

Engineering Student Technology Committee

Meeting Minutes for February 17, 2005

Dean's Conference Room, 3:00pm

Present: Bryce Eldridge (ECE), Greg Elsaesser (Atmos), Ryan Fleming, *chair* (CE), Prof. Darrell Fontane (CE), Henrik Forsling (CE), Klaus Hartinger (ECE), Prof. Kevin Lear (ECE), David Miller (ChemE), Mark Ritschard (ENS), Dr. Tom Siller (Academic Affairs), Prof. David Wang (ChemE)

Absent: Prof. David Alciatore (ME), David Bryant (ME), Prof. Jeff Collett (Atmos), Mike Floren (ChemE), Kendra Gabbert (CE), Doug Hopper (ME), Derek Johnson (ChemE), Amanda Kaiser (ME), Heidi Shray (ECE), Luke Van Roekel (Atmos), Intra-departmental undergraduate (*two unfilled*)

Previous Meeting Minutes

The committee came to a consensus to accept the minutes from the meetings on 10-6-2004, 10-27-2004, 12-1-2004, and 2-1-2005.

New Academic Village

In the future, the site where Ellis and Newsom halls currently are will become a new *Academic Village*, part of which will be dedicated to engineering students. Currently, \$50 million is available for the Ellis side, and demolition is scheduled to begin on May 16th. Each floor in this new building will have three main spaces: a social lounge(400 sq. ft.), a study lounge(140 sq. ft.), and a kitchen (140 sq. ft.). Originally the kitchen would be connected to the social lounge, and each floor would have its own kitchen. The architect for the new building wanted the committee's input on combining all of the kitchen space into two larger spaces, with more counter space and tables. This larger space would be good for group cooking and extra social room. Overall, the committee approved of this idea.

College Opportunity Fund (COF)

The COF is basically another name for the voucher system, where each student would be given a certain amount of money to attend the institution of his or her choice. Along with the COF comes a mandate for an additional \$2 million in scholarships. Right now, the Charges for Technology system takes in about \$3.4 million, with \$340,000 going to scholarships. Next year, it is possible that students will see a 21% increase in tuition and fees, so is it fair to make the students pay for both the CFT and the COF scholarships. There are basically four options:

- 1) Eliminate CFT scholarships and reduce tech fees by 10%
- 2) Eliminate CFT scholarships and keep the 10%
- 3) Keep the CFT scholarships and centralize the management
- 4) Keep the CFT scholarships, retain management, but make the rules for distribution \ consistent across all the colleges.

First, a clarification of the 21% increase: Several factors could contribute to this increase. First, the lower limit for full time would be increased from 9 to 10 credits, resulting in an increase of ~11%. The base charge per credit would also increase ~9%. Supplemental tuition for undergrads in engineering (\$12.50/credit), business (\$19/credit), and computer science (\$12.50) also add to the expense. Finally, a \$10/student building fund fee could be imposed.

From the committee discussion, option 2 is not going to happen. The committee discussed option 4, and the best way to help the most student scope with the sudden increase. This could mean a return to the old way of passing out many small scholarships. However, the processing fees for this method are quite high, and the university discourages it.

Forsling moved to support option 4, to leave the fee constant and develop consistent rules for awarding scholarships. Hartinger seconded, and the motion passed 8 for, 0 against, 2 abstentions.

The University Charges for Technology committee will meet on March 4th. Eldridge and Hartinger volunteered to attend.

Amendments to CFT Manual

The committee expressed a need for funding in order to pay for furniture and physical renovation, since these are common aspects of projects that the committee funds. Currently, only "ergonomic" furniture is an allowable expense.

Fleming proposed that up to 5-10% of the total budget for a project be available for facility improvement. It was pointed out that the current situation provides a motivation for the college to help pay for those type of improvements, and that allowing the expenses would decrease the college's incentive to help out. However, traditionally the college doesn't have the money to pay for the renovations that are needed, and it would be nice if the committee had the option to cover those expenses.

Ritschard suggested that 20-30% would be more realistic, since furniture is expensive. Alciatore moved that we allow up to 25% of the total equipment budget for furnishings for that project only, and that we present this to the University committee for approval. Forsling seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

For renovations, including carpet, painting, raised floors, and doors, the committee decided that these expenses are beyond the scope of the technology fee, and that renovations could easily consume the entire equipment budget, which would negatively impact students. Ritschard moved to continue to disallow renovation expenses, Miller seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Next Meeting: March 1st, 8am

Topics: Graduate scholarship criteria

\$15k in strategic initiatives fund

Dan Herrick - Photoshop and Dreamweaver

Review Equipment

Set budget

Anderson lab to electronic classroom

Submitted by

Bryce Eldridge