Computation Advisory Committee

Meeting Minutes

March 23, 2017

Business Meeting
1. Call meeting to order; seating of substitutes
2. Approvals
   a. Agenda
   b. Minutes from last regular meeting, February 16, 2017
   c. Financial Reports
3. Old Business
   a. Advanced Writing Support With New Technology formal proposal
4. New Business
   a. Techstarter new proposals
      i. Techstarter Torchmate Plasma Update
5. Good of the Order
6. Adjourn

Members Present: Alex Ramirez (chair), Jennifer Nieland (Design), Bailey Wood (Business), Maggie Hollander (Engineering), Gaylan Scofield (CALS), Otavio Camargo-Bartalotti (LAS), Xiaolu Wang (Business), Patrick Hepner (Vet Med), David Popelka (ITS), Young-A Lee (Human Sciences), Mitchell Stephenson (Human Sciences), John Jackman (Engineering), Arne Hallam (LAS)

Ex-Officio Members Present: Jim Kurtenbach (CIO), Amy Ward (CELT), Brent Swanson (Library).

Guest Present: Chris King (Library)

1. Call meeting to order; seating of substitutes.
   a. Claire Andreasen was seated as a substitute for Austin Viall (Vet Med).
2. Approvals
   a. Motion to approve agenda – Otavio Camargo-Bartalotti moved to approve the agenda, Patrick Hepner seconded. Motion passed.
b. Motion was made to approve minutes from last meeting, February 16, 2017 – Gaylan Scofield moved to approve the minutes, Jennifer Nieland seconded. Motion passed.

c. Financial Reports
Brent pointed out that Accounts Receivable has made a spring distribution of CAC funds. We are on target to pass $10 million again for this fiscal year. A/R should send out one more distribution for summer which will be around $1 million. For the central college pool, Brent mentioned that we are on track for all line items staying within their budgeted amounts. John Jackman inquired about the columns that are zeroes with Brent explaining that funds for one reason or another have not been spent this fiscal year. Jim Kurtenbach mentioned that next fall, the committee may want to invite units in that received CAC funding to discuss their projects and how funds were spent.

3. Old Business
   a. Advanced Writing Support With New Technology formal proposal – John stated he was not clear what the demand for this is and asked if they have the people to staff this as it sounded labor intensive. Mitch Stephenson answered that there are 11 consultants currently and that they don’t have enough people on the ground to meet all the demand. He also said that they do not currently have any laptops or computers. Arne Hallam said that the concern of the committee would be that they are not buying these laptops for individual people. There was also a concern regarding if these students were distance students. Mitch mentioned that the focus is on the graduate students and every once in a while students that need English translation. Jen Nieland said she felt it was a worthwhile proposal and would like to see what type of equipment they are purchasing to ensure they aren’t purchasing something that will be obsolete. Amy Ward reiterated that she would question what type of equipment they will be buying. Gaylan Scofield questioned how these would be stored and the serviceability of the laptops. Alex Ramirez said we would table discussion for now, with Arne Hallam volunteering to gather more information from Elena Cotos and Sarah Huffman.

4. New Business
   b. Techstarter Torchmate Plasma Update – Alex informed the committee that the proposal that had been approved by CAC did not have support of the department. Alex said that Techstarter is still a learning process. It has put us in a bind in that with the initial screening process we need to get support and approval from departments but that is not currently happening. Gaylan made a motion that every proposal has the necessary steps required for funding, mainly that it has a letter of support and addresses matching funds. Further discussion commenced. Jim stated that proposals that do not address these need to be kicked back to the college and ask them to give us clarity regarding cost share and support of the college. He would ask if this is a priority of the college. If it is they need to put some “skin” in the game. He further stated, we need to reestablish some of the old protocol, and that the committee is supposed to be for broad impact. Jen stated that the complication arises with some areas as to what college they fall into (i.e. GIS). Xiaolu
Wang asked if colleges were coming to CAC because they don’t have money. Jim answered that it should not be the primary reason. He said that his feeling is the colleges should be telling the committee what their priorities are and not vice versa. Gaylan asked if we should allocate a smaller dollar figure to Techstarter and have colleges pull out of there. Jim said we do need to pull back the reigns and look at the structure but also that going back to the Call for Proposals may not be the answer. Jim said Provost Wickert will need to be involved, with him giving direction to move forward. Gaylan mentioned that with the Techstarter getting approved and then the college saying it was not a priority, it left a very sour taste for the College of Ag.

a. Techstarter new proposals – Alex mentioned that there were 4 ideas on Techstarter; High Def Screens for Architecture, 248 Durham GIS Machine Replacements, Testing Center Upgrades, and Picture in a Flash (PIAF) Software and Paper. He suggested with the current conversation we only address the PIAF proposal. Jim said this would fit as they do not have a home and this would benefit a lot of students. He said one could also argue this should be funded by the university. Gaylan asked if this was university required with Chris King responding that it was not. Otavio made the motion that with the current conversation, we should request additional info. Gaylan seconded. Gaylan pointed out that he still had a motion on the floor as well. Alex added a friendly amendment to Gaylan’s motion that for stage 1 he would work with ITS to identify who would need approvals with the intent of speeding up the process. Otavio stated that to ensure transparency he would like Alex to report back on the progress. Xiaolu asked if there was a clear guideline in stage 1 on what to submit. Alex said that for stage 2 there is but not for stage 1. Otavio asked to hear from students as to what they thought of the motions. The students agree that this would make things more efficient. Otavio 2nd Gaylan’s prior motion. Motions passed.

5. Good of the Order – Jim said that he will come back in April to provide a report regarding wifi. Gaylan mentioned that if an additional request was made for funding of wifi he would ask for a match from the department. Jim also mentioned ITS is looking at Lastpass for students which would cost around $40,000. They are currently exploring with Purchasing and this product stores passwords for students even after they’ve left the university. Jim asked if the students would be interested. Maggie Hollander responded that it probably would not be something she personally would use and said it was not something she’d need the university to keep track of. Bailey responded that she was not how it would be used. Patrick said as a Vet Med student he has the same laptop all day every day. He said there might be some students that bounce around between computers. He thought the longevity might be beneficial after students graduate. Gaylan asked if IT had seen a lot of breaches. Jim responded that there had been a lot of phishing schemes where students have given up their passwords. Otavio stated that we need to be careful that Lastpass might be able to solicit ads to a captive audience and was not sure how storing these passwords on a site would help with phishing. Amy had a concern regarding students that go to public computers, login and then forget to log back out which could leave them open to have their passwords stolen. Jim said he’d bring these to the committee next month.
6. Motion to Adjourn

Brent Swanson
Library Ex Officio