Comments and Questions

Second Set of Abstracts Revised After Feb 13

(Discussed at February 13 Meeting)

Note: Includes later comments from Eckroth and de Almeida.

FAIRHAVEN 1: Field Audio Recording Equipment

Comments

- I like this abstract and how many students it can impact with such a small portion of money.
- The equipment being requested has a lot of uses for a wide variety of different students.
- I appreciate the proposer's research into classroom services current equipment of this type and their communications with Gary Malick.
- I would recommend seeing a more in depth proposal.
- The abstract was well thought out and the equipment request was clear and specific.
- The authors seemed to have consulted with ATUS, who will be holding the equipment. It will be complementing and enhancing what is already available.
- I appreciate that they will have an expert available through office hours to help any student to learn how to use the equipment.

Questions for Proposal Invitation (If applicable)

- Is the demand high enough for ten units (Zoom 4)? Ask Gary Malick ourselves?

Initial Rating: "3 points" "7 points"

FAIRHAVEN 2: Fairhaven and CFPA Audio Tech Update

Comments

- Should they have had course fees to fund this?
- Give them some benefit for not asking for funds too often.
- This abstract is for quite a lot of money considering the benefit to all Western students.
- I can see the need for this new technology and software in their program but overall I am left with more questions, including what software is needed and other basics. I am in the middle on this but inclined to say no.
- This abstract was not as clear as the first one ("select pieces of hardware and software" does not say much, especially if the existing equipment has been discontinued). Price tag seems high considering the lack of specificity.

Questions for Proposal Invitation (If applicable)

- Realistically, is this equipment for Fairhaven?

Initial Rating: "1 point" 2 points

FAIRHAVEN 3: Textile Arts and Cultural Activism

Comments

- This looks like last year's "screen-printing" abstract.
- Well-written abstract.
- Common problem: Every school wants its own resources; sharing can be problematic.
- Class enrollment of 10-12 students is too low to warrant this funding.
- I like how inexpensive this abstract is and its ability to impact many art-focused students at Western.
- It seems this program has been almost fully equipped by the STF, which makes me less inclined to look for a new proposal.
- While the equipment is well identified, it is not clear to me how the technical functions of these machines would complement the existing ones. At first, it seemed to me that they wanted to add more machines so all 12 students in the class would have access to the same equipment. But if these newer machines are varied, that might not be the case.

Questions for Proposal Invitation (If applicable)

- Did the STF buy sewing machines last year already? If not then I see no problem in requesting a full proposal since it would impact a good number of students with new sewing technology.

Initial Rating: ~~"0 points"~~ "2 points"

FAIRHAVEN 4: Solar Editing Lab

Comments

- This is more appropriate for the Green Energy Fund.
- AS students will take care of directing this abstract to Green Energy Committee.
- They should send this to the Green Energy Fee, this seems to have little to do with our mission and is focused more on how the technology is fueled than how the technology works and can improve a field of work.
- The abstract sounded to me more of a matter of infrastructure, but I could be wrong. Also not sure what this would entail in terms of installation and maintenance costs. I had a hard time fitting this request into one of the three categories of fundable technology listed in the Proposal Guidelines.

Questions for Proposal Invitation (If applicable)

- No questions surfaced during discussion.

Initial Rating: "Not Applicable" (same)

HUXLEY 1: Huxley College ITV

Comments

- This is an instructional responsibility, not appropriate for the Student Tech Fee.
- This could be considered to be classroom upgrades.
- Not clear what exactly the money would be used for. Online expansion?

- Do distance students pay the Student Tech Fee? (Lawson will verify with Provost which students pay the fee.)
- This abstract is asking for $25,000 from STF, not $97,000.
- This technology would be usable for everyone; I think this should see a full proposal.
- This could potentially increase Western's ability to have more off-site classes and programs such as Huxley on the Peninsula or Western programs in Everett.
- I appreciate this is a project that the college is strongly behind, since they are paying for most of it.

Questions for Proposal Invitation (If applicable)

- What specific equipment would be purchased if this were funded?
- According to the abstract, the equipment requires training by a qualified vendor. How easy would it be for the overall campus community to use it? Would someone be available to help with the setup?

