REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
SECOND ROUND

FY 2015 SECOND ROUND
TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents

Requests for Proposals 1
Funding Categories 6
Metrics 9
Findings 12
Contact Information 14
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Request for Proposals

OVERVIEW
Please take the time to familiarize yourself with the new Request for Proposals (RFP). Read through the body of the RFP and then browse the appendices as needed.

INTRODUCTION
The Student Technology Fee was established to supplement the availability of technology to UW students and to provide opportunities for facilities and projects that require capital investment. The Committee solicits proposals from campus units for projects that meet the technology needs of students.

Money from the fee is not to be used to fund items that should properly be funded by legislative or administrative funds. These awards are intended to be one-time sources of funding.

The Committee encourages and favors proposals that demonstrate a commitment to collaboration between different departments and show a willingness to either contribute departmental funds to a project or seek alternative funding sources.


SECOND ROUND NOTES AND RESTRICTIONS:
- The Committee has a budget of $1,527,000.00 to allocate in the second round.
- Proposals cannot exceed $100,000.00 in funding value.
- We will not limit funding based on proposal categories.
- Presentations will be on April 24th, 2015. Please plan accordingly. However, we may have an additional presentation day on May 1st, 2015 if there are greater than 10 proposal submissions.

RESUBMISSIONS
Proposal authors can resubmit a rejected proposal.

1. Contact the Committee for reasons about your rejection and edit your proposal accordingly.
2. You will have to submit a new proposal to the website. You can copy the parts that remain the same.
3. You will still have to attend proposal presentations.

Contact techfee@uw.edu for questions about your proposal. In difficult cases, the Committee may recommend drastic changes or not resubmitting.
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IMPORTANT POINTS

- Collaborative and Portable are now two separate categories. (Collaborative) (Portable)
- There are requirements for how line items should be written (Writing the Proposals).
- Proposal budgets close on May 1, 2016
- The author must identify a permanent staff or faculty member within the University to submit the proposal and serve as the primary contact.
- All requests should explain the number of students who will benefit from the proposal and how this number was determined; if the proposal includes items that will last a long period of time then please include projections of use over the lifespan of the items. This information should be explained in the “Benefit to Students” section.
- Insurance will not be funded by the Committee. Please see the bottom of the restrictions on proposals. (Insurance)

ITEM GROUPING

The website allows grouping line items. This addition allows proposal authors to indicate to the Committee which items should be funded together because of how they will be used or to indicate to the Committee the author’s preference for certain items over others in the proposal. This information will allow the Committee to make educated funding decisions, especially as the Committee makes partial options. These groups are not binding on the Committee’s funding decisions nor will indicating a preference for certain items over others determine what the Committee funds. The use of these groupings is informational and will help the Committee make decisions that accurately reflect the priorities of the proposal author. Accordingly, the Committee fully encourages each author to consider grouping items in their proposal.

PROPER PROPOSALS AND LIMITATIONS

Proposals should: primarily benefit students; include a summary of student input; provide a plan for long-term operation; and address the issue of student access.

The Committee looks favorably upon: cooperation between departments, schools, colleges, and other campus units; creative approaches to improving services for students; and using/seeking additional sources of funding or contributing department funds, and disclose any additional funding allocated to the proposal.

Proposals should not be: contingent upon subsequent years of funding, equipment used for classroom instruction, ongoing maintenance and supply costs, furniture, wiring or infrastructure costs, salary for full-time or part-time staff or students, or wireless networking outside the University’s central deployment.
ELIGIBILITY
The author must identify a permanent staff or faculty member within the University to submit the proposal and serve as the primary contact. This ensures the Committee can identify an individual responsible for a proposal’s compliance during the three years that STFC retains limited control over the project.

Students unable to find a departmental sponsor should contact the Student Activities Office.

The primary contact must be from a department that will be involved in the implementation or maintenance of the proposal, unless the proposal is being submitted on behalf of a student organization (i.e. ASUW, GPSS, RSO).

The primary contact is held responsible for the full and successful implementation of the proposal as well as its continued compliance with STF standards. This person will be the initial point of contact for any questions or follow up after the proposal is funded. This in no way limits how or to whom departments internally allocate responsibility.

The Committee recommends departments to involve students to take leadership roles in the creation, presentation and implementation of proposals.

The author’s proposal must be approved by their Dean, department chair, or program equivalent. Authors are encouraged to seek sponsorship from another department if they fail to get signatures from their host department. Student groups who are unable to meet this requirement are encouraged to approach the Department of Student Life.

A link to a signature page is presented at the bottom of the proposal submission page. The proposal author is responsible for printing this page from the STFC website, obtaining the necessary approvals, scanning this page as a PDF, and uploading it to the website. The Committee will not consider proposals that do not have the necessary signatures and will not consider mailed copies of the signature page.

