Computation Advisory Committee

Meeting Minutes

April 17, 2014

Agenda:

1) Call meeting to order; seating of substitutes

2) Approvals
   a. Agenda
   b. Minutes from last regular meeting, March 27, 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. Appropriate Expenditure Guidelines (see handouts)
   b. Update - Communication overview, and next steps for techstarter/proposals

5) New Business
   a. Changes in distributing print subsidies
   b. Rebudgeting and no-cost extension request from Diana Peterson (see handouts)
   c. No-cost extension request from Joyce Hammen (see handouts)

6) Good of the order

7) Adjourn

Members Present: Eliot Winer (Chair), Adam Abbott (Student-LAS), Anson Call (for Paul Bruski; Faculty-DES), Greg Davis (Staff-LIB), Arne Hallam (Faculty-LAS), Young-A Lee (Faculty-HS), Mervyn Marasinghe (Faculty-LAS), Divya Mistry (GPSS), Alejandro Ramirez (Faculty-VM), Gaylan Scofield (Faculty-CALS), Ekaterina Sinitskaya (Student-LAS), Jim Twetten (Staff-ITS), Ryan Williams (Student-DES)

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

1. Call meeting to order; seating of substitutes
   Eliot Winer called the meeting to order. The chair recognized Anson Call who is substituting for Paul Bruski, faculty representative from the College of Design.

2. Approvals
   a. Agenda – Jim Twetten moved to approve the agenda; Gaylan Scofield seconded. Motion passed.
b. Minutes of the last meeting – Alex Ramirez moved to approve; Ryan Williams seconded. Motion passed.

3. Financial Report
   a. Income distribution and balance overview – Lynette pointed out that there is $184,536 left to allocate for spring 2014 SCH prorated income. This represents 20% of the spring 2014 total SCH prorated income. The first 80% was distributed as preliminary income based on RMM data. The remaining distribution cannot be done until final data is received from Institutional Research.
   b. Central Pool budget – Lynette noted that the Central Pool receives approximately $1.3m per year. With the $1m wireless commitment out of FY15 income plus the general commitments that next year’s income is fully committed. Therefore, the “Available for Commitment” balance is fairly static through the next fiscal year.
   c. Summary of Unusual Expenses – Lynette noted that the approved requests last month are now included in the annual summary. The College of Engineering confirmed that CBE would support 50% of the FP&M renovation costs for the project that the committee gave contingent approval. Therefore, it has been approved to move forward.

4. Old Business
   a. Appropriate Expenditure Guidelines – There was discussion as to proposed language to add individual laptops and tablets to the unusual expense category. (Remove “Also” in *content). With this edit, Arne Hallam moved to accept the modifications to the Appropriate Expenditure Guidelines. Jim Twetten seconded. Motion passed.
   b. Update – Communication overview, and next steps for techstarter/proposals
      i. Eliot noted that Provost Wickert wanted to be sure the direction would be impactful. And he was sensitive to student technology fees. So, Eliot is in the process of soliciting approval from upper level administration, GSB and GPSS and no change would be made until then. So far, all have responded positively although not all needed meetings have occurred yet.
      ii. Eliot also noted we should not send out an email to the entire university community until fully approved. He noted that CAC representatives at that point can distribute further in their units and Eliot will engage deans. Regarding students, we want to get information out on FB, Twitter, and other social media.
      iii. Eliot also noted that we are getting approval for both the concept and the process with Eliot’s presentation and the flow chart.
      iv. Once everything is set, President Leath will need to sign off. Then we can roll out in the fall including communication announcing this.
      v. Point of clarification – “not beyond the third meeting date without committee approval” includes the first meeting where the proposal is presented.
      vi. How do we evaluate techstarter ideas? Not clear yet; it is important to keep the onboarding easy without early requirements. This process will evolve.
vii. It was also noted that we need to address the life of the proposal on techstarter and associated comments.

