Meeting Minutes
April 18, 2013

Agenda

1) Call meeting to order; seating of substitutes
2) Approvals
   a. Agenda
   b. Minutes from last regular meeting, March 28, 2013
3) Financial Report
4) Old Business
   a. Wireless update (Jennifer Lohrbach)
   b. Laptop checkout (Jim Twetten)
   c. CAC Call for Proposals
      1. Update (Lynette Sherer)
      2. Next year’s process? Rethink – Do proposals represent our goals?
5) New Business
   a. Engineering request for unusual expense
   b. Discussion of student technology fee
6) Good of the order
7) Adjourn

Members Present: Eliot Winer, Chair, Greg Davis (LIB), Daniel Dowd (LAS), Arne Hallam (LAS), Steven Harm (GSB), Erich Hodges (CALS), LaDon Jones (ENG), Young-A Lee (HS), Mervyn Marasinghe (LAS), Kris Michalson (Vet Med), Divya Mistry (GPSS), Alejandro Ramirez (Vet Med), Valentina Salotti (BUS), Joshua Schroetter (ENG), Gaylan Scofield (CALS), Ekaterina Sinitskaya (LAS), Jim Twetten, ITS, Bryce Williams (BUS)

Ex-Officio Members Present: Lynette Sherer (ITS), Allan Schmidt (CELT), Brent Swanson (ITS)
Guests: Wesley Hamstreet (future GSB representative), Jennifer Lohrbach (presenter, ITS)

1. **Meeting called to order by Eliot Winer, Chair**

2. **Approvals**
   a. **Agenda** – Alex Ramirez moved to approve the agenda. LaDon Jones seconded. Committee voted in favor, and the agenda was approved.
   b. **Minutes from March 28, 2013 meeting** –
      Gaylan moved to approve the meeting minutes for March 28, 2013. Erich Hodges seconded. Committee approved the minutes as written.

3. **Financial Report**
   *Financial report* – Lynette Sherer provided a financial overview of income distributed to date along with the Central Pool budget.
4. Old Business

a. Wireless Update (Jennifer Lohrbach) –

Jennifer Lohrbach noted that over the last year ITS has been working against the $1m allocated by CAC for the wireless upgrade. As far as the technology, they are still focused on 802.11n. New technology (802.11ac) will be ratified later this year with new equipment coming out next year. At that time, ITS will start acquiring the new technology. Regarding the $1m, to date ITS has installed 350 access points and they expect to install about 450 total. Along with the 350, they have added about 300 in the residence halls. A lot of departmental spaces (~250) were also added so about 1,000 access points have been added to date. The committee raised the issue as to streaming video by students against a normal access point, and Jen noted that the wiring is another three-year project with 1,000 access points per year which is pretty aggressive. It was noted the new phone system will not really impact wireless delivery.

b. Laptop Checkout (Jim Twetten) –

Jim Twetten noted that this topic has come up a few times as to establishing a line item in the Central Pool budget for this. In looking at permanently funding this, he would like to go back and look at usage patterns and feather that against other priorities in the ITS Academic Technologies area. There have been 3,500 checkouts in the last year of the 90 machines. Since CAC just approved this proposal again for the coming year, he wants to look at more proactively rolling through new technology. Getting classrooms online with increased enrollments may have higher priority. Maybe a permanent line item for “Device Distribution” would be a more appropriate fit. The group asked for student demographic data (national versus international, year, major, etc.). The group encouraged a more aggressive approach to newer devices.

c. CAC Call for Proposals –

Lynette shared the following information as to progress on the FY14 awards.

- Diana Peterson accepted the terms stated by the committee.
- The request from Arne Hallam, Pro Tem Chair, is with the Provost and upon his endorsement awards will be issued, publicized and posted to the website.

What about next year’s process? Rethink? Do proposals represent our goals?

- What really comes to CAC? Projects not funded by colleges or proposals from units that don’t have access to CAC funds. It used to be those that were too big for a college.
- What we are seeing the last couple of years is very different from an innovation standpoint.
- With changes in the budget model and a strategic activity, then the college funds it.
- It was noted that the fall initiative (2010) was “different” and we might want to consider doing that again. And maybe we want to change the timing of the call to be more real-time for students.
- How about a theme for the proposals (such as overloaded classes)? Those that come in associated with the theme would have the highest priority.
- One area that would be beneficial is more interdepartmental, cross college collaboration. Now, with the distributive model no department or college will fund another department or college as it is not beneficial. Should a proposal be interdepartmental?
- Also, active research faculty will be looking at this opportunity. Research groups are pushed
to go after big money projects. If you put a lot of conditions on this, research faculty won’t do this.

- Or push the money up in size of award and make it “real” money.
- If we took this money and concentrated on upgrading classrooms, would that be beneficial? Maybe a proposal from a college for classroom upgrade may be the thing we need to fund.
- Compared to classrooms, is there interest in wireless versus classrooms. It was noted that a classroom in Gilman is neglected.
- How about distributing money back out to units if there isn’t need?
- Maybe representatives should go back to the departments and get feedback from people on the ground.

5. New Business
   a. ENG unusual expense request – Eliot advocated for this request and noted that Mechanical Engineering is the biggest department on campus and their student to faculty ratio is 40:1. They are in need of space and going through their rooms to see if they could update and get more students in. In this case, Mechanical Engineering can double the capacity of the room. This is a technology and teaching classroom. Because this is also a computer lab when the room is not for teaching, Arne Hallam moved to support this. Erich Hodges seconded. The committee voted to approve this request.
   b. Discussion of student technology fee – Eliot invited comments to share with Jim Davis, Chief Information Officer, as to the fee and any proposed increase
      - It was noted that LAS pretty much has the money to do the things that have to be done. LAS was tight this spring but it was because they did quite a few creative things. There was concern as to raising the student fees if it is to do a lot of creative, innovative things.
      - CALS and ENG noted they have sufficient funds for their current needs. Balances in departments are carrying needed projects.
      - Vet Med is exploring a differential fee of $80/semester (~$50k/year addl income) to upgrade classrooms.
      - Human Sciences is okay.
      - Design may want to consider a differential fee rather than request raising the general fee.
      - Business says they have a differential fee and it takes care of their needs.
      - Library made a case to raise the fee based on the inflationary cost of technology. They also noted that enrollment is cyclical and the opportunity to catch up once enrollment goes down is gone. Eliot noted that it is hard to plan for something we don’t know will happen, and right now the level of funding is adequate. Therefore, this approach would not be a valid argument.
      - Eliot noted that tying an increase to a simple measurement and applying it across the board doesn’t seem appropriate.
      - Students noted that a lot of things funded through CAC are longer-term and they are okay with this. There needs to be a mix of long-term and short-term projects.

6. Good of the Order
   Eliot thanked everyone for their service on the committee this year. He noted the committee has
oversight of approximately $8m and the effort of the committee is appreciated. Looking ahead, he asked the group to start thinking about the challenges of additional money due to enrollment and meeting the needs of a larger student body. He reminded the group that there is a line item on the Central Pool budget for “Major Initiatives” and we could fund other special initiatives such as online classrooms, portal software, cloud services, etc. Eliot asked that representatives email him or the committee with an idea or seed. This team could be the driver for this if the students support that.

It was also noted that instructors don’t always know how to use the technology. An initiative to help them would be good.

The committee agreed that a request should go forward for staff assistance to further wiring and classroom upgrade. Eliot will work with Jim Davis on this request to the Provost.

7. **Adjourn**
   Erich Hodges moved to adjourn. Divya Mistra seconded. Motion passed, and the meeting was adjourned.
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