

Meeting Minutes for Engineering Student Technology Committee

Meeting: 22 April 2010
7:45am in Titan

Attending: Mark Berrill (ECE), Prof. Tom Chen (ECE), Hannah Hudson, *chair* (ME), Rachel McCrary (ATS), Nick Parazoo (ATS), Mark Ritschard (ENS), Steve Rosnowski (CE), Kevin Warner (ME)

Not Attending: Leah Belval (ECE), Prof. Brian Bledsoe (CE), Prof. Tom Bradley (ME), Ross Davenport (CE), Ryan Friese (ECE), Prof. Taka Ito (ATS), Katie Marshall (CBE), Syndi Nettles-Anderson (ME), Prof. Ashok Prasad (CBE), Nick Sansoni (CE), Prof. Tom Siller (Academic Affairs), Derek Williams (intra)

Guest: CJ Keist, ENS

-Review of 1 April meeting minutes
Unanimous approval

-Review of debt carried by ESTC in FY08 for the Academic Village

Ritschard reports on the issue: ESTC carried \$217,000 of debt for the Academic Village (to be paid off by resident fee) and in the first year the fee did not get paid. The remaining debt has been paid off. The committee has been repaid in full. See the attached documents for details.

-Update of the ERC design studio

Ritschard reports that the studio is in progress, they are working on carpeting and painting. Dan Herrick is ordering desks and equipment, wonders if the committee wants to add a low cost printer (\$250 a year) to the room and a card reader. Committee agrees that a card reader is necessary and a small printer should be added and metered to determine if it needs to swapped with the larger one in the classroom

-Proposals

-High Speed Camera (Dr. Alicatore)

Lists a number of courses it could be used for, committee questions if it would actually be used in these classes. He already has one and it appears to the committee that he just wants a better one for personal reasons. It seems as though having a better one does not really increase instructional value

Motion to deny proposal

Unanimous approval; proposal denied

-Sunray Server Improvements (CJ Keist)

Sunrays currently run on Spark Servers- CPU chip technology that runs multi-thread and multi-core, they have a very slow clock rate (1.2 GHz). Plan is to replace the Spark Servers with X86 Pentiums that will speed up the run rays considerably. \$30,000 is being requested from ESTC and this money will be augmented to \$80K by the Academic Village (\$40K) and the College of Engineering (\$10K). Also plans to get more thin farm servers which will allow for less people per server. Testing is being done with an estimated 10X improvement from current Sun Rays

Chen: Wants to know if this would improve Cadence

The display would improve whether the program does depends on the Linux computer servers it is being run on
Proposal will be held until the proposal deadline and all proposals have been reviewed

-Switch the Sunrays to a kiosk mode (CJ Keist)

Effectively shorten the login time for majority of users by replacing the main login screen with four options (Solaris, Windows, Business, and Admin). Benefits: Only one log on for majority of users; No apparent downsides

Motion for approval

Unanimous approval

-New Furnishings for Magellan (Dan Herrick)

Ritschard reports that Herrick requests 25% (per technology fee expenditure rules) of whatever money he spends updating the computing equipment in Magellan on new furniture. New desks or new chairs or some of both.

Proposal held until proposal deadline and all proposals have been reviewed.

TO: Engineering Student Technology Committee (ESTC)
 FROM: Mark Ritschard, Director, Engineering Network Services
 DATE: April 22, 2010
 RE: Academic Village debt borne by the Charge for Technology

At the ESTC meeting of November 9, 2007, the committee agreed to carry the debt created by extenuating circumstances during the construction of the Academic Village in 2007. The minutes of that meeting are attached as an explanation of the debt. Then-Provost Tony Frank and Vice President Pat Burns accepted the repayment plan approved by the committee.

I am pleased to report that the debt has been paid in full as proposed, though not as originally envisioned. For unknown reasons, the first residents of the Academic Village were not assessed the program fee as had been planned. As a result, the College of Engineering, Housing and Dining Services, and the Office of the Provost agreed to cover the lost revenue over the three succeeding years. The program fee then covered the balance of the debt in FY09 and FY10. The total debt and the repayment are outlined below.