viii. How do we keep techstarter from becoming CAC only? Comments:
1. Could replicate the techstarter concept and it would be only CAC ("CACstarter" for example)
2. May be a communication issue in that techstarter is a distributed process. If people start to see that, it may help clarify that
3. Doesn’t recommend two sites.
4. Need those who want specific consideration by CAC to indicate such. Once we decide it is a “no” or “yes” by CAC, we need a way to indicate that (maybe #CAC) w/o review notations.
5. Do we need to make the link from techstarter proposals to CAC by the proposer?
6. It appears there are two types of groups and do they need to self identify (such as being a student). This might mean that certain information won’t be required of a student since they would not know.
7. Or check a radio button for consideration by all funding sources or individual boxes (such as CAC).
8. Why indicate CAC at all? Student computer fees would be more understandable. (Eliot and Jim Twetten will mock up some content for the techstarter site and get committee input.)

ix. How do we notify people?
1. How do we avoid negative comments on the techstarter site?
2. What if we take it forward? Does the idea stay out there? Jim Twetten noted that on each of the projects that have been moved to the committee stage, that a note can be added to techstarter inviting others to contact the leader and become involved.
3. There has to be a point where the proposal comes down.
4. What happens if a popular proposal keeps getting kicked back? We should review it, and we would need to communicate effectively including other options for funding.
5. Then the idea is that we don’t ever take them down…maintaining history. And having them stay up could spark other ideas or they could morph.
6. Maybe a green/progress bar as to the stages of review of each proposal.

c. Eliot noted he and Jim would come up with some draft language for the buttons and also a progress bar. Committee input will be engaged via email.
d. Gaylan Scofield volunteered video resources for a 1-minute clip as to success stories. Jim Twetten noted also that he is going to do a media blitz about techstarter.
e. Eliot would like an early meeting in September to get this finalized and announced.
f. Over the summer, the two-page template will be sent out for committee review.

5. New Business
a. Changes in distributing print subsidies –
   i. Brent Swanson talked about a PaperCut and printing change over the last year. ITS has made some major changes to the funding distribution and streamlining the process in getting funds back out to units. The integrity of income is now maintained (CAC versus u-Bill) along with ITS no longer taking a per copy cost for expenses which supported the PaperCut license, etc. CAC is now providing that directly. Now Brent no longer has to do the calculation so money can flow directly to units. In addition, we are automating the income directly to the units without flowing through ITS. Lynette emphasized that it is important to note that the transfer of income is to offset expenses at the local level. The transfer of printing subsidies is not an expense.
   ii. Eliot noted he had a meeting with a GSB rep about printing costs. Printing in general is on GSB’s radar. There are a number of things they are paying attention to and would like addressed. An issue they had is how the credits work, difference in printing costs, some colleges where they run out but another college where there have credits, etc. A comprehensive strategy is needed, and Eliot committed to support GSB as to bringing it to CAC.

b. Rebudgeting and no-cost extension request from Diana Peterson – Greg Davis moved to approve; Arne Hallam seconded. Motion passed.

c. No-cost extension request from Joyce Hammen – Eliot noted that he approved this. The committee supported Eliot’s decision.

6. Good of the order
   a. Eliot thanked everyone for their service and recognized representatives who are ending their terms.
   b. Jim Twetten noted an opportunity to hear from the Educause President, Debra Oblinger, who will be speaking at the Memorial Union on Monday evening.

7. Adjourn – Arne Hallam moved to adjourn; Divya Mistra seconded. Motion passed.

Addendum – 5/6/14

An unusual request was received 4/28/14 from the College of Engineering (Aerospace Engineering) to merge lab facilities (EM321L and EM327) in 0638 and 0257 Howe Hall. This was an unusual expense due to the cost level of the project, $150,000. By email, the committee reviewed and the resulting vote was 14 yes, 1 no, and 1 abstain. The request was approved.

Addendum – 5/30/14

An unusual request was received 5/19/14 from the College of Engineering (Mechanical Engineering) for electrical work ($7,000). This was an unusual expense due electrical being considered a “Renovation”
expense. By email, the committee reviewed and the resulting vote was 16 year, 0 no, and 0 abstain. The request was approved.

Lynette Sherer
CAC Administrative Liaison