Computation Advisory Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
February 18, 2016

Business Meeting
1. Call meeting to order; seating of substitutes
2. Approvals
   a. Agenda
   b. Minutes from last regular meeting, January 14, 2016
   c. Financial Reports
3. Old Business
   a. Discuss Major Projects/Initiatives
   b. Printing Behavioral Research Project – Status Report
4. New Business
   a. Techstarter New Prescreen Proposals
5. Good of the Order
6. Adjourn

Members Present: Alex Ramirez (chair), Jennifer Nieland (Design), Jorge Blanco (LAS), Otavio Camargo-Bartalotti (LAS), Cory Preston (Engineering), Xiaolu Wang (Business), Gaylan Scofield (CALS), John Sawatzky (LAS), Patrick Hepner (Vet Med), Jim Tvetten (ITS), Arne Hallam (LAS), Changhyun Nam (HS), Austin Viall (Vet Med), Young-A Lee (HS), Greg Davis (Library).

Guests Present: Mary Wickhan (Eng)

Ex-Officio Members Present: Brent Swanson (Library).

1. Call meeting to order; seating of substitutes
2. Approvals
   a. Motion to approve agenda from last meeting, January 14th, 2015 – Gaylan Scofield moved to approve the agenda, Otavio Camargo-Bartalotti seconded. Motion passed.
   b. Motion was made to approve minutes from last meeting, January 14th, 2015 – Arne Hallam moved to approve the minutes, Cory Preston seconded. Motion passed.
   c. Financial Reports
      Brent noted that the Income Summary report had not changed much as no additional revenue has been distributed yet. He did transfer around $200,000 from Central Pool to
the College accounts based on final fall SCH data. For the central pool Brent noted a budgeted free balance of around $566,000.

3. Old Business-Alex requested we speak about student printing first.
   a. Discuss Major Projects/Initiatives – Jim Twetten discussed ways to get the word out about funding projects and initiatives. He said a communications campaign for the Techstarter initiatives might be in order. He also mentioned having another channel for students to get the word out, i.e. The Daily. Young-A Lee mentioned that not all departments and staff seem to be aware of the new procedures to submit proposals. Mary asked if there are things that we can do now, i.e. piloting, so that we are better positioned for the future. Alex said that we have enough turnover in faculty that some are not aware that is such a variety in how funds are requested and spent. His mission is to do more and help with what others on campus need and want, with wireless being the big one. He went onto mention that at one time departments had to pay for wireless but now it has moved towards being University funded. Jim mentioned the fact that some institutions have annual themes in the focus of funding projects. Otavio asked what the status of the Data Science major was and if that was something we could consider. Arne said the proposal is out there for a degree in this major and is back at the departmental level. He said it will not have a huge number of students. They are also looking a minor in Data Science. Alex mentioned that right now wireless is one that continues to be a big expense. Ultimately, we want to see students who pay the computer fees, receive the benefit as quick as possible. Jorge said that he wished there could be a way to access notes from prior classes/semesters. Jim responded that the storage regiment is an issue. Currently, it rolls over at the end of the semester unless an instructor requests it not to. Arne mentioned that instructors have access to old data but students do not often have it. Jorge said that storage for reference to old classes would be an option for an initiative. Cory said that he did have one professor put all their material into a pdf and send to the class. Arne asked Jim if there was any slick export function in Blackboard, with Jim replying there was not. Gaylan brought up the feasibility of rolling out tablets to incoming freshman. Brent looked at incoming freshman count for 2015 and it was 6,200. He said that a total cost assuming around $400/tablet would be $2.5 million. There was some additional discussion regarding this but the committee concluded it may not be feasible for several reasons.
   b. Printing Behavioral Research Project – Status Report – Jim mentioned that they’ve been looking at the amount of printing on campus and reached out to Mary Rankin’s office. She brought in Dr. Peter Orazem to look at and pursue different popup messages and signs in computer labs. There will be different types of messages that cycle through. They will test to see if there is an effective way to reduce printing. The pop up messages are in 14 labs. Jim has not heard of any concerns or complaints regarding the messages. Arne mentioned that his IT managers were very concerned initially, but so far they have not received any. Jim mentioned a survey will also be going out to students with an incentive to respond attached to it. Jorge Blanco asked if the pop ups will occur during finals week and if it could skew the data. The committee discussed and decided that it will be ok. Gaylan asked if there could be a way to add a popup along the lines of , “Are
you sure you are printing to the right printer?” Arne said that the University is in discussions with Adobe. If every student had Adobe Pro, they could bring documents to class on their devices instead of printing them out. Jen Nieland said that in Design students have Adobe Pro but still print everything out. Cory Preston brought up that last semester there had been discussion about students purchasing credits. Jim replied that all the discussions are now geared towards standardizing the cost of printing or having rollovers. John Sawatzky asked if there was any way to ask instructors to have them do more electronically and not have professors ask students to hand in printed coursework. Jim said that there could be some issues with tech that could cause systems to crash especially during Dead Week and Finals Week if large amounts of students are submitting assignments electronically. Otavio stated that when everyone transfers files that are very similar in nature it can look suspicious to the instructor that students are just submitting someone else’s work. He said that at least with paperwork they are taking the time to copy off others.

During this time, Alex Ramirez introduced Mary Wickham as the new Associate Dean in Engineering. Mary discussed that she has spent the last 30 years in industry before becoming the Associate Dean.

4. New Business
   a. Techstarter Prescreen Proposals
      i. Student-Athlete Development Computer Lab Upgrade – Greg Davis asked if this lab was available to other students on campus or just to athletes. Patrick Hepner replied that he used to be a tutor here, and there’s nothing stopping them per se, but it’s not really that open either. Alex pointed out with the number of athletes using the lab, space may already be limited. John S. asked if other students even want to use this type of lab. Jen mentioned that athletes do pay the computer fees like everyone else. Otavio moved to approve. Arne seconded. Motion passed with Otavio requesting that we ask them to elaborate on access to this lab and if it is restrictive or not.

5. Good of the Order

6. Motion to Adjourn
   Arne motioned to adjourn. Jen seconded. Motion passed.

Brent Swanson
IT Services Ex Officio