Meeting Summary

February 26, 2009

206 Durham

**Members Present:** Scott McLeod, Fred Gulden, Jim Twetten, Philip Spike, Tony Townsend, Joe Herriges, Larry Booth, Rich Hanton, Steve Sulhoff, Laura Bestler (in stead of Jamie Fath), Mike Bowman, Allan Schmidt, Ying Cai, Jonathan Salvador

- Meeting called to order at 5:13PM
- Agenda approved
- Minutes approved
- Bowman, Financial Report
  - 2008-2009 Computer Fee Income Summary - 1/31/09
- Townsend: Quick question, we have proposals that are talking about shared general student use and research resources; is that allowed, how is that handled?
  - Spike: The wording in our allowable usage seems to be that the funding should be in proportion to the usage
- Unit Reports
  - Computer Science
    - Demonstration of Expenditures Table
    - Most funds go to support the Pearson Computer Lab
    - Spike: It would seem that there are a few items that aren’t technically expendables in your expendables category
    - Gulden: What’s the makeup of the committee that oversees allocation?
      - Cai: On the committee is the department secretary, the department chair, SSG (Student Support Group)
        - Spike: Fred's question was aimed at the expectation that committees have equal representation of students and faculty/staff
• Unit Reports (continued)

• CELT, Schmidt

• As a group that gets a few CAC grants, I thought I would say a little about what our center does with CAC grants

• Focus on web-based instruction

• Center for Teaching Excellence was started in 1993 by the Faculty Senate

• In 2004 the Provost reorganized, and CTE became CELT

• Since then preparing future faculty, and ISUCOMM have been incorporated into CELT

• CELT’s mission is to support teaching and learning on campus; funded by the Provost’s office

• We previously had Miller grants; about 250K a year for faculty projects

  • The Miller grant has been suspended

• Townsend: Just wondering about that plagiarism program you mentioned.

  • Schmidt: We just went live with it last week, it’s called Safe Assign; it’s part of the WebCT suite of tools. It’s intended for students to run their own papers through it first to receive a plagiarism report.

• Old Business

• Proposals

  • McLeod: I’d just like to clear up what was decided at the last meeting. So you’d like to keep the first round of rankings?

    • Spike: Correct

  • Review of First Round Proposal process

• Concern of Associate Dean Holger

  • McLeod: I had a long chat with Associate Dean Holger, and he had a concern that a proportionate amount of money wasn’t making it back to the graduate college

    • Given that we’ve restructured to have more money flowing through the colleges, I told him that he should direct his concerns towards the colleges since the money up for CAC grants isn’t that much anymore

    • The talk went well, he seemed pleased at the direction the committee was taking
• McLeod: This sort of brings us back to the problem of not having a place where we can tell students to go to see how their money is spent. Is it CAC’s job to post that information? The colleges?

  • Townsend: I’d have to say the colleges

    • McLeod: So are we committing to doing this at the college level? We need to proactive in this, but at least give it some thought, go back to your colleges and see what the best way of getting this information to students is.

• Proposal Plan

  • McLeod: I just wanted to be clear on the plan; we meet April 2nd for the first review, we have our final proposal discussion on April 16, and then we have a meeting on April 30th. What’s the last meeting for?

    • Bowman: To evaluate the process. The last meeting’s purpose is to reflect on what should be done to improve the process.

• New Business

  • Can CAC monies go toward certain campus technology events?

    • Spike: It has been done. In the early years of CAC, a survey was conducted. Of course, it’s important that the committee be careful to make sure it’s an event that benefits students.

    • McLeod: If we can, then is that something that has to be an official proposal or is that something that we can be proactive about?

      • Bowman: Something to keep in mind. Though the guidelines document can be revised by this committee, as it is now, it would restrict certain things. Additionally, CAC is advisory to the Provost.

    • McLeod: So where does a proposal for a university-wide event come from then?

      • Booth: It would seem that CELT would be the logical source for a proposal like that

    • McLeod: Is there anything else for the good of the cause?

• Meeting adjourned