Computation Advisory Committee

Meeting Minutes

September 24, 2015

Business Meeting
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 16, 2015
   c. FY16 Calendar
   d. Financial Reports
5. Old Business
   a. Techstarter overview/proposal process
   b. BCBGSO Laptop Upgrade formal proposal
   c. Collaborative Assessment Tool in Thinkspace formal proposal
   d. KURE Production Upgrade formal proposal
6. New Business
   a. Unit and initiative reports
   b. Administrative audit
   c. ME Unusual Request – Floor panels in 95 Black Eng.
   d. Techstarter new proposals
7. Good of the Order
8. Adjourn

Members Present: Alex Ramirez (chair), Gaylan Scofield (CALS), Jorge Blanco (LAS), Michael Knight (CALS), John Sawatzky (LAS), Denise Crawford (HS), Changhyun Nam (HS), Bharat Agrawal (GPSS), Cory Preston (Engineering), Patrick Hepner (Vet Med), Kyle Douglas (GSB), Jim Twetten (ITS), Austin Viall (Vet Med), Otavio Camargo-Bartalotti (LAS), Arne Hallam (LAS), Greg Davis (Library), Xiaolu Wang (Business).

Ex-Officio Members Present: Brent Swanson (ITS), Jim Kurtenbach (ITS), Eliot Winer (former chair), Wensheng Zhang (Computer Science), Allan Schmidt (CELT).
1. Call meeting to order; seating of substitutes
   a. Michael Knight was seated as a substitute for Drew Mogler, student representative of CALS.
   b. Denise Crawford was seated as a substitute for Young-A Lee, representative of HS.

2. Welcome to CAC
   a. The committee went around the room and introduced themselves.

3. Overview for New Members
   a. A brief history was given by Alex Ramirez and Brent Swanson about the history of CAC, its mission and the distribution of funds. Alex mentioned that the mission statement of CAC is somewhat outdated and may need to be revised.

4. Approvals
   a. Motion to approve agenda from last regular meeting, April 16th, 2015 – Gaylan Scofield moved to approve the agenda, Arne Hallam seconded. Motion passed.
   b. Motion was made to approve minutes from last regular meeting, April 16th, 2015 – Jim Twetten moved to approve the minutes, Arne seconded. Motion passed.
   c. FY16 Calendar.
   d. Financial Reports
      Brent discussed the final financial reports for FY ’15. He called attention to the fact that last year 9.5 million in computer fee money was received by colleges and units. He also pointed out that carryforward balances by departments was just over around 6.8 million which is consistent with the last three years. He also mentioned that the central pool budget the committee has to work with is around 1.5 million. Due to several Techstarter projects approved last spring, the carryforward is starting at a negative amount available for commitment.

5. Old Business
   a. Techstarter overview/proposal process – Alex stated that the idea was to create a process that wasn’t limited to colleges and move away from small impact projects and broaden impact of computer fees. Jim Twetten mentioned that IT Services wanted to setup a way for new engaging and innovative ideas with in a low-barrier sort of way. Alex also mentioned that Techstarter was not created for CAC but was something our committee jumped on. Arne added that we did not want to get a situation where the university is hurting for money and would look at CAC for funds; we wanted proposals to be related directly to students.
   b. BCBGSO Laptop Upgrade formal proposal – Jim Twetten mentioned there are other checkout programs on campus but with shorter checkout terms. Arne stated with this program, there are multi-disciplines involved. It is not directly for one college. Alex said that since it is multi-colleges, the challenge is who do they go to for funding? The
question is, is it an efficient way to have a checkout program. Eliot Winer stated that a concern he has is how will it not be used for research? Jim Kurtenbach mentioned that this proposal maybe an example where he pulls this proposal back to get units to buy in a more sufficient fashion with bulk purchase pricing. There’s a potential to save 30-40% when buying in bulk. Otavio Camargo-Bartalotti asked if computational power in labs would be sufficient for these students, with Arne stating that an alternative could be creating a ‘grad-student lab’. Bharat Agrawal inquired about the software that is available on these machines. Denise Schmidt stated that she believes the research part of the proposal needs clarified and to remind them that CAC funds are not to be used for research. Jim Kurtenbach asked that we pull this proposal for now. He will address this one with the colleges.

c. Collaborative Assessment Tool in Thinkspace formal proposal – Jim Twetten stated that Thinkspace is a collection of tools in IT Services started as an experimental program. This proposal is to add another tool that currently does not exist. Otavio asked what is the situation of the platform now, is it owned by Iowa State and could we potentially have royalties coming for this project? Jim Twetten replied that he does not necessarily have an answer right now, historically faculty have allowed users to freely access it. It is a platform that does not have a business plan moving forward. Denise mentioned that a year or two ago ISU was talking about Thinkspace going away. She inquired about the sustainability now that a 3rd party has taken this product over. Alex asked if this is something they would be coming back for in another year and ask for additional funds for module 2, module 3, etc. Otavio mentioned that the proposal needs a strategy for more people to use with a sustainability component. It was decided that Alex and Brent would contact the proposer of this initiative with a few questions related to sustainability and business model.

d. KURE Production Upgrade formal proposal – Otavio asked if this was mainly an internship type of position. Eliot responded that it is more of a club that is completely student run. Bharat mentioned that he had participated in Kaleidoquiz and that their impact is much broader than that. Jim K. mentioned that there are over 800 other student organizations on campus and that this could open the flood gates for more student organizations. Otavio asked if we can attach any restrictions or ask if they had other funding sources they’ve considered. Gaylan asked if they sell any advertisements and that he would like to see a list of income and expenses to see what they are working with. Otavio said he’d be willing to entertain matching funds if they were to ask Alumni, etc. It was also mentioned that we should remind them about proper expenditures and make purchases through Purchasing. This proposal was tabled until we can get more information from them.

6. New Business
a. Unit and initiative reports – Brent mentioned that all the unit reports were now posted to the CAC website. This was the first year he could recall that all units had submitted their reports before the first CAC meeting.

b. Administrative audit – Brent conducted an audit of all CAC expenses for all units looking for any expenses that were out of line or staff that had been listed at more than 50%. He did not find any expenses that needed further investigation.

c. ME Unusual Request – Floor panels in 95 Black Engineering – Denise said the phrase that speaks to her is that it will add an “additional 22 seats”, that is a premium on campus. Greg motioned to approve. Jim T. seconded. Motion passed.

d. Techstarter new proposals – Alex said that with so many new proposals and to save time on the full committee having to look at all of them, he recommended a subcommittee be formed to vet them. Jim Twetten, Jorge Blanco, and Austin Viall volunteered to be on this subcommittee that will report back to the committee.

7. Good of the Order

8. Motion to Adjourn
   Michael Knight motioned to adjourn. John Sawatzky seconded. Motion passed.

Brent Swanson
IT Services Ex Officio