

**College Computation Advisory Committee (CAC)
2008-2009 Report
Submitted by: Denise Schmidt, Chair**

Committee Membership:

Members on the College Computation Advisory Committee (CAC) serve as a link between the College and University computer-related committees, as well as between the College and individual departmental committees, with equal faculty/student representation.

Department	Faculty Representative	Student Representative
AESHM	Young-A Lee	Yang Yu
C & I	Dale Niederhauser	David Braet
ELPS	Frankie Laanan	Philip Vasquez
FSHN	Linda Svendsen	Heidi Weinkauf
KIN	Rich Engelhorn	Justin Scherff
HDFS	Dan Russell	Kate Daugherty
College Tech Support (ex-officio)	Sly Upah	
Chair	Denise Schmidt	

Committee's Responsibilities:

This committee's major responsibility is to oversee and manage issues related to how student fees are allocated and spent from the University Computation Advisory Committee (CAC) in our College. Our role is to make recommendations related to these issues to the Associate Dean in charge of Instructional Technology for the College.

Specific responsibilities include:

- Review, evaluate and recommend CAC proposals submitted from the College of Human Sciences for University CAC consideration.
- Distribute all CAC funds to departments based on enrollment and student credit hours.
- Review departmental reporting of expenditures of CAC funds.

Meetings Held (2008-2009 Academic Year):

October 24; November 14; December 12; February 2; February 23; March 30; April 20

Major Accomplishments:

- One goal for this committee was to complete the review process of the CAC department/unit spending plans earlier in the year. Typically, these plans were reviewed and "approved" in April, which left little time for departments/unit to purchase and receive their requested items by June 30. This year, departments/unit submitted their spending request plans to committee members by December 1 and the committee voted on those plans during our December 12 meeting. Four department plans and one unit plan were approved and then recommended to the Associate Dean David Whaley for final action. The other two department plans were approved in April. Overall, the timeline did prove useful for departments and we will continue improving the process during the upcoming year.
- All six departments and the college technology support unit are allocated funds based upon student enrollment and credit hours taught (see attached College of HS Student Computer Fees Allocations document). Expenditure categories for the student computer fee money are hardware, software, expendable supplies, student access to networks, security and protection,

support personnel and personnel involved in course development. Each department requested items for purchase that move the College in a positive direction for improving and enhancing instruction for our students. Recommendations from the CAC committee were forwarded and approved by Associate Dean David Whaley. Each department or unit will submit a final report to the chair by August 1, 2009 that documents all approved purchases. The departmental reports are compiled and a final college CAC spending report will be submitted to the University CAC by August 15, 2009.

- The College CAC met to review, evaluate and recommend four CAC proposals that were submitted by departments and units from the College of Human Sciences. After reviewing and discussing the four proposals, the committee ranked ordered (1-4) the proposals and forwarded the committee's recommendations to Associate Dean David Whaley for final review before spending to the University CAC for final funding decisions.
- Last year, one of our challenges as a committee was to maintain a level of communication between the university, college and department CAC committees so that all committees were informed about CAC activities. It is so important for all the departments to be aware of the unique instructional opportunities that they have related to CAC funding. Starting last year, the committee chairs for each department began serving as the faculty representative to the College CAC. This structure was maintained again this year and really helped in terms of having well-informed representatives from each department serving on the College CAC. This change has helped considerably in terms of communicating important deadlines back to departments, justifying reasons for department purchases, and focusing on student needs for departments.

Significant challenges confronted/How they were addressed:

- Reviewing and recommending CAC purchases from each department is a very important task for this committee and the expectations are that all purchases will benefit students directly. The final CAC reporting structure at the university level was revised in 2007-2008 and tracks the spending of these funds with greater detail. The deadlines for the final report, August 15, comes at a challenging/busy time for faculty/staff – in fact, some are not even on contract. Managing this process is challenging, but will be completed as required.
- Most departments in our College have CAC carry-over funds in their accounts. This is acceptable and needed as long-range spending plans are necessary when funding larger projects. However, we do need to explain in detail on our year-end reports what the plan is for spending those funds. Students brought this issue to the University CAC and felt there should not be a lot of excess funds in these accounts. If departments/colleges were not spending the money, why were student fees going up? During the next year, we will look closer at these carry-over funds and begin more insightful planning for spending these funds.

Next Steps:

- Each faculty representative and a representative from the college technology support unit will submit a final spending report to the chair by August 1, 2009. These reports will be compiled and a final CAC college report will be submitted to the University CAC by August 15, 2009.
- Next fall, the College CAC will meet to review and recommend department spending plans for the 2009-2010 academic year. This timeline encourages better long-range planning for technology purchasing by departments/unit in the college.