Computation Advisory Committee

AGENDA

March 27, 2014

Business Meeting
1) Call meeting to order; seating of substitutes
2) Approvals
   a. Agenda
   b. Minutes from last regular meeting, January 16, 2014
3) Financial Report
   a. Income distribution and balance overview
   b. Central Pool budget
   c. Summary of “Unusual Expenses” in FY14
4) Old Business
   a. Update - Wireless
   b. Update - Communication overview, and next steps for techstarter/proposals
5) New Business
   a. Recurring transaction audit and unusual expenses
   b. Unusual expense requests
      1. Aerospace Engineering
      2. Chemical & Biological Systems Engineering
      3. Industrial & Manufacturing Systems Engineering
      4. Political Science
6) Good of the order
7) Adjourn

Members Present: Jim Twetten, Pro Tem Chair, Adam Abbott (Student-LAS), Paul Bruski (Faculty-Design), Alex Byrd (Student-CALS), Gregory Davis (Staff-Library), Arne Hallam (Faculty-LAS), Kyuho Lee (Student-HS), Young-A Lee (Faculty-HS), Akshaya Maller (Student-VM), Mervyn Marasinghe (Faculty-LAS), Divya Mistry (GPSS), Alejandro Ramirez (Faculty-VM), Valentina Salotti (Faculty-Business), Gaylan Scofield (Faculty-LAS), Ekaterina Sinitskaya (Student-LAS), Ryan Williams (Student-Design)

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

1) Call meeting to order; seating of substitutes
   Jim Twetten, Pro Tem Chair, called the meeting to order. There were no substitutes.
2) Approvals
   a. Agenda – Alex Ramirez moved to approve the agenda; Gaylan Scofield seconded. Motion passed.
   b. Minutes of last meeting – Alex Ramirez moved to approve; Divya Mistry seconded. Motion passed.

3) Financial Report
   a. Income distribution and balance overview – Lynette pointed out that this shows $1.2m in the college pool cell that has been or will be distributed for fall final SCH and Spring preliminary SCH.
   b. Central Pool budget – Lynette pointed out Excel cell that includes the uncommitted and available monies for further allocation. This would be where future CAC initiatives would be funded from.

4) Old Business
   a. Update on wireless -
      i. Jim Davis noted we have had success in securing wireless funds from central which triggers the match by CAC. With CAC stepping up, this was a compelling story. Jim thanked the committee for their support. Where we are – ITS went ahead and started the engineering ahead of the funding with the idea that wireless would be updated annually. That study is almost done, and ITS is in the process of ordering more access points and other equipment. Things are moving forward.
   b. Update – Communication overview, and next steps for techstarter/proposals
      i. Jim Twetten noted that the discussions that have been occurring this spring since the committee last met have been favorable. However, significant changes are proposed so there has been a lot of dialog as to high level questions.
      ii. After a series of discussions, we have arrived at a process. And we will through this tonight to see if the committee has feedback. The goal is to hopefully come to resolution and agreement with Eliot and Jim Davis some action items before the next CAC meeting.
      iii. Jim walked us through the flow diagram of the process. This diagram is being fine tuned and will be shared at the next meeting.
      iv. Comments/suggestions from committee –
         1. Give proposers 5 days before a scheduled CAC meeting but not beyond 3 meetings after.
         2. Mentors may ask for time on the agenda for questions of the committee or get feedback after assigned and before the full proposal is presented to the committee.
         3. Because we have a limited pool of resources and get maybe 10 proposals really quick, is it possible to delay funding consideration? This would better allow for a great idea to be considered when funding is absent (when presented).
         4. With a rolling process, maybe we need to fund some, shelve some, etc.
5. Regarding timing, does a rolling process create some problems and maybe we should move to once a semester or twice a semester?
6. Just because CAC likes rolling, rolling may not work for units when it comes to matching.
7. If we put things on the shelf when we run out of money, we will automatically put those back in the hopper in the next cycle?
8. Maybe we should build on the idea that we would spend the residual balance on the previous year’s income and the committee would know the limits of their commitments.
   a. Proposed: Spend last semester’s residual balance rather than annual.
9. Maybe the committee would set aside an amount of money that could be available for that really great idea (to be sure funding exists).
10. The committee should keep high standards.
11. The committee would like a copy of this chart. Jim noted that after some minor modifications and the committee will get a copy in its final format.
12. Maybe we should lock in three meetings after idea is picked up and could be extended if committee endorses.
13. Jim pointed out the decision box as to reviewing full proposals and what is the process criteria.
   a. Proposed to remove points from the same criteria as in the past since there is no ranking…just a vote.
14. Jim asked what the committee wants to see to review these at the idea stage.
   a. One paragraph summary and why this is important and who does it impact.
   b. Links to more information.
   c. Word limit of some kind to keep it succinct…200 words or less.
15. We need to be clear that the colleges realize they don’t have a decision role as to CAC Central funding.
16. After we have that first idea and kick it to the next step, the colleges should be aware at that point. That way something is not funded if the college doesn’t want it to happen.
17. Let the college committee know what we are considering for funding.
18. The Chair of CAC may be the best communicator to the college (either fee committee or dean’s office) as to the yay or nay at the idea stage.
19. Maybe we need college sign off prior to considering the full proposal.
20. Proper signatures on the full one proposal.
21. Add a category of “Conditional Approval” in the full proposal decision process…reflect

5) Recurring transaction
   a. Laptops for faculty?
i. Should be approved by CAC prior to purchase
   1. Laptops or tablets that are not available for checkout or in a computer lab/laptop cart and used for educational purposes.
   2. Any laptop or tablet not primarily used by students.
b. Laptops for Lecturers? Holds true for this bullet as well. Bundled with first bullet.
c. Regarding student advisor – same response
d. PhD offices and lounges – done and regularly if more than one to one (used by more than one person)
e. Replacement TV? –
f. Lynette will draft new expenditure guidelines and bring to committee at the next meeting review and for approval.
6) Unusual Expense requests
   a. Aerospace Engineering – Moved by Arne; then Gaylan to approve. Passed.
   b. CBE – Motion to ask CBE to cover ½ of renovation costs with rest covered by student technology fees. Then CAC will approve it. Arne moved; Gaylan seconded. Passed.
   c. IMSE – Arne moved to approve; Paul seconded. Passed.
   d. Political Science – Mervyn moved to approve; Alex seconded. Passed.
7) Good of the order
   None
8) Move to adjourn – Arne Hallam moved to approve; Alex Ramirez seconded. Passed.