

ELC Agenda **March 10th, 2016**

- **Dean, Manos Maragakis**
- **Differential Fees**
 - **Dr. Candice Bauer**
- **Receipts still needed**
 - **October**
 - IEEE: 566.16
 - **November**
 - ACM: 150
 - **December**
 - ASCE: 1600
 - HPVC: 75
 - NRS: 159.95
 - SHPES: 97.50

- **Officer Elections**
 - President - Creates meeting agendas, collects funding applications, performs initial analysis of funding applications, guides conversation at meetings.
 - Vice-President - Fills in for the President, when they are not able to attend, assists in guiding conversation at meetings.
 - Treasurer - Primarily assists the president with working with ASUN and planning E-Week and Welcome Back BBQ, assists with guiding conversation at meetings
 - Secretary - Takes meeting minutes and adds them to the ELC website, assists with guiding conversation at meetings

- **Unspent Funds**
 - Reappropriation
 - Return to ELC

- **Funding Hearing**
 - ARLISS
 - \$859.42 for Parts
 - ASME
 - \$1600 for Conference
 - Concrete Canoe
 - \$1368.30 for Mid-Pac
 - ECS
 - \$60 for Pizza
 - HERC
 - \$1000 for Machining Stock
 - Mackay Muckers
 - \$1600 for Competition
 - Robotics

- \$721 for Parts
 - Steel Bridge
 - \$1503.10 for Mid-Pac
 - SWE
 - \$479.85 for Six Flags Tour
 - Theta Tau
 - \$880 for Retreat
 - TBP
 - \$500 for End of Year Banquet
 - \$625 for Tutoring Incentives
 - H2O Treatment
 - \$679 for Mid-Pac
 - WICSE
 - \$147.28 for swag bags
 - Wolf Pack Racing
 - \$985.54 for Parts
- What is going on with everyone :)

Website: <http://nevadaelc.weebly.com>

Funding Form: <https://goo.gl/forms/VXBllEqZcsP3rf713>

Guidelines for Requesting Differential Fees from the CoEN Central Committee

Differential fee funding priority goes to developing a globally competitive education, matching the strategic plan, and state-of-art resources. These justifications need to be legitimate, though. We got a lot of proposals that were over inflated. That deceit leads the committee to interpreting the whole proposal as being dishonest.

The original mission of differential fees set these categories as priority (in no particular order).

Enhancing undergraduate and graduate education.

Purchasing equipment and state-of-the-art software as needed (ABET Criteria i, l).

Implementing sustainable laboratory and equipment maintenance plans (ABET Criteria j)

Implementing sustainable laboratory safety plans (ABET Criteria k).

Better equipping and maintaining the Engineering Computer Center and improving its availability, scheduling and efficiency for instruction and research.

Offering funds as needed to establish and maintain hardware and non-academic versions of software required to interact with hi-tech industry.

Hiring technicians and computer system administrators.

Hiring internship/placement coordinators to interact with industry and assist with the identification of internships and placement after graduation.

Generating additional scholarships to assist students with increased higher education costs (allocate at least 15% of the generated revenue).

Hiring additional support staff needed to accommodate the growth.

Hiring additional tenure track faculty (ABET Criteria a-e).

Hiring full or part-time instructors (ABET Criteria a, b, d).

Hiring additional teaching assistants (ABET Criteria f, g).

Offering graduate fellowships (ABET Criteria h).

Proposals which have cost sharing are prioritized over proposals with no contributions (as it shows a willingness of the proposing entity to do their part in seeking funds).

Specifically for the club proposals, the ones that have the support of the faculty advisor do better than those that do not even mention discussions with the faculty advisors or their home departments. (For example, we asked a club advisor for information, and that person did not even know that the club had submitted a proposal.)

Proposals that clearly show how the money will be spent and have done research on actual costs are stronger than those that just throw out random numbers.

Small items (less than \$2500) are less appropriate for the differential fees committees, especially for clubs. The mindset is that such small asks should be funded by the ELC, ASUN,

self-fundraising, sponsors, etc. One of the justifications for funding the ELC is that the committees would stop getting the “low end” or “frivolous” proposals (polos, jackets, t-shirts, etc.) that have little impact on education as a whole. It is not that the committee undervalues these items and in general supports clubs and teams in uniform and such, but there is no legitimate way to say that a t-shirt enhances the education of hundreds of students within CoEN and makes a global impact (i.e., would someone from England know/care that we had matching t-shirts?).

Proposals that have high impact in terms of students affected are more successful. Proposals that will only benefit a small group of students are not as powerful as proposals that benefit hundreds. For example, if proposing to go to a conference, the proposal should include how sending that small delegation will impact hundreds of students because they plan to do something like hold a college-wide seminar to discuss what they learned at the conference.

Proposals that have no lasting effect (disposal items like a jacket for a specific person) have lower priority.

Proposals must be in terms of “line items,” (i.e., receipt obtainable items). It is against policy to fund something like a club’s deficit. We need a specific line item. It is okay for things like conferences that have a specific line item to pay for registration, but it is not okay to have something like “give us \$4000 so we can spend it on travel and stuff.” These funds are not deposited into the club’s accounts. They are specific purchases. So, when clubs just ask for money without showing the ability to provide receipts (line items), it cannot be funded due to audit requirements.