

Central Student Technology Committee (CSTC)

Meeting: Friday November 19, 2004

Location: Union 203

Attendees: Maggie Deming, Jesse Ballard, Phyllis Brecher, Jud Brown, Luc Carr, Marcus Curley, Leila D`Aquino, Matt Deasaro, Klaus Hanson, Jack R. Hatfield II, Cheryl Hilman, Travis Jordan, Natalie Kosine, Josie Maus, Paul Medina, Kate Muir, Abby Norman, John Nutter, Christine Primus, Dean Roddick, William Russell, Mark Sunderman, Renee Tihen

**1. Introductions**

Introductions by all the committee members present were made

**2. Name Change for the committee**

At the last meeting it was briefly discussed that we should possibly change the name of the committee since the funds are part of tuition and not fees. A possible name change suggestion was Central Student Technology Committee (CSTC).

Cheryl Hilman moved that the committee change the name to Central Student Technology Committee (CSTC).

John Nutter seconded the motion

Favor – all

Opposed – none

Abstain – none

**3. Observations, feedback on committee invested infrastructure**

Over the past year the University and the labs have been recognized for the level of technology available to students. In the Noel Levitz survey conducted last year at UW, the student computer labs were the highest ranked student service among all items polled. UW was also recognized as one of the nation's most 'Unwired' campuses, due in large part to the committee's funding of wireless across campus.

**4. Status reports from Call for Proposal recipients**

The committee members reviewed the status reports. No questions about the reports were posed.

**5. Project Status reports**

Maggie explained that Bob Morrison provided a quick update on the status of the remote desktop farm and the mobile computers in Coe at the last meeting. At

this time the projects have not been completed, but no funds have been expended. Bob has more information he would like to share, but is unable to attend the meeting. Maggie would like to table this issue until Bob can return. He will hopefully be able to attend the 12/3 meeting.

## **6. Approach to funding Requests**

Before moving on to other items Maggie wanted to committee to decide how to look at funding request for the surplus funds the committee has available.

Jud moved to adopt the guide defined at the last meeting: “Central needs would be identified in the fall of the first FY of the biennium and the committee would approve the funds so they are set aside. The committee could then identify funds to be released in a call for proposal. The call for proposal would be released in the spring of the first FY. Over the summer colleges and departments would have time to generate their requests. The CSFC would then meet in the fall of the second FY to review the call for proposal requests. Approval and funding would be provided in early spring of the second FY, with the notice that funds must be expended or obligated before June 30<sup>th</sup> of the second FY of the biennium.”

Leila D`Aquin seconded the motion

Discussion

Maggie talked about how the committee still needed to allow flexibility in funding the call for proposals.

Mark Sunderman voiced a concern about a single call for proposal would not generate enough good proposals if we only release one call for proposals a year.

John Nutter was concerned that we do not allow as much flexibility by working with the budget on a biennium cycle vs. a year by year cycle.

Leila recommended maybe an October 1 meeting to review proposals instead of September. Then if not enough proposals came in the committee could release a second call in early spring. Leila also noted that going through the call for proposals is not the only way colleges can bring requests to the committee. Colleges can send request to the chair of the committee to have a proposal included in on the agenda for discussion.

Cheryl Hilman recommended not necessarily approving central needs in the Fall, but identify them so reps can go back to their colleges and talk about the central needs. She explained that we can still approve urgent requests, but instead of seeing and approving the central needs in the same meeting, there be time to introduce and discuss them internally and with various colleges before the approval vote.

Jesse voiced his concern of putting all proposals into the second FY because it creates an imbalance of replacement and project loads. Jesse recommended possibly explore releasing 3 call for proposals. Once now for review in early spring, then at the end of the spring for review in October, then if need be a third one in late fall for review

After much discussion the following timeline was proposed:

In the Fall of the first FY the committee would meet to approve required expenditures and urgent central needs. In the remaining meetings in the Fall of the first FY the committee will examine and identify other central needs. Approval for the additional central needs will be made in February of the first FY. The committee would release a call for proposals in March or April of the first FY for colleges and committees to review and develop projects over the summer. The proposals would be due to the chair of the committee by the beginning of October of the second FY. In October of the second FY the committee would also review and approve new central needs that have been identified. The committee would review and approve the call for proposals during the Fall of the second FY with award letters going out in November. Funds approved in the call for proposals must be expended by June of the second FY. If there are still funds remaining after awarding call for proposals the committee could then release a second call which would be due back to the committee by April or May of the second FY.

Jud Brown asked for a friendly amendment to include the timeline.  
Abby Norman – seconded the amendment

Vote was taken on the approval of the timeline

Favor – All but one  
Opposed – John Nutter  
Abstain - none

### **Engineering Wireless move**

Cheryl Hilman asked for permission to move a wireless access point in the Engineering College that the CSTC funded to a new location to eliminate a conflict with another existing access point. Maggie provided the approval.

Maggie adjourned the meeting at 4:10pm