The Computation Advisory Committee  
TechStarter Proposal Process – Stage 2

Once a Techstarter idea has been approved to move to stage 2, a proposal must be developed. As CAC Techstarter ideas can come from all parts of campus, the committee understands that idea submitters may not be familiar with generating a proposal to explain the details of their idea. To address this, the CAC will appoint one of its members to facilitate the development of the proposal. The role of this facilitator will be to:

- Assist in locating a suitable person to write the proposal if needed
- Aid in developing the proposal
- Aid in creating collaborations across units and colleges for the proposal
- Provide a central point for questions to the person(s) writing the proposal

Will the facilitator write the proposal?
For an idea to get funded and be implemented successfully, there must be a central person (i.e. Principal Investigator) to oversee all aspects of the idea as it moves through to proposals and then to a funded project. The CAC facilitator may or may not be that person. For example, if a faculty member generated the original Techstarter idea, then that person would be expected to oversee the proposal development (and project if funded). In this case, the facilitator would assist in answering questions and providing feedback. However, if a student generated the original Techstarter idea, then a different person would need to be found to oversee as it is not expected a student would understand the rules regarding financial, personnel, etc. matters of running a sponsored project. In this case, the CAC facilitator may want to oversee the project or they may work to find a faculty or staff member to oversee it. This will be determined on a case by case basis.

When does the proposal have to be submitted to the CAC?
Proposals have 45 days from when they are approved to be submitted to the CAC for evaluation. If a proposal for an approved idea is not submitted in that time, it will no longer be considered for funding by the committee.
Proposal Format

Proposals must be created using the formatting rules with the required sections as outlined below. Proposals that do not comply with the preparation instructions may be returned and not evaluated. Proposals should be short, concise and in the following outline format.

1) **Cover Page** (maximum one page)
   a) **Project Title:** A descriptive title in 15 words or less.
   b) **Proposer(s):** List the names of the faculty, staff and students who developed the proposal.
   c) **Proposing Unit(s):** List the units involved in developing this proposal.
   d) **Project Leader:** List the name, phone number, email address and signature of the project leader. Student-led projects must include a faculty/staff leader in addition to the student leader.

2) **Project Method and Plan** (maximum two pages)

   *Discussion of the following points is required in the proposal*

   a) **Purpose (20%):** Why is the proposed project needed for students at ISU? How will the project be innovative for the university? Proposed projects should speak to excellence as a means to provide information technology access and capability for Iowa State University students. Describe how this work will be implemented / disseminated at Iowa State.

   b) **Impact on Student Experience (40%):** The proposal must clearly identify how the project will positively benefit the student body and instructional program at Iowa State University. Proposals are encouraged to include evidence of student interest and support for the project. Proposers are encouraged to have work positively affect as many students as possible. All funded proposals should clearly identify how the project will benefit instructional programs at Iowa State University. While all factors are important, this is the most heavily weighted factor for review. Since CAC monies are paid by all students, the more students that can attain positive benefits or the greater the impact on any group of students from your project, the more favorably it will be reviewed. Partnering with other departments and units to increase student impact is highly encouraged.

   c) **Integration with current university infrastructure (20%):** Proposals should clearly identify how the proposed project will be integrated and sustained with existing university technology programs. CAC proposal funds are not intended to provide continuing funds for projects. Rather, these funds are to allow innovative and impactful ideas to get started. Successful projects are expected to integrate with current university infrastructure to provide the best opportunity for long-term survivability. All proposals should detail
how they will comply with university standards and other policies regarding computing and networking if applicable.

3) **Budget and Budget Justification (20%)** (maximum two pages)

a) Budgets should reflect reasonable costs for the proposed work. Cost efficiency may result from efficient design, matching funding, cost sharing (in-kind staffing or support), or other approaches that maximize the effect of CAC monies. It is highly encouraged to approach your department or unit and attempt to leverage existing monies (e.g., college CAC, grants, general funds) they may already have. Traditionally, the committee has looked on this very favorably.

b) All expenditures of student computer fees, including proposals in response to this call for proposals are expected to conform to the “Guidelines for Appropriate Expenditure of Income from the Student Computer Fee” (cio.iastate.edu/committees/cac/policies/expenditures_2011-2012.pdf).

c) Multiple year projects may be considered. Budgets for multiple year projects should include annual budgets for each year of the project. If multiple year projects are funded, the complete budget will be charged against the total amount awarded for the current year. In all cases, funds are held by CAC until they are expended.

d) Prepare a budget using the form from Table 1 to identify the costs and proposed source of funding for hardware, software, personnel and other materials needed for the proposed project. Include the unit price, quantity, total price and the source of funding for each item. Calculate the total amount requested. Only one budget reflecting requested funding should be submitted per proposal.

e) Because funding recommendations will be limited to the items in the budget, please make the budget complete. Minor budget adjustments may be approved but significant changes involving the size or scope of the project will normally require a complete committee review. Total expenditures shall not exceed the total amount approved for a project without a complete review by CAC.

f) A one to two line justification for each line item must be provided. This should briefly describe why the cost is needed for the project.

g) All or part of a proposal may be funded. CAC reserves the right to make line-item adjustments to a proposed budget.
## Budget

### Table 1 - Itemized Budget (Costs for the entire project rounded up to nearest dollar)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Item</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost by Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAC Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please be sure to include hazardous materials surcharge of 1.75% on hardware.**

**Please provide breakdown of cost such as salaries, benefits, tuition, etc. as added rows in the table.

### Budget Justification

**Hardware:** A sentence or two justifying why the cost is needed for the project. For example, “$xx,xxx is requested for desktop computers to run the software to allow ....”

*List all other categories in budget table with a brief justification*
Evaluation of Proposals

The review committee will consist of current CAC members. If any CAC member is listed as a proposer (does not include facilitator), they will not be involved in any part of the review process as this is a conflict of interest.

All proposals will be reviewed based on:

- Purpose (20%)
- Impact on student experience (40%)
- Integration with current university infrastructure (20%)
- Budget and Budget Justification (20%)

Proposers may be asked to come to a CAC meeting and give a short presentation and answer any additional questions. The committee will thoroughly discuss each proposal and then render a decision on to funding.