Items purchased with STFC funds are the property of the Committee for a period of three years from the purchase date. For equipment above $50,000 in value, the ownership period is seven years. Therefore, the items must be used for student purposes during this period as defined by the STFC finding on Use of Equipment Funded by the Student Technology Fee. The Committee strongly encourages the department to continue student use after this ownership period.

WRITING THE PROPOSAL
Each proposal should be submitted in a Funding Category. Please consult the category descriptions there to determine under which category your proposal falls. Please email techfee@uw.edu if you have questions about category placement. The Committee reserves the right to change the category chosen by the author.

When writing a proposal please answer the questions that are listed in the description of each category. These questions will help the Committee evaluate proposals on a fair and balanced basis.
The Committee has established guidelines for how line items MUST be written. Each line item should have a clear and descriptive title (i.e. Zoom Pocket Camcorder or Macbook Pro). The first line of the description should include the make and model (i.e. Canon DM-100 Directional Stereo Microphone). The second line of the description should be the place where you received your price quote; this can either be the website address or the company name (if not ordered online).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MacBook Pro</td>
<td>$2,198.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$4,396.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description**

15” i7 2.66GHz MacBook Pro


**Justification**

The next generation of Apple computers come with Intel technology and superior graphics capabilities. The dual core processors and built-in hyper-threading technology standard on the MacBook Pro laptops makes these units ideal for film and audio editing in the field.

This is all that should be included in the description. In the justifications section, please provide why this item is needed and how it interacts with the rest of the proposal.

The Committee recommends that appropriate departmental support be provided in the form of endorsements. Represented groups should include department chairs, faculty, and student interest groups.

**REVIEW PROCESS**

The voting members of the Committee will review proposals. A representative must present the proposal to the Committee. Details on this process will be provided in a subsequent email to proposal authors who submit a proposal.

**FUNDING OF PROPOSALS**

All non-fast track awards will be disbursed on July 1, 2015.
CONTACT US

The Committee wishes to help proposal authors in any way possible. The Committee urges proposal authors to come forward with questions as early as possible in the process. The Student Technology Fee Committee can be reached at techfee@uw.edu.
Funding Categories

The following are the categories in which proposals should be submitted. The Committee has split Collaborative and Portable into two separate categories. For examples, please visit http://techfee.washington.edu/proposals/ and organize by ‘category’ on the right side.

**COMPUTER LABS**
Definition: A computer lab is any number of computers that are accessible to the general student body or a sizable group of students. It includes physical hardware such as computers, speakers, monitors and peripherals that are necessary for the proper functioning of the lab (excluding printers and software which fall under the Key Server criteria). Any equipment that is required to the functioning the facility can be funded. Remote clusters and terminals are not included in this category.

Purpose: Computer labs exist to provide students with access with computing services across campus. The Committee provides support primarily to centralized computing services, computer labs providing specialized computer needs, and labs located in remote locations.

**REMOTE COMPUTING**
Definition: A remote computing facility is defined as any central system that can simultaneously accept multiple connections to serve more than one individual. It includes all physical hardware that are required for the proper functioning of the facility. Traditional computer labs are not included in this category nor does the category include any software that meets the Key Server criteria.

Purpose: Remote computing is meant to give students flexible, location-independent access to computing services. Remote computing facilities serve a large number of students while minimizing operating costs.

**FRONTIER TECHNOLOGY**
Definition: This category is for technology on the technological forefront and more experimental. It is for pilot programs that could later be expanded in scope. These expansions could potentially be funded by future proposals submitted under another, more traditional category.

Purpose: This category provides student access to early, experimental technology. It serves as a testing ground for students and for departments to explore how this technology will be used. By pushing technological boundaries, the Committee provides more prestige to the university, which attracts stronger students and faculty.
FUNDING CATEGORIES

COLLABORATIVE
Definition: This category includes all equipment intended for the assistance in collaboration between students, whether it be in projects, coursework, or research. Requests should be for equipment that is novel or scarce on campus.

Purpose: To utilize technology to facilitate the social collaboration between students and departments.

PORTABLE
Definition: Portable proposals involve equipment and technologies that do not require a permanent host. Ideally, items in this category should be reusable, and broadly applicable. They should be durable and able to last in field work.

Purpose: This category ensures that students have necessary equipment to maximize education value from field work or studies occurring away from the classroom.

MACHINERY AND RESEARCH
Definition: This category includes all equipment specific to scientific inquiry, fabrication, or development. The category could include machinery used for scientific research (microscopes, chemical analysis machines, and field equipment), art creation (3-d printers, lamination machines) and special software to operate this machinery.

Purpose: The purpose of this category is to advance the research, development, and scholarly opportunities available to students. Students will benefit from increased access to machinery and equipment that will enable the pursuit of academic interests.

