

Meeting Minutes for Engineering Student Technology Committee

Meeting: 17 November 2009
7:30am in Titan

Attending: Leah Belval (ECE), Mark Berrill (ECE), Prof. Tom Bradley (ME), Ross Davenport (CE), Ryan Friese (ECE), Hannah Hudson, *chair* (ME), Katie Marshall (CBE), Rachel McCrary (ATS), Syndi Nettles-Anderson (ME), Nick Parazoo (ATS), Prof. Ashok Prasad (CBE), Mark Ritschard (ENS), Steve Rosnowski (CE), Nick Sansoni (CE), Prof. Tom Siller (Academic Affairs), Kevin Warner (ME), Derek Williams (intra)

Not Attending: Prof. Brian Bledsoe (CE), Prof. Thom Chen (ECE), Prof. Taka Ito (Atmos),

-Welcome and Introductions

Chair Hudson welcomed the new and returning committee members and introductions were performed

-Review of ESTC and Responsibilities

Ritschard reviewed the responsibilities of the committee that is governed by rules laid out by the University Charges for Technology Committee (UCFT) in the Charges for Technology manual (can be viewed online).

Ritschard emphasized that the CFT is meant to pay for equipment and that departments/other committees within the college are allocated funds for purchasing and their purchases go through Ritschard to ensure they are in accordance with the CFT rules

The committee for this year determines the budget for the next fiscal year

Ritschard emphasized that everything done by the committee is public and all past meeting minutes and budgets may be found in the historical section on the ESTC website

Ritschard notes that the Strategic Initiative category is the money set aside within the budget that can be used to fund projects that the committee will vote on. The Assistive Technology Fee category is a tax on the college implemented by the UCFT to pay for technology for people with disabilities and that the CFT pays the university to collect our funds called "Business Expenses"

-Review of Projects approved Last Year

Ritschard recapped the projects last years committee approved

- replaced GIS lab sunrays with computers

- Allison hall lab was closed

- The number of seats in Anderson lab was reduced

- Introduction of small laser printers in labs

- Design Studio in ERC: nothing has happened yet, they have until the end of this fiscal year to begin making decisions or the money that was approved goes away

- Microscope and Potentiostat for the school of Biomedical Engineering – these have been purchased but have not yet arrived

Berrill brings up that the reason two items were purchased for the school of Biomedical Engineering is because the past committee solicited them to use money that was allocated to them

-Budget Creation

Ritschard showed the budget for this year as it was decided on by last years committee and reviewed the way the money is spent and how decisions are made by the committee

-Consideration of college e-mail for students (@rams and @engr)

Everyone has an @engr account and the issue is whether or not keep this available

Ritschard brings this unsolicited topic from ENS, a survey was taken last year asking if students wanted both emails, ~75% said yes, the issue was brought up again by a faculty member

Students may want to keep this because it is a way to separate school email from personal email, also that it appears professional

Nettles-Anderson states that in her experience as a TA for senior design people are not using the @engr accounts and that in terms of professionalism they do not make a big difference. She finds that people seem to be far more organized using the Google apps

Berrill states that in his experience in his lab group people are using the @engr accounts and that it will be very inconvenient to switch

Rosnowski brings up that the @engr accounts provide a larger attachment size than Google apps

Marshall questions if the @engr is really any more professional than @rams

Suggestions are to phase out the @engr, not giving it to new students but allowing existing students to keep their @engr or to keep the @engr address but get rid of the server space so the address would have to forward to another email account

-Review of overall software expenditures and permitted CFT percentage

Solicited by ENS from Dan Herrick (via Ritschard)

Herrick has concerns that 80% of software charges can be paid for by CFT allocations and that departments are not purchasing lab equipment because they are using all of their allocated money to purchase software. Suggestions are to reduce the % of software that can be paid for by CFT allocation or set a total % of CFT allocation that can be used to pay for software. After discussion, the committee agreed to keep the 80% rule.