Meeting Minutes  
January 16, 2014

Agenda

Business Meeting
1) Call meeting to order; seating of substitutes  
2) Approvals
   a. Agenda  
   b. Minutes from last regular meeting, November 21, 2013  
3) Financial Report
   a. Income distribution and balance overview  
   b. Central Pool budget  
   c. Summary of “Unusual Expenses” in FY14  
4) Old Business
   a. CAC Initiatives  
5) New Business  
6) Good of the order  
7) Adjourn

Members Present: Eliot Winer (Chair), Adam Abbott (Student-LAS), Paul Bruski (Faculty-Design), Alex Byrd (Student-CALS), Gregory Davis (Staff-Library), Arne Hallam (Faculty-LAS), Travis Reed (for Wesley Hamstreet-GSB), Kyuho Lee (Student-HS), Young-A Lee (Faculty-HS), Akshaya Maller (Student-VM), Mervyn Marasinghe (Faculty-LAS), Divya Mistry (GPSS), Alejandro Ramirez (Faculty-VM), Gaylan Scofield (Faculty-LAS), Ekaterina Sinitskaya (Student-LAS), Jim Twetten (Staff-ITS), Ryan Williams (Student-Design)

Ex-Officio Members Present: Jim Davis (CIO), Brent Swanson (ITS), Lynette Sherer (ITS)

1. Meeting called to order by Eliot Winer, Chair
   a. Travis Reed was later seated as substitute for Wes Hamstreet.

2. Approvals
   a. Agenda – Gaylan Scofield moved to approve the agenda. Alex Ramirez seconded. Committee voted in favor, agenda approved.
   b. Minutes from November 21, 2013 meeting – Alex Ramirez moved to approve minutes from the November 21, 2013 meeting. Alex Byrd seconded. Committee approved the minutes as written.

3. Financial Report
   Financial report – Lynette Sherer provided a budget overview for FY14 for both distributed income across units including current balances as well as the Central Pool budget.
4. Old Business

CAC Initiatives -

Eliot introduced a new concept for the CAC Call for Proposals. He noted that Jim Davis and he are meeting with Provost Wickert tomorrow. Toward that, the committee goal is to establish the concept and solidify it after confirming its success. We also need to communicate a change in process to the campus.

What will the new process be (based on all needed approvals in place)?

- Multiple phase kind of thing (initial straw man) with these components:
  - Guidelines and documentation as to what should be on Techstarter.
  - How will we evaluate those and triage them
  - Then we identify the 4 or 5 we want to go for
  - Should gain a champion and where does that champion come from
  - A full proposal then needs to be developed (need to revisit components)
  - Then evaluate that; is there a presentation
  - How many times a year are we doing this?
- Need to complete the prototype by the end of this academic year and move to testing next year.
- Group response:
  - What about the groups that fall through the cracks? (Disability Resources, computer labs, student laptop checkouts for example)
  - Prioritizing – How will that occur? This may be an open-ended question until we see how many we get and the caliber. We may need to brainstorm the process.
    - Techstarter allows comments
  - Proposal section on sustainability is a throw away
  - Think tank for ideas (Stage 1)
    - Intent for funding is one-time although some projects merit that (wireless, classroom technology). Maybe we need to take a stance that this committee will not fund core initiatives that should be supported by the university.
    - Techstarter
      - What would the committee want to see here
        - Option of whether a submitter wants opportunity to speak on the topic.
        - Encourage adding images. (Feel free to attach pictures.)
        - Simple headers/questions/topics that could be answered (purpose, impact, community that would be served, technology that would be used, objectives, why would this make a difference, other members of a team prepared to work on this, example as to why this would be helpful, what
would this technology enable, what is the need you are trying to address, timeline) might add value.

- Need to define the process as to reviewing
  - Review each meeting (set aside 20 minutes) or establish a subcommittee that brings forward summary information. Decide if the committee wants to consider an idea further.
  - Need to have continuity in idea components and what we need in the proposal
  - Agenda item to engage members to see if they want to bring forward an idea or champion/vet an idea between one meeting and the next.

  ○ Stage 2 - If we agree the idea should move on, what next?
    - Champion is identified – how
      - Someone on the committee takes it or suggests someone they believe is best able to assist
      - Connect with local computer fee committee and they review and support idea – encourage those committees to review techstarter and pick up on ideas (communication point as well)
    - Keep proposal to two pages or less
      - Expand on impact, quality (leveraging)
      - Who is in charge
      - Timeline
      - Budget and justification (encourage cost sharing and match)
      - Integration
    - Written initially
      - Concern as to funding projects real-time and then not having $$ to fund a big project due to timing
      - Defining “educational technology” so people understand what CAC funds…and giving examples of what we have funded.

- Language out to community as to change in concept:
  - The last two years, CAC has put a large % of its money into large initiatives. As a result, our funding is more limited. And we are looking at ways of maximizing our funds, cancel the spring call, carry over the balance we have, and come up with a new process.
  - Over the past 3-4 years, it has become clear there are 2-3 types of requests we see that are recurring. We believe large projects across campus are a more effective use of our funds.
  - We have a wide range of needs and we need a process that encompasses all of that.
  - A running process is more effective rather than waiting for an annual call.
  - The annual call for proposals is not turning up the kind of proposals that the committee wants to see and the timing may not be right.
- The proposed process will solicit the voice of the entire community rather than faculty/staff only.

5. New Business
   None

6. Good of the Order
   There are wireless surveys underway now. People are walking around checking RF surveys on campus in buildings.

7. Adjourn
   Gaylan Scofield moved to adjourn. Divya Mistry seconded. Motion passed, meeting was adjourned.

Lynette Sherer
Information Technology Services