Meeting Summary

January 29, 2009

206 Durham

**Members Present:** Fred Gulden, Jim Twetten, Philip Spike, Tony Townsend, Cameron Campbell, Loren Zachary, Denise Schmidt, Larry Booth, Misha Rajaram, Rick Hanton, Steve Sanda, Jamie Fath, Ivon Katz, Scott Pattee, Mike Bowman, Brent Swanson, Allan Schmidt, Ying Cai, Jonathan Salvador

- Meeting called to order at 5:15PM
- Agenda is approved
- Minutes are approved
- Financial Report, Bowman
  - 2008-2009 Computer Fee Income Summary - 12/31/08
- Unit Reports
  - Agriculture, Spike
    - Funds allocated out to departments, small amount kept centrally
    - Detailed reports from units
    - 40K kept centrally; departments get share by credit hours and students
    - Available at http://www.anlab.iastate.edu/tac/
    - Committee is put together by the dean, going to the Ag student council for students
      - 4-5 faculty, 4-5 students
  - Business, Townsend
    - Culture of Business
      - 60-65 faculty members; kind of like a department
      - Everything done with a central committee
• Until 2 years ago there was an MIS premium on the tuition
  • 60-70K dollars left from MIS CAC
• Bulk of money goes into lab support
  • We feel we should be moving away from that
• Some CAC money has been used for public displays
  • Used for effective communication with students
• All of CAC funding doesn’t go to small cliques; most goes to the common good of department
• Partnered with ITS to enhance classroom experience
• Encouraging faculty to use CAC funds creatively
• I’m (Townsend) chair for next three years, and my mandate includes mainly two things:
  • Funding for more diverse units, Clear criteria for evaluation
  • Twetten: We will have Computer Science report in our February meeting

• Call for Proposals
  • Twetten: The call is out, due date to CAC is March 13
    • Anyone know the dates for separate colleges?
    • We’ll get those dates and post them online

• Evaluation Criteria
  • Twetten: Scott wanted to have a discussion on the weighting
    • Is the current system appropriate?
      • Denise Schmidt: The way we have it will work if we agree as a group what our ratings mean and are consistent
      • Twetten: Perhaps we should bring back the initial ranking to address the category-fit concern?
        • Committee agrees, but no formal vote held
• Graduate College Dean Concern

  • Twetten: Dean Holger expressed concern that the CAC process doesn’t seem to benefit graduate students as much as undergrad students

  • Bowman & Spike: That’s the exact same argument that was used to lower the graduate computer fee

  • Zachary: The language in the call restricting use of funds for graduate students seems to mostly be about research, and that seems is correct.

  • Twetten: I think we need to go back to Scott to see exactly what the specific concern was

  • Salvador: If I could read a part of the email that Holger sent,

    • “Since it is likely that roughly 20% of computer fees collected are from graduate students, it would not be unreasonable to see roughly that percentage of proposals funded to be associated with graduate student computing support”

  • Denise Schmidt: I have a hard time believing that at least 20% of the funded proposals haven’t benefited graduate students in some shape or form

  • Townsend: This concern might be an effect of the budget cuts this year too; deans looking for additional sources for funding

  • Spike: Is there anyway to find out what proportion of fees are paid by graduate students?

    • Bowman: Not in the information that we directly get

    • Twetten: I’m curious where this 20% number came from

  • Twetten: Anything else for the good of the order?

• Meeting adjourned 6:25PM