Meeting Summary

Draft Minutes
April 3, 2008
Durham 206

Members Present: Jim Davis, Fred Gulden, Jim Twetten, Dwight Dake, Sree Nilakanta, Cameron Campbell, Loren
Zachary, Denise Schmidt, William Meeker, Volker Hegelheimer, Larry Booth, Melissa Suek, Carl Bauer, Jamie Fath, Quinn
Warnick, Elizabeth Harriman, Mike Bowman, Jonathan Salvador

• Meeting called to order at 5:10PM
• Agenda is approved
• Minutes are approved
• ITS Report, Twetten:
  • There’s been a targeted fishing scheme
  • Emails go to a handful (5-600) at a time; asking people to reply with their password
  • This is happening at universities across the country
  • Nobody at Iowa State or ITS will ever request password information via email

• New Business

  • Discussion on proposal evaluation, Bowman
    • Projects with a mean initial rating less than 2 will be removed from consideration
  • Discussion on proposal 26, opened by Hegelheimer
    • Zachary: Doesn’t seem to be scalable; waste of money
    • Hegelheimer: Would like to draw the line at 2, excluding proposals with mean of 2
      • How did people decide on proposal 7:
        • Gulden: This is the 3rd year it’s been proposed
• Discussion on proposal evaluation (continued)
  • Davis: Motion to put the line at mean of 2?  
    • Motion passes; Nilakanta opposed
  • Discussion on proposal 5, Suek: Why was this rated low? 
    • Gulden: Proposal to put proposal 5 back into consideration 
    • Booth: Matching funds is an issue with this project 
    • Meeker: Benefit primarily to one college 
    • 10-5 in favor of moving project 5 back above the line; motion passes
  • Discussion of next step in proposal evaluation 
    • Meeker: Motion to eliminate criteria 6 from evaluation criteria 
      • Motion passes
    • Denise Schmidt: How do we evaluate in this round, if our criteria seems to be different than the priorities listed in the call for proposals 
      • Davis: The call then does not seem to be in congruence with the criteria the committee will be using
        • It would seem the fair thing to do would be to keep them the same 
  • Discussion of Dr. Jurik’s question on appropriate use of CAC funds for grad students
    • Dake: Spirit of the rule is that it be open access
      • Originally, the restriction was meant to discourage researchers from using CAC funds to purchase computers for research that would not be accessible to the general student body
    • Warnick: We certainly do not want to create a situation where we create barriers to graduate students doing research on openly accessible computers
    • Zachary: Allowing things like this might encourage abuse of CAC funds by research professors
  • Meeting is adjourned at 6:29PM.