

MSFT Committee Meeting Minutes
Monday, February 11th, 2019 — 8:00-9:00 AM
Provost's Conference Room BTW#2185

Meeting Objective: To welcome new and returning committee members, review the committee's purpose, and prepare to review proposals for fiscal year 2019-2020 (FY19-20) projects.

Attendees: Laine Lyzak, Sean Kelly, Raul Perez, Thomas Dorch, Jerry Garcia
Staff present: David Daniels, Jacky Connell, Dianne Wei, Kirk England

I. Welcome and introductions

- a. D. Daniels welcomed attendees and thanked them for coming, committee members introduced themselves to each other;

II. Overview of budget outlook for FY19-20

- a. D. Daniels offered overview of MSFT budget outlook; K. England added that the 833k figure for current year expenses captures if everyone spends their entire awarded amount; emphasized that a sound strategy for the committee is to make sure to maintain a 20% fund balance as a contingency;

III. New Business

- a. Discussion of the ability to roll-over MSFT funds (using MSFT Award 18.37 "Stage Floor Replacement and Upgrades in Malibu Hall #140 as example);
 - i. K. England noted that when reviewing proposals that the awardee needs to have the administrative expertise to execute the project; this being the first meeting, let's take a look at the guidelines and refresh our knowledge of the charter; in cases like Malibu Hall, need to consider the Campus Master Plan when taking on capital outlay projects; having the flexibility to roll over funds in certain cases may aid in the implementation deadline; D. Daniels added that in this case the work must be performed when students are not present – heard back from C. Burriss' team that they will be able to complete some work during Spring Break, but may need to go into late-May / early-June and aren't sure if all vendors can be paid by the close of this fiscal year (6/30/19);
- b. Additional MSFT support requested for the Learning Resource Center (LRC), \$25k, and the Writing and Multi-literacy Center (WMC), \$15k.
 - i. L. Lyzak recalled the prior committee's vote on not using the carry forward for additional support; the 25k they're asking for is to

support tutor salary; however, observed that visits are decreasing, lost about 600 visits; asked why are the tutor hours rising but the tutor visits are dropping; S. Kelly added that he didn't see the numbers in the same way, if you did a moving average it would be about 5800 based on a 3-yr moving average, I wouldn't assume a trend with this – observed that blue and other lines are basically flat, which makes sense because we haven't had a massive increase in students; if you aggregated data differently, you would see the beginning and end of the red line finishing in about the same place; K. England observed that the bottom line is the distinct number of students, and that number of visit hours could change depending on the amount of use; L. Lyzak summarized that they asked for 95k last year and they were funded for 65k, now asking for 25k more; S. Kelly recommended we invite them in to our next committee meeting; J. Connell asked if MSFT funds are the only funding they receive? K. England recalled that the primary source of funding is from MSFT; further noted structure of Graduate Learning Center, WMC and LRC; further committee discussion of differences between each and whether there is some way of leveraging the existing resources;

IV. Other business and meeting adjournment

- a. K. England noted that MSFT has an opportunity to support innovation on future proposals, but there may be a danger if creating a dependency for proposals that are consistently funded; let's think through how they could be considered, amid our limitations from a finite amount of money ; L. Lyzak observed that ESRM and CHEM have put in significant requests for FY19-20; further recalled that CHEM has been funded for their student assistants last four years running, but every other program pays for it out of their program funds; paying for student assistants may not be the best use of this fund; R. Perez agreed that this committee should be awarding innovation; L. Lyzak also agreed and suggested the question of how do we pull back gracefully; K. England suggested that we really wrap our heads around our charter, another is to ask what additional resources are available to the proposer, i.e. are MSFT funds the last resources available or is there some kind of cost-share that may be available;
- b. S. Kelly observed the requests from IT, in excess of \$900k, offered that this may be better suited as simply the cost of doing business and may need to come from a different funding source; K. England recalled discussions about adding a student fee to specifically refresh technology; J. Garcia added that at this point that MSFT funds are the only source of funding; S. Kelly recalled that it's always been this way; L. Lyzak asked if there is a way we can put a task force together; K. England observed that if you think about existing technology infrastructure sitting behind computers and laptops, could this approach be out of date, could we consider a more mobile friendly approach; committee asked if anyone from Facilities has served; D. Wei added that the aim is to find a staff member with some experience with IT and/or facilities; T. Dorch suggested maybe we require an in-person meeting depending on the amount requested;
- c. Meeting adjourned at 9:02AM