

## CEE-BP 4/23/19 Call Notes

### Participants:

Linda Akli, Jay Alameda, Marques Bland, Kate Cahill, Sergio Contreras Pinto, Rosalia Gomez, John Holly

### Discussion:

#### 1. CEE-BP Student Program

- a. As of Friday 4/19, only 2 completed applications for ACSC/PEARC19 and 29 for C4C/SC19.
- b. Rosie identified the uncertainty students have about their summer plans as one issue for the high number incomplete applications for ACSC/PEARC19.
- c. Possible confusion by students and their mentors regarding the difference in programs. Rosie indicated there is a FAQ on the website.
- d. Agreed to extend both program application deadlines to May 17<sup>th</sup>.
- e. Send out emails indicating deadline extended for both programs with both flyers and identify in the email text the difference in the programs and structure.
- f. Rosie reached out to students that weren't accepted into the ACSC REU at TACC and will do the same with the recommenders.
- g. John will send out to the students on the CEE-BP mailing lists.
- h. Rosie will send to CAHSI, Henry Neeman list, Linda Hayden Science Gateway Outreach manager, and to Leticia who manages the new Tapia Center list which is a combination of their ELA and XSEDE Scholars lists.
- i. Linda will send to Black Women in Computing, Hispanics in Computing, SURA IT Committee, and the XSEDE MRC lists.
- j. Kate will send to SIGHPC list.
- k. Jay will identify some possible lists he can use to disseminate the information.
- l. Rosie resent flyers to everyone for distribution as noted in f – i.
- m. Goal is 30 applications for ASCS and at least 100 for C4C.

#### 2. CEE-BP Metrics

- a. CEE-BP targets were missed for the first 3 reporting periods of PY8 for new underrepresented minority and women users of XSEDE resources and services. This is a count of who created new portal accounts during that period. The sustained users are on track and have been met each reporting period.
- b. At the March quarterly meeting, it was hypothesized that the new users were down due to the lower number of training events that were delivered in the fall and projected that the events in the February and March should result in targets being met for the later reporting periods. Also discussed at the meeting was reporting the URM students as a raw number and not a percentage because the percentage was misleading and not realistic. The raw number was a better representation of the impact of the student program activities.
- c. To confirm hypothesis and better manage the program to meet the targets, evaluation is providing data on a monthly basis.
- d. The review of the February and March data confirmed the hypothesis. Three training events were held including CSULA and UCSB. The numbers for the first two months of the reporting period were greater than the 200 per quarter target. It was agreed this approach was much better for program management.
- e. Linda to send email to Maytal to let her know about the monthly request and rationale.
- f. Linda to follow up on the PCR for the change to the reporting of the URM student data with Leslie, Kelly, and Lorna and confirm that it will be retroactive for PY8.

3. L3s received the reminder that the annual report preparation starts May 1<sup>st</sup> and we have a May 6<sup>th</sup> due date for our WBS input.