SOFTWARE
Proposals in this category will fall into three areas:

1. Requests for software to be placed on the Key Server
2. Requests for software upgrades on the Key Server
3. Software requests that are not compatible with the Key Server

If you are proposing for software related to the Key Server, please email keyserve@uw.edu to verify that it is compatible or not already available. Once you’ve done that, please submit a proposal without any hardware or non-Key Server software. And please clearly indicate in your title that the software is for the Key Server.

A proposal requesting software not compatible with the Key Server should be its own proposal without any hardware. Please clearly indicate in the software proposal that the software is not for the Key Server. If the author has an additional proposal (for items such as hardware) we ask the author put “See Proposal ###” in the title and all description categories of the software proposal. The Committee will hear both proposals at the same meeting.
Key Server

All software that is eligible to be placed on the Key Server will not be funded in a proposal. If you have special circumstances that you believe warrant additional consideration please contact techfee@uw.edu.

The Key Server is currently unavailable for the current hardware/operating systems:

- Laptops that leave campus (if the laptop permanently resides on campus and remains connected to the Internet then it may be eligible for the Key Server. Please contact techfee@uw.edu if you are seeking software for a laptop that remains on campus).
- Computers running Linux.

Please visit the website for a list of software that is available on the Key Server; e-mail keyserve@uw.edu before requesting software in a proposal to determine whether the software you would like can be put on the Key Server. Any request that has not contacted the Key Server alias before requesting their software will not be considered.
Metrics

All proposals will be evaluated by a common set of metrics and a couple of category-specific metrics. The common metrics are divided up into four separate constructs: student access, departmental support and responsibility, cost-benefit, and scholarship. Scores will be assigned to each proposal by averaging the numeric responses to each question with a construct and multiplying that number by an assigned weight that varies based on category. The weighted scores will then be added together to obtain a final metric score for a proposal. Generally, a higher scoring proposal is more likely to be approved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Computer Labs</th>
<th>Remote Computing</th>
<th>Frontier Research</th>
<th>Machinery Research</th>
<th>Collaborative</th>
<th>Portable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STUDENT ACCESS</strong></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPARTMENT SUPPORT AND RESPONSIBIL</strong></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COST BENEFIT</strong></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCHOLARSHIP</strong></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CATEGORY SPECIFIC</strong></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

METRICS FOR ALL PROPOSALS

Student Access

- How many students will utilize this technology (1 = Few, 5 = Many)
- How will students hear about, and locate, this technology? (1 = hard to find, 5 = easy to find)

Departmental Support and Responsibility
METRICS

- Will the project have necessary access to UW or departmental infrastructure (including security, maintenance, power, water, sewer, Internet/WiFi, insurance, or other needs for full operation)? (1 = inadequate resources, 5 = more than adequate)
- Does the project have the necessary support, maintenance, and administrative staff to effectively serve users? (1 = no staff commitment, 5 = fully committed staff)
- How accessible will support staff be to the students utilizing the technology (i.e. by email, phone, onsite, etc.) (1 = inadequate resources, 5 = more then adequate)

Cost-Benefit

- Are there broader impacts to funding this technology beyond the proposal’s primary use? (1 = high opportunity cost, 5 = low opportunity cost)
- Is the money in the budget apportioned in a sensible way that will satisfy the intended needs for the target population? (1 = poor, 5 = well structured)
- Will the successful execution of this project significantly benefit UW students in the long-term? (1 = not beneficial to students, 5 = very beneficial to students)
- Are there other resources on campus that fulfill this need? (1 = no evidence for need, 5 = ample evidence for need)

Scholarship

- Does the project bring significant attention to the UW and/or your department in some way? (1 = low prestige, 5 = high prestige)
- Does the project provide students with the tools necessary to achieve academic success in their classes and coursework? (1 = low value, 5 = high value)
- Does the technology provide students with the tools necessary to conduct independent research, research for in-class projects, design projects, competitions, and graduate level research? (1 = low value, 5 = high value)

CATEGORY SPECIFIC METRICS

Computer Labs

- What are the hours of the lab? (1 = inadequate, 5 = 24 hours)
- How accessible is the lab to students? (1 = not so accessible, 5 = very accessible)

Frontier

- What evidence suggests that this project is likely to succeed? (1 = failure is very likely, 5 = success is very likely)
- Is the proposed project a novel effort? (1 = unoriginal, 5 = novel)
- Is the proposed project typically unavailable to students (1 = No, 5 = Yes)

Remote Computing

- Does the application of this technology give students flexible, location-independent access to standard computing services? (1 = very low degree of flexibility and location independence, 5 = very high degree)
• Does the successful implementation of technology reduce the need for certain traditional computing facilities? (1 = does not reduce need for labs and resources, 5 = reduces need for many labs and resources)