Original Loan:

Monitors	62,900.87
Student Wages for AV Setup	9,865.07
Sun Ray thin clients	67,141.63
Sun Ray servers	19,818.68
Sun Ray Windows servers	57,839.86
	217,566.11

Payoff Summary	FY08	FY09	FY10	Total
Academic Village Program Fee		60,464.53	55,858.23	116,322.76
College of Engineering	20,000.00		10,000.00	30,000.00
Housing & Dining Services		10,000.00	20,000.00	30,000.00
Office of the Provost	10,000.00	10,000.00	10,000.00	30,000.00
Reallocation of equipment	10,706.85	536.50		11,243.35
	40,706.85	81,001.03	95,858.23	217,566.11

TO: Dr. Patrick Burns, Vice President for Information Technology

FROM: Christine Canter, chair, Engineering Student Technology Committee (ESTC)

DATE: December 19, 2007

RE: Academic Village debt borne by the Charge for Technology

Dr. Burns,

This memo is in regards to your meeting with Mr. Jupe Herrick and Mr. Mark Ritschard of August, 2007 in which the request by Dr. Tony Frank for a frank discussion of the debt to the engineering Charge for Technology was discussed. The ESTC has considered the issue during the fall semester and formally voted to approve the debt and the repayment plan presented by Mr. Ritschard. It is our understanding that the debt will be repaid via the program fee that is being assessed to the residents of the engineering building in the Academic Village. As verification, the minutes of the November 9, 2007 meeting, at which the vote took place, are attached for your review. They contain the details of the repayment plan presented to us and verification of the vote. These minutes were approved at our meeting of December 7, 2007 and are posted on our ESTC web site for any interested party to review: <http://www.engr.colostate.edu/ESTC>. Should you have any questions or need additional information, please feel free to contact me at Christina.Canter@colostate.edu.

Engineering Student Technology Committee (ESTC)

November 9, 2007

Titan Studio Classroom, 12:00pm

In Attendance - Derek Bonner (ECE), Kris Bruun (CEE), Christina Canter, *chair* (CBE), David Grzenia (CBE), Ryan Horn (CEE), Chris Klumph (ECE), Lucas Oehlerking (ME), Brad Reichel (CEE), Mark Ritschard (ENS), Tiffany Suekama (CBE), *guest* Dan Herrick (ENS)

Absent - Becky Adams (Atmos), Prof. Mazdak Arabi (CEE), Prof. Taka Ito (Atmos), Prof. Ricky Kwok (ECE), David Lerach (Atmos), Vladamir Shestak (ECE), Prof. Tom Siller (Acad. Affairs), Prof. David Wang (CBE)

Introductions

Committee Overview

A quick review was given of the committee responsibilities and budget. The ESTC web page (<http://www.engr.colostate.edu/ESTC>) has all the details and should be reviewed.

Academic Village Project and Debt

The committee reviewed the debt incurred by the engineering charge for technology fund during last summer's implementation of the Academic Village project. The project was one of six funded by this committee. All six projects have either been completed or are underway and a quick review of each was provided by Ritschard. He then provided the background that led to the existing debt.

Background

In the summer of 2005, Sun Microsystems expressed an interest in providing a Sun Ray thin client for every resident in the New Academic Village. It was made clear to Sun at that time that Sun Rays would not be provided in student residences unless Sun provided the complete resources to do so. Sun was very interested in doing so. They solidified their commitment with over \$100,000 worth of equipment in May of 2006 to start a test bed environment for the New Academic Village.

Unfortunately, Sun Microsystems went through a reorganization in the summer of 2006, which resulted in the departure from Sun of the Vice President who was the primary sponsor of the project. However, Sun continued to express interest in the project and in December of 2006 again provided equipment worth more than \$27,000 toward the Academic Village thin client infrastructure. Realizing that Sun was serious about moving forward, CSU began to advertise the existence of Sun Rays "per pillow" in the Academic Village.

Although Sun made several efforts to equip the project, fortunes changed again in March of 2007 when Sun Microsystems acknowledged that they could no longer participate. Of course, at this point, the building is well under way and prospective students are signing up. There was talk at this time of pulling the "thin client per pillow" idea from the project and from all promotional material.

Within the same month, however, the former Vice President of Sun and sponsor of the

project within Sun, contacted the College of Engineering. He indicated that the company he was now with, Jones Knowledge, would take over sponsorship of the "thin client per pillow" concept. As a result, plans continued for installation of thin clients in each student residence.

"Program Fee" for the Academic Village

Concurrent with the thin client planning with Sun, the college explored ways to fund the overall program plan in the Academic Village over the long-term. The college decided to fund the non-technology aspects of the program plan with a "program fee" that would be assessed to each resident of the village. Funding for the technology aspects of the program plan would be requested from the ESTC. The \$350 per year fee for each resident was approved by the university in February of 2007 and by the Board of Governors in June, 2007.

