

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

Morris Campus Student Association

Campus Governance

4-30-2018

MCSA Forum minutes 04/30/2018

Morris Campus Student Association

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/mcsa>

Recommended Citation

Morris Campus Student Association, "MCSA Forum minutes 04/30/2018" (2018). *Morris Campus Student Association*. 162.

<https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/mcsa/162>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Campus Governance at University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. It has been accepted for inclusion in Morris Campus Student Association by an authorized administrator of University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. For more information, please contact skulann@morris.umn.edu.

Memo to: MCSA Forum Members
From: MCSA Executive Committee
Subject: Forum Agenda for Monday, April 30th, 2018.

The Forum will meet on Monday at 6pm in IH 109/ Cow Palace.

Attendance: Kari Gillette, Elizabeth Abler, Sierra Brown, Autumn Johnson, Christina Munoz-Pinon, Josh Westfield, Sydney Bauer, Mitch Scanlan, Samuel Rosemark, Isaac Hunt, Charles Hassinger, Trey Goodsell, Parker Smith, Sara Carmen, Harshita Kaldindi, Tom Brisbane-Haubrich, Annika Nelson, Andrew Brichacek.

Called to order 6:05.

I. Open Forum

A. [Update to Tech Fee Guideline](#) presented by Vice Chancellor Hermann Hermann, Vice Chancellor of Finance and Facilities

Talked about splitting tech fee and how to do it differently. Specifically, thinking about how much we should be giving to IT for campus labs and classrooms on a 7-8 year cycle. thought about tech fee as a percentage break, bring plan forward every year with 25% for us to allocate what we have. Have laid it out for next 8-10 years, computer labs would be on a 4 year cycle instead of labs getting updated at sporadic times, spend a specific amount each year (50-60 comps each year). Very different amounts for classrooms (x number of classrooms need to be updated each year) and bring it to MCSA to be approved. The tricky part is that we don't know what's gonna happen, Humanities is next year but don't know specifically what needs to be done.

Hunt- 75% of what tech fee is allocated to infrastructure developments and what happens if it gets vetoed by tech fee?

Vice Chancellor Hermann- slate would be carving out specific budget and have more discussion on it with IT.

Brichacek- all this would come as a slate and approve all 75%, what happens if we don't approve it? Will plan be revised and brought back to us?

Hermann- that would make sense.

Brown- allocating 75% would be binding and placed into our guidelines, don't see why it would.

Nelson- would have some less necessary but allocated to tech fee?

Hermann- funds allocated are flexible, have asked for different amounts each year, would like to spread it out more so we can have more freedom, should think about raising tech fee because it hasn't been raised in a few years.

Brown- this would be able to keep classrooms etc. on a cycle so everything is the same every year.

Rosemark- it would be on a cycle by every 7-8 years.

Hermann- the goal is to spread it around and can request funds for different areas, hold back 20% of tech fee automatically for emergencies etc. and the 75% and 20% would come from what is left. The big advantages would be for it to plan and bring it to us and implement it. The limit on not being able to spend until July 1 has been an issue because it leads to scrambling at the end before school starts, we now will begin wiring earlier in May and June so it doesn't get slammed to the end.

Smith- clarification, would the 75% change in tech fee be significantly increased more than \$150,000?

Herman- yes it would.

Hunt- would we anticipate cost savings?

Hermann- don't know if there will be a significant amount of cost savings but would be more advantageous because we can plan for it (gave example for bonding bill planning might save money if we have a strategic use of funds). Also the idea of being able to look forward and plan can lead to more savings.

Brichacek- if any of money isn't used for the 75% will it go back to the general fund for various uses and if goes over 75% can we request more money?

Hermann- what isn't used will go back into the pool or we might be able to use allocated money for 1 project which was under budget and can do 2 smaller projects. Hermann gives credit to all of us because of leadership roles and wanting to plan for more things.