**Machinery and Research**

• Will the project enable new forms of innovation and research? (1 = does not produce innovation, 5 = highly innovative)
• Are there domain specific reasons to fund this project above and beyond those listed on this rubric? (1 = no special consideration, 5 = very important scientific/artistic rationale)
• Is this machinery typically unavailable to students? (1=No, 5 = Yes)

**Collaborative**

• Will the technology promote expanded opportunities for students to collaborate on coursework, projects, or research (1 = does not promote collaboration, 5 = actively promotes collaboration)
• Is this equipment typically unavailable to students? (1 = No, 5 = Yes)

**Portable**

• How portable is this technology? (1 = Not at All, 5 = Very)
• Can this technology be used in new and innovative ways due to its portability? (1 = No, 5 = Yes)
• Is this product durable and likely to survive a reasonable period of time or is there a replacement policy, or does the benefits of fragility outweigh the costs? (1 = Short, 5 = Long)
FINDINGS

Findings

RESTRICTIONS ON PROPOSALS

Ongoing Costs: The Committee will not fund ongoing costs. Proposal writers should avoid asking for anything that requires payment in more than one installment.

Extended Care Packages/Warranties: Because the Student Technology Fee has determined that most equipment funded through STF is replaced within three to five years, extended warranties are rarely necessary. If proposal writers decide to ask for an extended care package or warranty, they should expect to provide strong justification for why the expense is necessary and for how long the equipment is expected to be in use.

Replacement of Out-of-Warranty Equipment: The expiration of warranty alone is not a sufficient reason to replace old equipment. Proposal writers should either wait until the equipment is outdated and needs replacement or until the equipment is no longer functioning.

Software Upgrades: The Committee has found that in general software needs to be upgraded at the same rate as hardware for most of the equipment that the Student Technology Fee funds, and thus will usually not consider requests for software upgrades. Proposal authors will need to demonstrate that any upgrades will significantly extend the lifetime of the equipment.

Physical Security Devices: The Committee only rarely decides to fund physical security devices for computers, laptops, or other equipment. Proposal authors who wish to have such items funded must demonstrate extraordinary need for this equipment if they wish for it to be funded.

Power Cables (extension cables), Power Strips, and other Infrastructure: It is the responsibility of individual departments to provide the infrastructure necessary for the use of funded equipment. As such the Committee will not fund power cables, power strips, furniture, or other infrastructure requests outside of the specific technological equipment being funded.

Insurance: The Student Technology Fee Committee will not cover the cost of insurance funded equipment. The Committee believes that insurance is the responsibility of the department or body housing the equipment.

FINDING ON CONSUMABLES

The Student Technology Fee Committee hereby establishes the following policy on charging for consumables or access:

1. Departments may charge students for the cost of consumables. The proposal author must disclose the intention to levy this fee in the proposal. The Committee will consider approving a fee through the supplemental process only in very rare and unique situations. The funds may only be used to purchase new consumables for student use on the project from which the fee was collected.
2. Departments may not charge students for access.
3. Departments may charge non-students for consumables or access. There are no restrictions on these funds.

**Discussion**

The Committee remains committed to reducing any financial barriers that impede student access to technology. This policy is an acknowledgement that there may be situations where a department lacks the financial resources to continue providing the requisite consumables for students. The continued success and availability of these projects hinge upon the department’s ability to collect a minimal fee that offsets the price of the consumable. The Committee seeks to mitigate potential negative effects by restricting this fee to its narrowest possible form.

Moreover, this policy’s notice requirement provides the Committee a more comprehensive perspective on proposals. The Committee will now be able to take into account any potential fees when evaluating the merits and value of proposals.

**FUNDING SALARIES**

The Student Technology Fee Committee may fund salaries only to extent they represent the cost of creating a new item. Any request should be narrowly tailored and represent solely the price associated with the creation of the item for student use. If the position will also be doing other projects outside the scope of the proposal then the proposal request should be prorated to reflect only the costs associated with the proposal. We will not commit the Committee to funding items in future years. Each salary request should have a line item for each feature set that will be developed, specifying each feature and justifying its inclusion. The Committee will not fund development hours retroactively.

**Discussion**

The Committee will only consider requests for employee funding that reflect the hours and costs required to **create an item**. The Committee generally foresees this Finding being applicable to proposals that request funding for a software developer, however, the Committee does not foreclose the possibility that other projects may fit within the requirements. Examples of positions that will not be funded by the Committee include: lab staff, support staff, physical infrastructure maintenance staff.
Contact Information

Alton Lu | Program Coordinator

techfee@uw.edu

For process, policy, or budget inquiries.

Sanjay Sagar | Communications Officer

stfcmply@uw.edu

For visits or outreach ideas, concerns, and advertising.