Role of the Engineering Student Technology Committee (ESTC)

During the spring of 2006, the ESTC received a proposal from the College of Engineering for funding for the technology aspects of the Academic Village. The proposal was one of six received by the committee that academic year, most of which could not be funded without an increase in the charge for technology for engineering students. The committee agreed the proposal had merit, since it involved a funding partnership with the college via the academic village program fee. The partnership represented a higher chance of long-term success for the students. In order to fund the six projects, an increase in the charge for technology was proposed and approved in February, 2007. The committee then voted to approve the Academic Village proposal: funding for approximately \$138,000 worth of equipment.

University Facilities Fee Advisory Board (UFFAB)

Also in the spring of 2006, the college requested Academic Village funding for furnishings and projection equipment from the UFFAB. The request was predicated on the partnership of Sun and the ESTC and the planned environment of a "thin client per pillow". UFFAB approved the proposal and provided funding as requested.

Exit Jones Knowledge

The partnership with Jones Knowledge was pursued in earnest and several draft contracts were reviewed and approved. Sun Microsystems remained involved in the project by providing special pricing to Jones. Unfortunately, Jones Knowledge backed out of the project based on the following standard clause in all CSU contracts:

"FUND AVAILABILITY. CRS 24-30-202 (5.5)

Financial obligations of the State of Colorado payable after the current fiscal year are contingent upon funds for that purpose being appropriated, budgeted, and otherwise made available."

Essentially, the company was concerned that CSU would not hold up its part of the bargain. Despite reassurances from a number of parties at CSU that CSU has always honored its contracts, Jones Knowledge knew the clause permitted default by the university and withdrew from the process. The withdrawal occurred on June 28, 2007, less than 48 hours from the close of business at the end of the fiscal year. Why did that matter? The special pricing offered to Jones Knowledge by Sun expired on June 30.

The Debt

Sun agreed to extend the same pricing to CSU as long as a purchase order was issued prior to the close of Sun's fiscal year on June 30. This meant the PO had to clear the CSU system on June 29, requiring an approved requisition by the close of business on June 28. With only a few hours to make the decision, Ritschard consulted with the leadership in the College of Engineering. He proposed to utilize the student technology fund to front the expenses necessary to keep the project on track. The college agreed and decided that 1) promises to incoming freshmen regarding a "thin client per pillow" should be kept, 2) a project so visible to the entire project should not be compromised, and 3) not proceeding would potentially unravel the hard-won funding partnership between the college, the ESTC, and the UFFAB. A call was also placed to Pat Burns, CSU VP of IT for consultation. The PO was cut, placing the student technology fund approximately \$207,000 in debt for the Academic Village portion of the purchase order.

Repayment Plan

Ritschard proposed the following repayment plan for the debt:

FY08: \$87,000 (\$9K from equip. sales, \$78K from the Academic Village program fee)

FY09: \$70,000 (from the Academic Village program fee)

FY10: \$50,000 (from the Academic Village program fee)

To carry the debt, Ritschard proposed:

for FY08 (\$120,000 in debt unpaid):

\$60,000 by eliminating advance purchases for FY09

\$40,000 by delaying the server replacement plan

\$20,000 by delaying the computer lab replacement plan

for FY09 (\$50,000 in debt unpaid):

\$50,000 by eliminating advance purchases for FY10

for FY10 (no debt remaining):

Request for ESTC concurrence

Senior Vice President Tony Frank and Vice President Pat Burns requested that Ritschard seek "formal student approval for the new plan, including an open, frank discussion of implications on the entire environment, for both fiscal years." They requested a formal vote of approval.

Vote of Approval

Based on the above request from the CSU administration, Ritschard asked if the committee understood the debt, the implications, and the repayment plan. Good discussions of clarification followed. It was noted that the "special pricing" from Sun was an overall 31% discount off of list, whereas the normal educational discount is 20%. It was then moved and seconded "that the committee accept the debt and approved the repayment plan". Discussion of

the motion revealed that some students felt that not all items should be delayed in regards to the server and computing equipment replacement plans. Ritschard indicated that the fund would need to carry a negative balance forward to FY09 if more purchases were made. As a result, the motion was amended as follows, with the amendment being accepted and seconded: "The ESTC accepts the debt and approves the repayment plan. To ease the burden of the debt, the committee will request that a deficit of up to \$100,000 be permitted in FY08 and carried into FY09." The motion carried unanimously: no objections, no abstentions.

Request for feedback

Some members of the committee indicated an interest in getting feedback from the residents of the Academic Village regarding their experience with the "thin client per pillow" concept. Because so many changes were made in the summer of 2007, there is also interest in getting general feedback on all of the changes. The committee agreed to look into a survey in the spring.

Campus e-mail

Klumph, the college representative for the University Charges for Technology Committee, indicated that the university is considering both Google and Microsoft for student e-mail. He requested that the committee solicit feedback on which students might prefer.

Respectfully submitted,
Mark Ritschard