

Meeting minutes of the Engineering Student Technology Committee (ESTC)

Meeting: March 21, 2016

4:00 p.m. in Scott 203 Board Room

In attendance: Elaheh Alizadeh (CBE), Daniel Dauwe (ECE), Kristine Fischenich (SBME), Arunachalam Lakshminarayanan (ME), Chaz Myers (CE), Erik Nielsen (ATS), Kelley Wittmeyer (ENS, ex officio)

Not in attendance: Abdullah BaGais (CBE), Zachary Bodmer (CBE), Sean Brustuen (CE), Jordyn Dahlke (ME), Tammy Donahue (ME), Professor Emily Fischer (ATS), Peter Marinescu (ATS), Brian Munsky (CBE), Professor Peter Nelson (CEE), Aaron Smull (ECE), Anthony Marchese (ADAA, ex officio), Professor Sourajeet Roy (ECE)

Guests: Angie Branson (ENS), Nick Stratton (ENS)

CFT Charge

The committee discussed the current rate of \$170 per semester, per student for the College of Engineering Charge for Technology and there was agreement in keeping the charge the same for the coming academic year. A motion was made to keep the CFT at \$170 per semester, the motion was seconded and passed.

2017 Budget Discussion

Branson reviewed the Business Expenses, CSU Assistive Technology, I2P 3D Printing Lab, Software, and Departmental Allocations portions of the budget. The Business Expenses are bad debt incurred by the university for unpaid student accounts and is based upon a percentage set by the university on an annual basis. CSU Assistive Technology is for funds given by each college to the Assistive Technology Resource Center to provide assistive technology and information to students with disabilities, the amounts are set each year by the UCFT. Branson and Fischenich provided an overview of the funding provided to the I2P lab by last year's ESTC members, Dauwe let the committee know that David Prawel plans on attending the next meeting to provide an update on the I2P lab and the decision to continue funding the lab will be made at the next meeting. Branson presented options for funding software directly from the CFT budget and how this may affect funding departmental allocations. The committee had discussions and decided to fund the common software (Adobe Acrobat Pro, ANSYS, LabVIEW, MATLAB, Microsoft Office 365), excluding portions paid for by the college, departments, and other CSU departments, from the base-level budget. The committee also decided not to offset the departmental allocations or reduce their funding due to paying for the common software from the base budget. There was discussion of various options for providing allocations to the departments, including renaming the "maintenance amount" to "baseline amount" and looking at varying levels of funding for this baseline amount. The renaming was based on discussion of what the funding is intended to do and it was decided that this funding is intended by the committee to provide some base amount of funding to all five departments and the School of Biomedical Engineering while also taking into consideration the differences in enrollment with the "share by enrollment." The committee decided to increase departmental allocations to \$160,000 total split between the five departments, plus SBME, providing each with a baseline amount of \$5,000 and splitting the remaining allocated funds based upon enrollment percentage by each department.

Software funding policy

Branson mentioned that there is currently an ESTC policy restricting the funding of software. The current policy reads: "No more than 80% of any given software purchase or package may be paid for with CFT funds, regardless of how the software is used." Branson suggested that a policy revision will need to be made in order to accommodate the ESTC's decision to provide 100% funding for some of the common student-use software from the base annual budget. Branson will prepare a draft revision of the policy at the next committee meeting.

Alternative methods for budget planning

L. Arunachalam continued discussion from the previous meeting of ideas for alternate methods of setting the annual ESTC budget that may provide some efficiencies and allow the committee to be more focused on strategic initiatives. Other committee members added comments and discussion. Alternative methods of setting the annual budget would potentially be put in place for future committees to consider.