Computation Advisory Committee

Meeting Minutes

September 24, 2014

Agenda:
1. Call meeting to order; seating of substitutes
2. Welcome to CAC
3. Overview for new members
4. Approvals
   a. Agenda
   b. Minutes from last regular meeting, April 17, 2014
      (http://www.cio.iastate.edu/committees/cac/meetings/20140417/cac_minutes_2014-04-17.pdf)
   c. FY15 Calendar
   d. Financial Report
5. Old Business
6. New Business
   a. Unit and initiative reports
   b. Administrative audit
   c. Central Pool budget
   d. Techstarter/New Funding model
7. Good of the Order
8. Adjourn

Members Present: Eliot Winer (chair), Adam Eby (Student-VM), Drew Mogler (Student-CALS), Wes Hamstreet (Student-GSB), Mervyn Marasinghe (Faculty-LAS), Gaylan Scofield (Faculty-CALS), Kevin Scheibe (Faculty-Bus), Adam Abbott (Student-LAS), Divya Mistry (Student-GPSS), Jennifer Nieland (Staff-DES), Greg Davis (Staff-LIB), Alejandro Ramirez (Faculty-VM), Jim Twetten (Staff-ITS)

Ex-Officio Members Present: Jim Davis (CIO), Allan Schmidt (CELT), Brent Swanson (ITS)

1. Call meeting to order; seating of substitutes
   Eliot Winer called the meeting to order.

2. Welcome to CAC
   Members went around the room and introduced themselves.
3. Overview for new members
Eliot discussed the CAC mission and everything CAC does. He showed how the money flows through CAC and is passed onto the colleges and units on campus.

4. Approvals
   a. Agenda – Gaylan Scofield moved to approve the agenda; Wes Hamstreet seconded. Motion passed.
   b. Minutes from last regular meeting, April 17, 2014 – Alex Ramirez moved to approve; Gaylan Scofield seconded. Motion passed.
   c. FY15 Calendar – It was decided that CAC would continue this semester with Wednesday night meetings and in the spring semester move back to Thursdays at 5.
   d. Financial Report – Brent Swanson showed how much money had moved through CAC for FY’ 14 and pointed out current balances in the unit and college CAC accounts.

5. Old Business – There was no old business to discuss.

6. New Business
   a. Unit and initiative reports – Brent showed the committee where unit reports were on the CAC website as well as the initiative reports.
   b. Administrative audit – The committee discussed each line item from the audit. The first two line items need additional information from the colleges. The remainder of the line items are ok being paid with CAC funds.
   c. Central Pool budget – Brent explained the wireless enterprise initiatives as well as the annual general commitments.
   d. Techstarter/New Funding model
      i. Eliot talked about the flow diagram for Techstarter projects. He said every meeting we will look at Techstarter ideas. He said that for every project we say “yes” to, we will designate a member (mentor) on the committee to that project. They might help to write the proposal, especially if they are students.
      ii. Those that submit the ideas will have two CAC meetings if we like the idea, to submit it as a proposal. In the proposal stage, we are looking for purpose, impact and integration of current technology and infrastructure, and a budget.
      iii. Before we can start using Techstarter we need the support of various people per Jonathan Wickert. We have 2/3rds, we just need to run this by GSB & GPSS. If all goes well, Techstarter will be implemented by the next meeting so we can begin evaluations of ideas.
      iv. Mervyn asked how will we publicize the website. Eliot responded that we are not allowed to blanket the university with email. Instead we would use Inside Iowa State, Facebook, etc. Eliot asked for students what the best way to get the message out. Kevin Scheibe said that we could announce it to various campus clubs with Wes Hamstreet adding we should announce to all clubs. Divya Mistry
also stated we could advertise the website in magazines on campus, ISU Daily – online addition, and Design magazine.

v. Eliot asked for one or two volunteers to take on the channels to get the message out. Jim Twetten mentioned he could help in the communication process. Allan Schmidt said that committee members could spread the word 1 on 1 with faculty and staff.

vi. Eliot hoped to meet in the next week or two with GSB and GPSS and then email Jonathan Wickert for final signoff.

vii. Adam Abbott asked if there would be an incentive for students to submit proposals. Eliot stated the university would not allow for financial incentive. Adam responded that it would be great if it was even something students could put on their resume something along the lines of “Educational Technology Innovator”. Eliot said whatever title was decided on, we could also use that as the title for our central pool line item.

7. Good of the Order.


Brent Swanson
IT Services Ex Officio