

Engineering Student Technology Committee (ESTC):

Meeting minutes for February 26, 2003 - Eng. Conference Room - 7:45am

Present: Derek Akerhielm (ChemE), Morgan Defoort (ME), Tim Hinerman (ME),  
Shawn Klawitter (ChemE), J. P. Murray (ECE), Mark Ritschard (ENS),  
Prof. Sakurai (ME), David Wiegandt (ECE) - chair, Prof. Wilmsen (ECE),  
Prof. Wickramasinghe (ChemE)

Absent: Kat Christian (CE), Michael Flick (CE), Prof. Garcia (CE),  
Prof. Gessler (Academic Affairs), David Hodge (ChemE),  
Kate McDonnell (ECE), Jennifer Meints (intra), Arun Nair (CE),  
Derek Reding (ME)

Substitutes: Prof. Labadie (CE) for Prof. Garcia (CE)

Unfilled positions: one intra-departmental major

- Corrections to previous meetings minutes (2-5-03)  
    \*none\*

Updates:

- Introduction of New Members  
    Chemical Engineering representatives Derek Akerhielm and Shawn  
    Klawitter were introduced as new members of the committee. Prof.  
    Labadie was welcomed as the substitute for Prof. Garcia.
- Update on ESTC web page

Ritschard reported that updates to the committee web page that were requested in December of 2001 have finally been completed. Members are requested to review the committee web page ([www.engr.colostate.edu/ESTC](http://www.engr.colostate.edu/ESTC)) and over any additional suggestions. Klawitter noted that the hyperlinks for sending e-mail to committee members do not seem to work properly; Internet Explorer opens multiple windows when a name is selected. Ritschard will work to correct that.

-Update on laptop purchase and cafe laptop stations  
Ritschard reported that both have been ordered.

-Suggestion Box  
The committee suggestion box has been posted on the committee web page and on the ENS web pages under "Labs" and "Help"

-Update on Lab Funding Signs and Labels  
Wiegandt showed the finished sign for the Internet Cafe; ENS will hang all of the signs soon. He also noted that stickers have been placed on all equipment indicating use of student technology funds.

#### Business Items:

##### - Discuss GIS Lab

As Labadie holds the principal interest in the GIS lab, Wiegandt thanked him for joining the committee for this discussion. As context for the discussion, Ritschard noted that in the hand-out distributed by him at the December meeting, there were three significant errors. The first two were on the second line labeled "New Computers (SU01)". The entry should be "New Monitors (SU01)" and the amount in the ESTC contrib. column should be "1,000". The third error was one of omission and includes a new line entitled "New Computers (SU01)" with an entry of \$26,450 in the ESTC contrib. column. The corrected table is attached. The result of the errors is to change the overall contribution of the committee to the GIS Lab renovation to 42.83%, and the entire Student Tech Fund contribution to 92.53%. Labadie asked why all of the contributions (ESTC, CE, and ENS) are lumped into a single category on the spreadsheet. Wiegandt explained that the committee is concerned about the overall contribution of the fund to the GIS lab in comparison to the actual number of students who use the lab. The committee is seeking to understand the role of the lab in light of it's existing commitment to renew the lab every four years.

Labadie explained that the lab was created to provide a teaching facility for GIS classes, as well as a forum for class presentations. Since then, the lab has been opened up for use by several other CE classes (and one CB class, which is now also CE). He explained the uniqueness of the lab lies in the ability of GIS students to have all of the tools that they need in one place, including the ability to save files on the local hard disks.

Hinerman noted, that, per the committee's request to ENS at the December meeting, all of the software in the GIS lab was made available in all other labs, so there are no unique aspects (hardware or

software) to the GIS lab that would require GIS students to be in the lab. Ritschard asked if the classes directory on the T: drive could be used to save the GIS files. Once Labadie understood that faculty can give write access to their students, he thought it might work, but indicated that large file sizes might be a limitation.

Hinerman proposed that the GIS lab be opened up to anyone between 5pm and 8am. Ritschard confirmed that the card reader on the door could be set to accommodate different hours for different people. Labadie expressed concern about opening the lab because it would potentially limit the ability of GIS students to use the lab and would pose a security risk to the equipment since there are no windows in the lab. He also felt that there is not a big enough demand on resources after hours to warrant opening of the lab.

Defoort and others noted that the Lockheed Martin Design Studio is always crowded in the evenings and weekends and that the GIS lab could help alleviate that demand. Ritschard also confirmed that there are no unique resources in the GIS lab that would prevent a student from completing course work in another lab should the GIS lab be full. Security-wise, Ritschard noted that no equipment has been stolen from ENS labs in the past three years because of increased securing of the equipment. When Labadie noted that the door does not close all the way, Ritschard agreed to get it fixed. As for large file sizes, there is no limitation on class folders should a class need a large amount of space.

There was some confusion as to whether the issue was for the ESTC to pay for printing in the GIS lab. Wiegandt reminded the committee that the printing issue was resolved at the last meeting; CE agreed to continue taking care of printing expenses in order to keep the lab closed to uses other than those approved by CE. The current concern is that \$50,000 is currently set aside every four years to replace the equipment in the lab. Because the lab is only open to a few students (and even only a few CE students), the committee believes that the financial commitment is in question if the lab is not made more available to students. Wiegandt asked Labadie to consider the committee's position and to provide the committee with any requirements he may desire were the lab to be made more available. He emphasized that the committee is in a learning phase and currently plans no action regarding the lab. The committee will wait to hear more from CE before further discussion takes place.

