Meeting Summary

December 4, 2008
206 Durham

**Members Present:** Scott McLeod, Fred Gulden, Jim Twetten, Philip Spike, Cameron Campbell, Loren Zachary, Denise Schmidt, Joe Herriges, Geoffrey Sauer, Rick Hanton, Steve Sanda, Carl Bauer, Jamie Fath, Ivon Katz, Mike Bowman, Brent Swanson, Allan Schmidt, Ying Cai

- Meeting called to order at 5:10PM
- Agenda is approved
- Minutes are approved
- Financial Report, Bowman
  - No updated numbers from accounting
- McLeod: Reports from Human Sciences and Library
  - Reports
    - Denise Schmidt, Human Science
      - Certain departments get an allocation for labs
      - Other departments make proposals and those are approved by the college committee
      - Primarily, money is going to update existing facilities, and secondly support personnel
      - Labs are on 3-4 year rotation
      - Special purpose labs: motor control and learning, biomechanics, applied physiology
      - The college established the Office of Distance Education and Educational Technology
        - New possible target for funding
    - Fred Gulden, Library
      - Library doesn’t have departments; money is budgeted centrally
• 30-40K allocated for special projects

• Committee of 2 faculty and 2 students get together in fall to consider projects

• What are we doing that’s new and innovative?
  • e-Library infrastructure (hardware and software)
  • Library user environment (servers, workstations, printers, scanners, etc.)

• Responding to changing user needs?
  • Developing online guides, finding/search aids
  • Acquiring databases, e-books, e-journals, e-resources & print
  • Adapting changing physical learning and research environments for users

• Things we’re trying to do:
  • Greater mixture of different styles of study space, Wireless internet access and electrical outlets, Multimedia resources
  • Reference area replaced with collaborative areas and IT staff; response has been positive

• Questions?
  • McLeod: Are you finding that people are less likely to use the library’s databases as Google becomes the main search medium?
  • Gulden: We find that they use Google first, then turn to the libraries resources to find additional or better materials

• Discussion on Call for Proposals
  • Spike: The evaluation criteria doesn’t seem to sync with the new categories. It doesn’t seem to make sense to have a category if it’s not going to be given a numerical ranking during the ranking process.
    • McLeod: We can just remove that sentence in the call, because it seems to encourage proposal writers to submit proposals that don’t fit the four main categories.

  • Denise Schmidt: I noticed that the call isn’t clear about whether we will consider multi-year proposals or not. We’ve approved some in the past, but the call doesn’t mention that, and that seems to put some proposal writers at a disadvantage.
    • McLeod: Do we want to explicitly state that we support multi-year proposals?
• Zachary: Yup. We either do it or we don’t.

• McLeod: Okay, we’ll add “these may cut across multiple years” to the proposal categories summary.

• McLeod: Any other concerns?

• Campbell: On “general student benefit” do we need the word general?

• McLeod: No, we forgot to take it out when removing the word “general” from the rest of the paragraph.

• Gulden: Should we emphasize that proposals that employ cost sharing will be given preference?

• Zachary: VetMed might propose something, and their budget is relatively small. Let’s make sure we say cost sharing is encouraged and not required.

• Gulden: I’m fine with the language that’s in there, but I just wanted to raise the question because someone else might feel more strongly about it.

• McLeod: Any concerns about the integration part?

• Allan Schmidt: The language on providing access to students with disabilities could be a problem, because lots of pilot software never comes close to providing that functionality.

• McLeod: But it’s university policy, and it applies even if we don’t say it in the call. So how about we just take that language out of the call.

• McLeod: I’ll suggest a concern of Larry’s, since he’s not here tonight. He said that we should drop Table 2 from the budget section. He said he’d rather see the committee receive one budget and negotiate with the proposer for any changes.

• Campbell: I think that would make our lives a lot easier during evaluation.

• McLeod: So the idea before was that they’d submit a budget and also a last-chance budget, and now we just want them to submit their last-chance budget.

• Zach: So moved!

• Motion passes

• McLeod: Do we need to look at the weight for the categories we use in evaluation now?

• Zachary: We can wait until the next meeting.

• McLeod: Anything else for tonight?
• Allan Schmidt: I’d like to volunteer to present to CAC about what CELT is doing, because a lot of what we do uses CAC funding.

• McLeod: Alright, you’re on the agenda for February.

• Meeting adjourned