

Meeting minutes for March 15, 2000 - Engineering B214 Conference Room - 8:00am

Present: Megan Donovan (ECE), Jennifer Flint (ECE), Prof. Garcia (CBE),
Mike Holland (ME), Lance Parker (CBE), Mark Ritschard (ENS),
Jeff Sorrentino (ME) (for Torrey Burgess), Dan Stiles (CE),
Prof. Willson (ME)

Absent: Michelle Heintz (CE), Walt Hull (ME), John Labadie (CE),
Miranda Larsen (CBE), Carl Nassar (ECE), Bala Natarajan (ECE),
Tarek Salem (CE), Laurent Simon (CBE)

- Overview of the Engineering Student Technology Committee

The scope of the committee is the administration and disbursement of the Engineering College student technology fee. This committee is not the College of Engineering Technology Committee (CETC), the committee that oversaw the technology fee in the past.

Due to the late gathering of the committee, time constraints will narrowly focus discussions, perhaps until the end of the school year. The committee must immediately address current fund disbursement and next year's technology fee, both with the goal of completing the technology fee report.

Other issues will need to wait until the above are finalized.

The committee reports to the Dean of Engineering, but is governed primarily by the Charges for Technology Manual. In keeping with appropriate policies, the goal is to avoid departmental factions and view the technology fee fund as a college-wide resource.

- Charges for Technology Manual

Pertinent items from the manual were noted and all members are encouraged to read the State Board of Agriculture Charges for Technology Manual, found on the web at:

<http://www.colostate.edu/services/acns/itec/fee.html>

- Current Engineering Technology Fee & Budget Review

A review of the current budget was distributed, highlighting fees collected, disbursed, and allocated. Although there remains approximately \$167,000 for disbursement, Prof. Garcia noted that the annual amount is closer to \$80,000 and that the committee should keep the lower figure in mind during the discussion.

- Disbursement of Funds (proposals vs. allocation)

The pros and cons of departmental allocations vs. proposal collection were discussed. Departmental allocations help maintain equipment in

instructional labs, enable strategic decisions by departments, and facilitate better budget planning for departmental labs. However, the higher the allocation, the fewer the funds available for proposals. The committee voted unanimously not to allocate all of the existing funds, but leaned strongly toward some allocation. Committee members will gather information in the intervening week and a final decision made at the next meeting.

Regardless of how the funds are disbursed, the committee needs to maintain oversight of how the money is spent. Departmental allocations will require the committee to collect reports from departments on how the funds are spent.

- Proposal form

Mark Ritschard will send a draft proposal form to the committee, with the goal of developing a final form at the next meeting.

Submitted by
Mark Ritschard

Mark R. Ritschard
Director, Engineering Network Services
Colorado State University
Fort Collins, CO 80523-1301

ritschr@engr.colostate.edu
tel: (970) 491-7954
fax: (801) 409-7640

"He is no fool, who gives what he cannot keep, to gain what he cannot lose."
- James Elliott

**Engineering College
Colorado State University**

*Technology Fee Summary
1999-2000*

Beginning Balance*		79,000	
Fees Collected			
	Fall Semester	213,000	
	Spring Semester	194,000	
Fees Disbursed			
	Atmospheric Science (fall)	9,000	
	Atmospheric Science (spring)	10,000	
	Assistive Technology Charge	2,000	
	Scholarships	37,000	
Central Systems & Services (allocated)			
	Hardware & software maintenance	90,000	
	Network maintenance	25,000	
	Server maintenance & support	32,000	
	Computing lab equipment replacement	64,000	
	Student wages (lab support)	50,000	
	Totals	486,000	319,000
Funds remaining for disbursement		167,000	

*NOTE: for summation purposes, all figures are rounded to nearest thousand