- Cafe conference room sign

Ritschard provided an estimate for a conference room sign that would match the rest of the signs in the Engineering Building (turquoise and ivory). The sign would include an inlaid cork board to post the reservations. He had also spoken to Wiegandt earlier and they had agreed to ask for an estimate of a similar sign on the doors to the cafe. Ritschard said that they are amazingly expensive with a combined total of \$559 for all three signs. However, if the committee likes the idea, Ritschard agreed to split the cost between ENS and the ESTC. Murray moved and Morgan seconded that the signs be purchased under a split cost agreement and the motion passed unanimously. Ritschard will coordinate the purchase.

- More on the ERC printer

Although the purchase of a printer for the ERC general lab was approved at the last meeting, Ritschard noted that his estimate was way off for the price of the printer; rather than \$1200, it will cost \$2800 to get one of the standard student printers. Hinerman moved and Defoort seconded that the printer be purchased despite the extra cost. The motion passed unanimously.

- Scholarship Changes

As background, Wiegandt reminded the committee that 10% of all student tech funds collected are to be returned to the students in the form of a "scholarship". Based on requests from Business and Financial Services and the models of other colleges, Ritschard asked the committee if it wishes to change how scholarships are awarded to students. At present, a "scholarship" is a 50% refund of the current charge, or a refund of \$147.50 for the year. If a change is desired, Ritschard will take the proposal to the University Charges for Technology (CFT) committee. Currently, the CFT manual limits the way scholarships are awarded, but other colleges seem to be deviating from the manual. If the CFT committee agrees with our reading of the manual, we will propose a change to the manual that would allow a different model for the scholarships. Discussion will continue after more is known from the CFT committee.

- Discuss upcoming Charges for Technology Meeting

Wiegandt alerted the committee to a presentation by ACNS that will propose a \$25 "technology fee" for every student. The resulting fee will generate approximately \$1.2 million. The issue has come up because the library is trying to find a way to pay for its computers. The library came to the CFT committee last fall to ask for \$280,000 each year from the colleges and was strongly denied. There is concern that \$1.2 million will be generated to solve a perceived need of \$280,000 (which is, itself, debatable). Other information has also led us to believe that ASCSU is proposing a bill to implement the fee. The committee agreed with the concern and encouraged strong representation at the CFT. Wiegandt and Murray are the college's student representatives on CFT, but Hinerman agreed to attend since Murray can not.

Budget Items:

- Review of this year's budget

\*tabled\* until next meeting

- Funds available for next year's strategic initiatives

Ritschard reported that at least \$50K will be available next year, which the committee may take into consideration when considering proposals for strategic funds.

- Project Suggestions for this year's funds

\*tabled\* until next meeting

Items from the floor:

- Request to borrow Cafe monitors

Ritschard brought a request from ECE to borrow the Internet Cafe monitors in support of an NSF site visit. The visit is key in that a positive review would result in a project worth approximately \$6 million. Defoort suggested that a grant of that magnitude be supported as much as is possible, because it will also offer long-term benefits to students. However, others were concerned about the precedence and the potential damage to very expensive monitors. After much discussion, the committee agreed to loan monitors from the bar and round tables on the condition that ECE bear the cost of moving and returning the monitors and offer a guarantee of replacement should one of the monitors be damaged for any reason. It was emphasized that the Cafe remain open even with limited capacity. Ritschard will communicate this decision to the ECE faculty involved.

- Large Plotter in LMDS

The ENS Lab Manager, Brent Massey, has requested that the committee consider removing the large plotter from the Lockheed Martin Design Studio. Because it is so infrequently used, the print heads dry out prior to being fully utilized and the cost of replacing the five heads is approximately \$120 each. Defoort offered the Engines Lab as a new home that might make better use of the plotter. Before making a final decision, the committee agreed to explore the possibility of providing plotter paper now that a print quota system has been implemented. Ritschard noted that the faculty Design Team who oversee the LMDS would also have an equal say in the status of the printer; he will get their input.

The next meeting will be Wednesday, March 5.

Respectfully submitted by  
Mark Ritschard



Digital\_63.pdf

# GIS Lab Funding

May, 2000 to date

	Student Tech Funds			CE funds	
	ESTC contrib.	CE contrib.	ENS contrib.		
New Computers (SU00)		3,997.72			
New Monitors (SU01) <sup>1</sup>	1,000.00 <sup>2</sup>	8,000.00			
New Computers (SU01) <sup>3</sup>	26,450.10				
New Color Printer (SU01)			4,489.57		
Rebuild lab - labor (SU01)			432.00		
New Computers (FA01)		3,000.00	109.62		
Install computers - labor			86.40		
New plotter (FA01)		4,001.16			
ArcView license (AY02)		1,824.00			
New Projector (SP02)		3,809.75			
Install projector - labor			58.88		
Rewiring (SU02)				4,790.12	
ArcView license (AY03)		1,900.00			
printer maintenance (FA02)			139.50		
general maintenance			X		
total dollars	27,450.10	26,532.63	5,315.97	4,790.12	64,088.82
percentage	42.83%	41.40%	8.29%	7.47%	100.00%
		92.53%			

## Notes:

- 1) When the lab was rebuilt, CE agreed to be responsible for all printing costs. John Labadie has now requested that ENS pick up these charges.
- 2) Ritschard recalls that the ESTC agreed to fund the lab rebuild in summer of 2001 as long as CE opened up the lab when classes are not in session. However, no documented statements could be found.
- 3) The lab is closed to all students except those who are given access by Profs. John Labadie or Luis Garcia, or who have one-time access for a CE class.
- 4) Only CE classes have access to the room.
- 5) As of 12/3/02, 14 students and 11 CE faculty/staff have 24 hour access to the lab.  
An additional 19 students have access for class.

corrections from hand-out at 12/02 meeting

<sup>1</sup> was mis-labeled as "New Computers"

<sup>2</sup> was mis-recorded as "8,000"

<sup>3</sup> was omitted