

ABSTRACTS
Comments and Questions
Third Set of Abstracts
Discussed at February 20 Meeting

CSE 1: Upgrading Surface Analysis Capabilities for Materials Science Education and Research at WWW

Comments

- Affects 133 students per year.
- Well-written abstract.
- Leverages other equipment that the department already has.
- High cost at \$37,500.

Questions for Proposal Invitation (If applicable)

- Is partial funding possible?

Initial Rating: 10 points"

CSE 2: Enabling Investigative Labs on Gene Function using *Tetrahymena* and *C. elegans*

Comments

- High number of students (900) is questionable.
- Students would use something that the equipment produces, not the actual equipment.
- Nice that the department is contributing.
- "gateway" equipment

Questions for Proposal Invitation (If applicable)

- How long is the equipment life?
- Would this be better funded with start-up funding?

Initial Rating: "7 points"

CSE 3: Pilot: Universal Mathematica Site License

Comments

- Student Tech Fee would normally fund for one year, not two.
- There are two other similar math products in use on campus; this may be redundant.

Questions for Proposal Invitation (if applicable)

- No questions surfaced during discussion.

Initial Rating: "2 points"

CSE 4: Enhancing Student Quantitative and Practical Skills by Incorporation of Essential Quantitative PCR Technology into Molecular Techniques Laboratory Curriculum

Comments

- Limited reach; low number of students affected.
- Could be used by other departments.

Questions for Proposal Invitation (if applicable)

- Would this be mainly for Bio 324?
- Do they already have similar equipment?
- Would students be able to use the new equipment? Or just faculty?
- For a proposal, talk to other departments and specifically address how they might share.

Initial Rating: "6 points"

CSE 5: Experimental Earth Surface Processes Laboratory

Comments

- For a heavily taken course, with a fun lab.
- Equipment would benefit a lot of students.
- Equipment would leverage a setup already in place.
- Equipment has a relatively long life.

Questions for Proposal Invitation (if applicable)

- No questions surfaced during discussion.

Initial Rating: "10 points"

CSE 6: Leveraging the Use of X-Radiography for Undergraduates

Comments

- Doesn't appear that students would actually use the equipment.
- Maybe they want it more for research.
- Possible setup?: Upper-level students would use the equipment, and lower-level students would look at images

Questions for Proposal Invitation (If applicable)

- In a proposal, fully explain how equipment would be used and who would actually use it.

Initial Rating: "4 points"

CSE 7: Software for Terrestrial Laser Scanner

Comments

- Low amount at \$7,500.

Questions for Proposal Invitation (If applicable)

- In proposal, provide more detail about how students would actually use this technology.
- Would this be allowable per Student Tech Fee software rules? Check!

Initial Rating: "9 points"

CSE 8: Understanding Machining Phenomena through Measurement and Visualization

Comments

- Only two courses would use equipment.
- Students would actually be using the equipment.
- Engineering Department could really use some new technology.

Questions for Proposal Invitation (If applicable)

- How are concepts currently introduced, without the software?
- Would they need to create two new courses? If so, when would they start being offered?
- How would CSE benefit from this technology?
- Would students use just in classes, or in practice (career fields)?

Initial Rating: 6 points"