Initial Rating: "~~1 point~~" "4 points"

HUXLEY 2: Submersible Fluorometer for Aquatic Ecology Research and Education

Comments

- Cool technology!
- This is a unique technology that supports the STF mission by enhancing the quality of the academic experience. It has academic merit.
- It would be used by a relatively small number of students.
- This would not be useable or relevant for many students but for those who would use this equipment, it could change their academic experience entirely. This would essentially allow ESCI students in Huxley to do real field work relating to tracing nutrients through systems and other great research that would prepare students for the field.
- I recommend seeing a full proposal.
- This seemed a reasonable abstract. Making research procedures more achievable and reducing the needs and costs of multiple sampling trips are valid ways to enhance both quality and access to students. It is also advantageous that students from allied disciplines would be able to use the equipment.

Questions for Proposal Invitation (If applicable)

- How many courses would use this equipment? Class sizes?

Initial Rating: "~~8 points~~" "12 points"

LIBRARIES 1: Research-Writing Studio Collaborative Technologies

Comments

- Similar to an abstract from last year, for which only plug-ins were funded.
- [A student member] does not think students would use this equipment, and has not seen the existing, similar equipment in use.
- We need evidence of use for a purpose, or a specific request for the technology.
- This equipment needs a faculty champion.
- I think this abstract has some great benefits to a large majority of Western students who will have to write and may need assistance.

- I'd like to see a full proposal but with a reduction as they mentioned in the abstract, to 1 mediascape and 5 mobile units, or something that does not take $42,000.
- Although high in price, this abstract seems to appropriately complement an existing initial investment in a new facility to be available to all students.
- I appreciate that they are willing to break down the project in less costly steps, making it more feasible to be paid for.

Questions for Proposal Invitation (If applicable)

- No questions surfaced during discussion.

Initial Rating: ~~"2 points"~~ "6 points"

WOODRING 1: Chromebooks for Education

Comments

- Similar to this year's iPads abstract.
- Students would be using this equipment in their classes on campus, which would prepare them for field use. (Schools have and use similar equipment already.)
- There are no contractual problems. (Lawson verified.)
- We need to teach concepts, not keystrokes.
- The cost is modest, and 400 students/year would be affected.
- Are Chromebooks even used in K-12 classrooms?
- This is by far the best abstract I have seen for tablets. I think these tablets would get a lot of use for a low cost.
- All students can technically check these out from Miller Hall if they are available.
- They have also made a fairly strong case as to the Google apps portion.
- Using the same rationale that STF should not pay for iPads, I don't see   how it would be different with Chromebooks.

Questions for Proposal Invitation (If applicable)

- Who would maintain computers and accounts?
- Can they use other tablets and still have the proper apps? And if they can use other tablets and access these apps, are these the best option still?
-

Initial Rating: ~~"5 points"~~ ~~"7~~ points"

STUDENT ABSTRACT: GigaPan for Place-Based Learning through Time and Space

Comments

- Lots of likes for this abstract.
- Important for students to know how to use the equipment before checking it out.
- This seems like a great tool for spatial documentation.
- It is a low-cost abstract with high potential of usage of by many disciplines beyond Geology.
- The abstract was clear and well researched.

Questions for Proposal Invitation (If applicable)

- Would equipment be easy for students to use? Training?
- How many students would benefit?
- If housed in Geology, would other students really be able to use it?
- Has someone in the Geology department agreed to be the steward for the equipment? (This student will eventually graduate.) No additional contact person listed.

Initial Rating: "8 points" "12 points"

STUDENT ABSTRACT: WWU ATUS Academusic

Comments

- Students should not be able to set up the equipment at home.
- Having music editing equipment available for checkout from ATUS could potentially benefit students in projects in various disciplines such as Music, Communications, Video Production, etc.
- Iam not sure if the lending of software would be legally possible.
- The second part of the abstract, the actual Academusic, seems a bit hypothetical and outside the scope of this committee.

Questions for Proposal Invitation (If applicable)

- What does the student want to purchase?
- Does this duplicate some of the Fairhaven abstract equipment?

Initial Rating: "0 points" "1 point"

STUDENT ABSTRACT: WWU MakerLab

Comments

- Lots of "likes" for this abstract.

Questions for Proposal Invitation (If applicable)

- What would the noise level be?
- Who would be responsible for maintaining equipment?
- Could the Student Tech Center charge a usage fee?

Initial Rating: "10 points"