Members Present: Tristan Syron, Chair
Nick Bohn, Vice-Chair
Rachel Largay, Warner College of Natural Resources
Jeff Cook, Graduate College
Kalyn Blach, College of Agriculture
Miriam Wagoner, College of Business
Amanda Evans, CVMBS
Jacob Royer, College of Natural Resources
Kiri Michell, College of Health & Human Sciences

Member at Large: Tyler Siri, ASCSU

Associate Members Present:
Alex Stately, CVMBS
Shannon McNulty, Warner College of Natural Resources
Mauri Richards, College of Engineering
Grace Clark-Rabinowitz, College of Natural Sciences
Raleigh Heekin, College of Health & Human Sciences

Other Members Present:
Tom Satterly, Advisor
Tamla Blunt, Ex-Officio
Becca Mueller, Staff Support
Savanna Bunnell, Facilities Management
Dan Kozlowski, Facilities Management
Kristi Buffington, Facilities Management
Steve Kellums, Facilities Management

1. Call to order
   a. Meeting was called to order at 5:00pm.

2. Approval of minutes
   a. The chair sought unanimous consent in approving the minutes from February 9\textsuperscript{th}, 2016.
      i. No dissent
      ii. Minutes approved.

3. Presentation – Senior Capstone Design and Innovation Center – Anthony Marchese
   a. Total Ask: $996,883
   b. This proposal is to develop a space dedicated to the senior design capstone experience for engineering students. The space would exist in the current engineering building, not the Scott Bioengineering Building.
   c. All engineering students at CSU are required to complete a senior capstone. In FY16/17, 464 students engaged in a capstone course.
   d. Enrollment growth often forces teams working on their projects to relocate all over town, off campus. Enrollment is expected to continue to grow, and this issue will worsen. This space would allow more people to stay on campus to work.
   e. Some relocate off campus by design, to cater to their specific project, but some only relocate due to lack of space on Main Campus.
Having a centralized location would help ensure faculty can be present to supervise projects.

Due to enrollment increase, the college has had to put a cap on the mechanical engineering program for the first time.

This proposed senior capstone design space would be located where there is currently mezzanine space. It would involve relocating study space. The capstone center would be 45,000 square feet.

The capstone space would be a multidisciplinary space in which all engineering students would have access to work. Currently, there is no space in which all sections can work together, each engineering department has their own capstone space.

The proposed Senior Capstone Design and Innovation center will include open space for collaboration and light fabrication, meeting rooms with secure storage, shared conference rooms with video conferencing capability and rapid prototyping.

UFFAB’s funding would go towards the structural work that must be done to recapture the high bay space and the needed HVAC addition.

The benefits to students also include increased instructor safety and quality showcasing capability to attract new investors.

In total, the project will cost an estimated $1.5 million dollars, with several other units providing other funding.

Questions:

i. Jeff asked how the College of Engineering justifies coming to UFFAB for more funding when the board is still paying off bonds from the Scott Bioengineering building.
   1. This addition is located in the engineering building on main campus. There is a need for this space, mechanical engineering is mostly located in this building and there is no space for capstone work. Enrollment is growing in the College of Engineering, and the students contribute a lot of money in facility fees. Also, the goal is that this space will increase collaboration between the COE and other colleges, so ideally many students will benefit.

ii. Nick asked what the price difference would be if they did not relocate the study space above the proposed capstone space.
   1. In planning, they weighted a number of options including not adding the study space, however, there is high demand for the study space. It is not a huge additional cost, it will not require substantial HVAC work because it will be an open space, separated only by a balcony.

iii. Nick asked if there was a noise concern with the study space being open and above the capstone work space.
    1. There will not be heavy manufacturing equipment used in space. There will be noise from students working and talking, but the space now includes an open balcony between the study space and labs and there have been no issues.

iv. Tyler asked if this addition would allow for more growth within the college.
   1. No, but it would help the current students and faculty, help the overall program.

v. Jeff asked if UFFAB could partially fund part of the project.
   1. There are really no ways to cut cost except eliminate the second level study space component, and even that cut does not reduce the budget significantly. We would take partial funding, but we would need to raise the rest of the money somewhere else. This isn’t a project that can be fragmented and done in pieces.

vi. Tristan asked what type of projects involve collaboration between colleges.
   1. These projects would vary. Sometimes, sponsors develop ideas that involve collaboration. Some independent studies involve collaboration. Ideally, anyone in need of space for their capstone would use this space for credit and that alone increase the likelihood of collaboration.

vii. Tristan mentioned that Health and Human Sciences had some challenges with shared space. How will this space manage collaboration between the different engineering students?
1. Adequate planning will go into dividing the space between the various teams. Often times crowd issues arise in research oriented work, this space will not be used in that capacity.

   o. Legitimacy Vote:
   i. Jeff moved to legitimize the proposal.
   ii. Jacob seconded.
   iii. The chair asked for any dissention.
   iv. No dissent.
   v. Proposal is legitimized.

4. Presentation – College of Engineering Internet Café Remodel – Kelley Wittmeyer, Nick Stratton
   a. Total ask: $30,000
   b. This proposal is for a renovation of the Engineering Internet Café. Currently, the space is poorly utilized. The lab desks (tables with windows and monitors below) are failing and unusable. There is need for more seating for collaborative work and study space.
   c. The remodel will include removing the conference room to open up the space, adding regular desks in the middle of the room equipped with computers, additional bench seating, and new carpet and barstools.
   d. The department is considering removing the vending machines currently kept in the study space, as they are the least profitable machines on campus.
   e. The total cost of the remodel will be $40,000, however, ESTC will contribute $10,000.
   f. The project would begin summer 2017 and take no longer than three week.
   g. The remodel will increase seating by 12, allow for better usage of the room for studying and group work, and improve general comfort and usability.
   h. This space is the only computer lab on the first floor, and is available to all engineering students. There are about 3,295 students in the College of Engineering that will directly benefit from this remodel.
   i. Questions
      i. Are only engineering students allowed to use this space?
         1. Students from other colleges have access to the room to use for studying or group work, however, the computers are limited to engineering students.
      ii. Have you considered having the moveable tables in the middle of the room instead of fixed tables with monitors?
         1. The department decided to place computer stations in the middle of the room because there is a demand for it. Most computer spaces in the building are full the majority of the day, so professors and students are wanting computers.
      iii. Is there flexibility in the design if you discover you need more open table space?
         1. Yes, shifts can be made after the need is better understood. The computer that will be on the center tables are small and easy to move, we could potentially add more tables if need be. The room is relatively small so the department is not anticipating a need for more tables, as they would congest the space.

j. Legitimacy Vote:
   i. Jeff moved to legitimize the proposal.
   ii. Rachel seconded.
   iii. The chair asked for any dissention.
   iv. No dissent.
   v. Proposal is legitimized.