ensure that software requests comply with legal and state regulatory requirements (Commonwealth of MA Terms and Conditions for Information Technology Contracts, Standard Contract Form)

  See also:
  Commonwealth of MA Terms and Conditions for Information Technology Contracts ([here](#)).
  Commonwealth of MA Standard Contract Form ([here](#)).

5. Meetings:

The SRRC shall meet on a regular basis, as needed, to review software requests. The Chairperson shall schedule and facilitate meetings and provide notice to committee members in advance.

6. Decision-Making:

Decisions regarding software requests shall be made by a consensus of the committee members.

7. Reporting:

The SRRC shall provide regular reports to the Fitchburg State University leadership team regarding the status of software requests and their impact on the organization.

8. Amendments:

This charter may be amended as necessary to reflect changes in the University's needs or processes. Proposed amendments must be approved by a majority vote of the SRRC.

9. Review:

This charter shall be reviewed annually to ensure its relevance and effectiveness.

10. Approval:

This Software Request Review Committee Charter is hereby approved on [Date] by [Name and Title of Approving Authority].

Appendix B

Technology Equipment Replacement Policy for Grant-Funded Purchases

This policy applies to all technology equipment purchased using grant funds.

Definition of Technology Equipment:

Technology equipment includes, but is not limited to, computers, servers, laptops, tablets, monitors, printers, acquired through grant funding.

Replacement Criteria:

a. Technological Obsolescence:

Technology equipment may be considered for replacement if it becomes technologically obsolete, impeding its ability to support the objectives of the grant.

b. End of Life (EOL):

Replacement may be necessary when equipment reaches its manufacturer's End of Life (EOL) or End of Support (EOS) date, making it vulnerable to security risks and diminishing support.

c. Failure or Degradation:

Equipment that experiences frequent failures or significant degradation in performance, hindering its functionality, may be eligible for replacement.

Replacement Process:

a. Assessment:

A periodic assessment will be conducted to identify equipment that meets the replacement criteria.

b. Budgeting:

Adequate budgeting for replacement will be incorporated into the grant proposal, with consideration for the expected lifespan of the technology equipment.

c. Procurement:

Replacement equipment will be quoted by the Business Manager in the Technology Department and forwarded to the department in compliance with grant regulations and university procurement policies.

d. Data Management:

Proper data backup and transfer procedures will be followed during the replacement process to ensure the continuity of essential information.

Documentation:

All decisions related to technology equipment replacement, including assessments, approvals, and procurement, will be documented and maintained for auditing purposes.

Communication:

Stakeholders, including end-users, will be informed of the replacement process, timelines, and any potential impacts on their work.

Review and Revision:

This policy will be reviewed annually and revised as necessary to reflect changes in technology, organizational needs, or grant requirements.

Responsible Party for Technology Equipment Replacement: Chief Information Officer