Meeting Minutes
April 22, 2010

Agenda:
1. Call meeting to order
2. Approvals
   a. Agenda
   b. Minutes from March 21 meeting
   c. Minutes from April 15 meeting
   d. Financial reports
      i. FY10 Computer Fee Income Summary (Sherer)
3. Old Business
   a. Central Pool overview (Sherer)
4. New Business
   a. Proposed income distribution model for FY11 (Sherer)
   b. Proposed change in reporting (see handout)
   c. Proposed change in “Appropriate Expenditure Guideline”
   d. Review of FY11 Call process
   e. CELT proposal
5. Good of the Order
6. Adjourn

Members Present: Jim Davis (Interim Chair), Larry Booth (Vet Med), Cameron Campbell (Design), Dean Feasenhiser (Vet Med), Fred Gulden (Library), Erich Hodges (CALS), Ivon Katz (LAS), Mervyn Marasinghe (LAS), Misha Rajaram (GPSS), Denise Schmidt (HS), Gaylan Scofield (CALS), Jim Twetten (TTS), Eliot Winer (Engr), Brandon Wlosinski (Design).

Ex-Officio Members Present: Ying Cai (Comp Sci), Jonathan Salvador (TTS), Allan Schmidt (CELT), Lynette Sherer (TTS).

1. Meeting called to order at 5:09 p.m.
Davis welcomed the committee and stated that approval of the April 15 meeting needed to be added to the agenda. Davis also noted that the committee needed a chair for next year, so it would be good to have a nominee in the next few weeks.

2. Approvals
   a. Agenda
      Agenda was approved.
   b. Minutes from March 25 meeting
      Gulden noted a correction was needed to clarify his statement regarding creative use of funds.
Meeting minutes were approved.

c. Minutes from April 15 meeting
   Meeting minutes were approved.

d. Financial reports
   See “2009-2010 Computer Fee Income Summary” handout.
   Financial reports were approved.

3. Old Business
   a. Central Pool overview (Sherer)
      See “Central Fee Pool - FY ’10” handout.

4. New Business
   a. Proposed income distribution model for FY11 (Sherer)

      After reviewing the status of the unspent balance, discussion ensued on the possibility of reallocating part of the unspent balance through the normal CAC algorithm back to the colleges, or alternatively having a one-time special call for large projects.

      Gulden moved that $350K of the contingency be distributed out using the CAC allocation algorithm. Scofield seconded. The motion passed.

      Twetten moved that a competitive proposal process offering $400K for one or two projects be set up (or more if the next CAC decides to add to that amount). Katz seconded. The motion passed.

   b. Proposed change in reporting (see handout)

      Davis said that a couple of years ago, CAC overhauled the requirements for the annual reports from colleges and units. On one hand, the new requirements provided useful information. On the other hand, the new reporting guidelines required much more time to create the reports. CAC received a request to allow transaction detail information from the WebFM system make the reporting process easier.

      After some discussion, Campbell moved to empower the Chair to explore a simpler reporting format. Twetten seconded. The motion passed.

   c. Proposed change in “Appropriate Expenditure Guideline”

      Davis introduced two proposed changes to the Appropriate Expenditure Guidelines. First, under section 1, the following was proposed to be added, “4. Supportable information
technology includes devices and software used for the acquisition, processing, and testing of data, as long as the use is directly related to instruction.”

Second, there was a proposed addition to section 2, “H. GRADUATE STUDENT TUITION for students working on CAC projects and initiatives, and state or external funds are not available to support this cost.”

Committee members suggested new language which is reflected in the Appendix A of these minutes. There was a motion to accept the proposed language change. Gulden seconded. The motion passed.

d. Review of FY11 Call process

Item was tabled.

e. CELT proposal

Allan Schmidt said that CELT provides essential services to the university in supporting technology through faculty training, and that it might make sense for CELT to become a regularly funded unit of CAC. CAC suggested that CELT pursue on-going support for programs through the normal unit budgeting process.

5. **Good of the Order**

   No items.

6. **Adjourn**

   Meeting was adjourned at 7:12 p.m.
Appendix A

Guidelines for Appropriate Expenditure of Income from the
Student Computer/Technology Fee
Approved by Computation Advisory Committee, CAC, on May 9, 1991

These guidelines apply to the use of all student computer/technology fee funds (Central Pool, College Pool, or any other funds supported by student computer/technology fees). The expectation is that committees with half of their members consisting of Iowa State students establish priorities and make decisions about the expenditure of student computer/technology fees. The Computation Advisory Committee, CAC, should be consulted for interpretation of these guidelines or the perceived need for revisions of these guidelines.

I. USE CATEGORIES
A. The types of uses deemed to be supportable are:
   1. Information technology resources for all Iowa State University students.
   2. Information technology resources by faculty and staff (provided that such use is directly related to instruction).
   3. Wiring required for operation of equipment purchased with CAC funds.
Supportable information technology includes devices and software used for the acquisition, processing, and testing of data, as long as the use is directly related to instruction.

B. The types of uses deemed inappropriate for support are:
   1. Sponsored research and consulting by students, faculty or staff.
   2. Unsponsored research or consulting by faculty or staff.
   3. Staff work not directly related to instruction.
   4. Construction and renovation of physical facilities, including furniture.
   5. Purchase of major information technology equipment (greater than $25K per system) without consultation with CAC.
   6. Personnel on appointments exceeding two years.

II. EXPENDITURE CATEGORIES (intended principally for the supportable uses listed in section IA)
A. HARDWARE – Purchase, maintenance, replacements or upgrades of university-owned equipment
B. SOFTWARE – Purchase, maintenance, replacements or upgrades for university owned machines and/or site licenses
C. EXPENDABLE SUPPLIES (e.g., paper, toner, media, etc.)
D. STUDENT ACCESS TO NETWORKS
E. **SECURITY AND PROTECTION** against loss through theft of computers and computer peripherals (e.g. tie downs, special door locks, video surveillance systems, and payment of insurance premiums)

F. **SUPPORT PERSONNEL** directly involved with hardware/software assistance and maintenance (e.g. lab monitors)

G. **PERSONNEL INVOLVED IN COURSE DEVELOPMENT** as deemed appropriate by the colleges and departments for courses that make use of information technology resources. These expenditures may be for all Iowa State University student support, Information Technology Services personnel support, and general support costs (which may include expenditures to foster and promote course development).

H. **GRADUATE STUDENT TUITION** for students working on CAC projects and initiatives when state or external funds are not available to support this cost.

I. **OTHER SERVICES or FEES** related to the use of information technology for class development or delivery.