

Central Student Fee Committee
Meeting: Friday November 5, 2004
Location: Union 203

Attendees: Jesse Ballard, Christy Boggs, Phyllis Brecher, Jud Brown, Luc Carr, Marcus Curley, Leila D`Aquino, Matt Deasaro, Maggie Deming, Klaus Hanson, Jack Hatfield, Cheryl Hilman, Travis Jordan, Josie Maus, Paul Medina, Abby Norman, John Nutter, Christine Primus, William Russell, Michael Stephens, Mark Sunderman, Renee Tihen, Brenda Herbst

1. Introductions

Introductions by all the committee members present were made

2. Orientation packets

Maggie explained the handouts included an orientation packet, which includes the Operating Guidelines, the CSFC 3 year rotation cycle and a list of lab responsibility. It is the committee members' responsibility to familiarize themselves with these documents.

3. Budget Report

Maggie explained to the committee the budget report. The report indicates the amount of money approved for projects and what has been spent. The report also indicates items that were approved last year, but have still not been expended.

4. New Funding Dynamic

Funds provided to the CSFC are now part of the tuition instead of individual fee-based assessments. Because of this change the monies provided to the CSFC no longer roll-over between each biennium. This change means that the CSFC must expend or have obligated all of its funds before June 30th, 2006. The budget tracking that is provided now is based on a biennium schedule, as opposed to the fiscal year schedule that has been followed in past.

Cheryl Hilman questioned if the base \$383,518 is static or if it would be altered. Jesse stated that it would be static for the fiscal years, but could be adjusted between the biennium.

Mark Sunderman asked that if the funds are no longer part of a 'fee' could the administration possibly take back the money. Maggie stated that the availability of the funds are at the discretion of Trustees, but she had not received any indication that the funds would be removed.

Other discussion took place regarding how the money will have to be obligated and expended before the fiscal year (FY) end.

It was discussed that the committee should begin meeting earlier in the semester. Maggie stated that to have the meetings earlier she would need faster turn around on the colleges' parts in assigning representatives to the committee. One possibility is that colleges should attempt to identify their members at the end of each spring semester.

Klaus Hanson recommended that we change our name since we are no longer a fee committee.

Klaus voiced his concerns that we would be wasting funds if we have to have the funds expended by the end of the biennium, which might lead to the purchasing of un-needed items.

Phyllis Brecher wanted to clarify if the funds were available all biennium, or just for the fiscal year. Maggie stated that the funds are available through the biennium.

5. Required Expenditures

Maggie explained that the CSFC has core responsibilities that it is obligated to fund each year based on past projects. At the start of each year the committee approves the required expenditures.

Cheryl Hilman asked for clarification on the rotation cycle that Jesse provided. Jesse explained that the numbers they want to reference for the purchases are those in the column and not in the shapes.

Maggie asked for approval of the FY05 and FY06 computer replacement, staffing for FY06 and printer maintenance for FY06.

Leila D`Aquin moved that the committee approve \$234,989 for the purchase of computers for FY05 and FY06, the staffing for FY06 and the printer maintenance for FY06.

Abby Norman seconded

Mark Sunderman questioned if students are required to bring laptops, will the committee be able to remove commitment for computer purchases if the need is no longer there. Jesse explained that there should be flexibility if needed.

Approved – all
Opposed – none
Abstain - none

6. Systems request

Maggie explained that the IT Systems group has a couple of items that need the committee's immediate attention. Bob Morrison, Director of Telecommunications and Systems Support, was given the floor.

Bob outlined two requests. The first request was for a replacement server for the UW printer server named Grail. Grail is over 5 ½ years old and is failing on a daily basis. The estimated cost of a new server is \$8500

The second request was for the replacement of the domain controller. The Systems group is preparing to do an Active Directory update this semester and would like to bring in the new server during the update process. The estimated cost of the new server is \$7000

Jud Brown questioned if the servers were on an active rotation cycle. Bob explained that they are not on a replacement schedule; instead they are requested on an as-needed basis.

Jud Brown moved that \$8500 for a new print server and \$7000 for a new domain controller be approved
Bill Russell seconded

Favor – all
Opposed – none
Abstain – none

7. Approach to funding requests

Maggie asked the committee to consider how it would like to approach funding considerations given the change in the funding dynamic and several requests that have already been posed to the CSFC.

Maggie explained that traditionally the CSFC has always focused on the central funding needs first and then considered specialized projects. She asked that the committee still consider this approach because it is the mandate of the CSFC to fund central needs.

Maggie suggested the following outline. 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 30th of the second FY of the biennium.

Mark had concerns about putting all the proposals in a single call for proposals. He suggested that the committee might look at releasing two calls for proposals.

Jud pointed out that the call last year had a number of proposals that showed a wide variety of projects and that one call might be enough.

There was discussion on the issue and Chris Primus pointed out that the committee should be sure to hold some funds aside for emergency needs in the second FY if there are central requests that are not identified in the first FY.

No firm decision was made on the topic.

8. Update on projects

Cheryl Hilman asked if we could get a quick update on the remote desktop farm.

Bob explained that the project has been examined, but it has not been developed or put into a test environment. He explained that the research done so far was on equipment IT already has in house, so none of the \$45,000 has been expended.

Bob explained that the reason for the lack of progress is that the success of the UWStudent lab system and the growth of student computing have stretched the personnel resources in the IT Systems group to their limit. If expansion of the services is needed more personnel resources may be needed. He asked the committee to possibly consider allowing CSFC funds be made available for staffing of full time positions.

Maggie adjourned the meeting at 4:05pm