

Engineering Student Technology Committee

Meeting Minutes for September 22, 2004 - Conference Area 1, Lockheed Martin Design Studio - 8:00am

Present: Bryce Eldridge (ECE), Ryan Fleming, chair (CE), Henrik Forsling (CE), Doug Hopper (ME), Derek Johnson (ChemE), Amanda Kaiser (ME), Prof. Kevin Lear (ECE), David Miller (ChemE), Mark Ritschard (ENS), Dr. Tom Siller (Academic Affairs)

Absent: Prof. David Alciatore (ME), David Bryant (ME), Prof. Jeff Collett (Atmos), Kendra Gabbert (CE), Klaus Hartinger (ECE), Elizabeth Lipp (intra), Russ Schumacher (Atmos), Heidi Shray (ECE), Luke Van Roekel (Atmos), ChemE undergraduate (unfilled), ChemE faculty (unfilled), CE faculty (unfilled), Intra-departmental undergraduate (unfilled)

Welcome and Introductions

Review of Meeting Minutes

The minutes of the meeting on September 8th were accepted with the corrections that Dr. Siller and Dr. Lear were both present.

New Secretary

Bryce Eldridge will serve as the new secretary, barring any change of mind.

Bid Proposal Process

Fleming read a copy of the draft of the letter that will be sent out to the departments informing them of the proposal submission and review process. There was a lively discussion about the intent behind sending out a letter, and much clarification of the purpose and history of the strategic initiatives (SI) fund. Ritschard explained that traditionally the SI fund was used to concentrate on one area of the college, and that proposals from the departments were not solicited. There were concerns that we did not make our intent clear when we first suggested sending out a letter, and that the departments might think that this money was for any project they wanted. We clarified that the money is intended to be used for the students benefit, and suggested that the letter be more explicit about this. Ritschard suggested adding some wording to the letter to emphasize the fact that the proposal solicitation is only a part of the input process for how the SI money gets dispersed. Dr. Lear pointed out that what we are really doing is putting the majority of the work of coming up with ideas for the money on the faculty instead of on this committee. In conclusion, another draft of the letter will be e-mailed to the committee early next week.

Scholarship Credit Requirement Change

Currently, most engineering scholarships require that the recipients be enrolled in at least 14 credits. However, the ESTC scholarships that were created last year only require a minimum of 12 credits. Dr. Siller asked that the committee raise the requirement to 14 credits in order to match the other scholarships. There was some concern that students receiving these scholarships might not be able to take 14 credits, and that 12 credits was really adequate for full time. The general consensus was that the students with need-based scholarships were more likely to have to work a job in addition to going to school, and that the requirements for those scholarships should remain at 12 credits. Johnson motioned that any merit based scholarships be raised to 14 credits, while any need based (including merit/need) remain at 12. Miller seconded, motion passed unanimously.

ERC Funding Idea

Ritschard informed the committee that because of recent competition from computer suppliers, the prices of the computers that the committee is purchasing this year have declined, resulting in a savings of \$5,000 to \$7,000. Ritschard suggested that the committee use this extra money to finish funding the ERC classroom, thus reducing the contribution from the SI fund to \$3,000 to \$5,000. Some of the rationale behind fully funding the ERC follows. We need to show that we care about our labs and about the ERC by being willing to fund facility improvements. Also, if we put in the money to get things started now, it is more likely that an outside source will contribute in the future. The final consideration was that if the committee approved the funding now, the ERC classroom would be ready by next semester. Eldridge motioned that we accept this idea and fully fund the ERC classroom. Kaiser seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Clock

Ritschard informed the committee of the status of getting a large clock for the Lockheed Martin Design Studio. A 38 inch clock costs approximately \$400, so the committee discussed alternate options. Options included commissioning a professor from the Mechanical Engineering department to build a clock, purchasing several small clocks, hiring a town crier to announce the time with a bell, or buying an airport clock. The committee finally decided that this is not a priority, and Dr. Siller said that he would use some of the money from Lockheed to furnish the Design Studio with a time telling device.

Chemical Engineering Laptop

Ritschard just wanted to let the committee know about a proposal coming in from the Chemical Engineering department to request funding for their own laptop. The committee decided to table this topic until a formal proposal has been received.

Wording of MS Office Disappearance Note

Wording read by Ritschard, basically explains that the reason MS Office is no longer available is because of Microsoft's licensing policy. Committee suggested that Ritschard's name be removed from the note in order to save him some time dealing with complaints. Committee clarified that only the Virtual Lab is affected by this, not the Sunray system. Committee approved the note.

Reps for UCFT and UTFAB

Ritschard explained that representatives need to be appointed this week for the university technology committees, asked for volunteers. Johnson volunteered for the UCFT, and Kaiser volunteered for the UTFAB. Johnson also volunteered for the faculty tech fee committee.

Meeting Adjourned

Next Meeting - 2 weeks (10/6/04)

Submitted by Bryce Eldridge