Brown shout out to Salvi Alam *claps* Thank you Vice Chancellor Hermann
applause as Vice Chancellor Hermann leaves

II. For Action: Approve Agenda

A. Goodsell- can we approve the agenda because the bylaws were not included?

DeBellis- recommended to approve bylaws that were sent out and wait on those not sent out 10 days before.

Brown- we will vote on it at the first forum after sending it out.

Johnson motions

Rosemark seconds

Motion passes

III. For Action: Approve [Minutes from 4.23.18](#)

A. Brichacek motions

B. Rosemark seconds

C. Motion passes

D. Smith abstains

IV. President's Remarks

A. Brichacek- Thank you everybody for all the work you've done this year and for coming, have good summer, good luck on finals.

V. Committee Reports

A. MCSA Committees

Academic Affairs

Campus Relations

Executive Committee

First Year Council

Resources and Operations

Student Services

B. Campus Assembly Committees

Assessment of Student Learning

Academic Support Services

Consultative

Curriculum

Faculty and P&A Affairs

Faculty Development

Finance

Functions and Awards

International Programs

Membership

Multi-Ethnic Experience

Planning

Scholastic

Steering

Student Affairs

VI. Organization Reports

VII. Old Business

A. For Information:

1. [Draft Vision and Goals](#) feedback presented by Secretary Rosemark

Rosemark- I think it would be good idea if we went through each vision and goal statement to provide feedback, follow along and let Rosemark know if you have thoughts.

A. Vision statement:

Smith- this feels like freezer burned vanilla ice cream , where we think we are now rather than where we want to be in 10 years, it's non memorable or visionary, we should trash and restart.

Rosemark- vision statement is where we want to be in the next ten years.

Bauer- we can't have a vision without buzzwords, this should have buzzwords but make them have purpose.

Rosemark- the hard part about the vision statement is implementation, this vision is bland and could be improved.

Brown, Nelson- we like last sentence of statement but hate the first sentence. We should be able to say more about inclusive liberal arts and the word sustainable is missing.

Brichacek- the biggest issue is that sustainability is missing, as it's only included in a small subpoint.

Smith- one of the goals is about financial sustainability and environmental sustainability is not the priority.

Rosemark- this supposed to be in 10 years and now we're doing sustainability really well. A lot of people on task force aren't seeing the things we're doing well but rather including what we aren't doing well.

Hunt- it doesn't actually define what the liberal arts mean, what do they mean to us?

Smith- liberal arts is a very wide term, every school says they do the liberal arts, most of this is what we do or what we think we do.

Hassinger- need to keep sustainability momentum and shouldn't put it on the back burner, needs to be implemented into the statement.

Brichacek- the whole vision statement could be applied to what we do now and nothing in it is new.

Hunt- something we might be doing with vision statement is when institutions are at a cross road, they use vague language because it allows you to do what you have to so to survive and still fits.

Bauer- the statement feels like a pat on a back and the goals do not feel connected to her. The buzzwords don't connect to a greater meaning, for example, the statement is just saying innovative to say innovative.

Smith- understands why it has to be vague but it is super important to write a new way to reallocate resources by the time get it gets presented to President Kaler in December, we have to be comfortable with it.

Nelson- goal 1 should be to more explicitly say what liberal arts are to us. People looking up UMM should know what the liberal arts mean to us and that it matches these 3 criteria, those making vision and goals have been doing this for 20 years.

Brown- The vision doesn't draw potential students

Bauer- we could just put it {sustainability} in the beginning to frame the statement.

Brichacek- we need to say why we stand out in liberal arts.

Nelson- it should still be a goal to meet this definition, we should have the first goal be about the vision.

B. Goal 6:

Bauer- why isn't a goal about sustainability, sustainability is a whole bunch of things and being able to say what we're doing and how we can do it better. A lot of what were talking about is energy and we need to address how were going to do it and fund it, we need to be proud of it in our goals. Sustainability needs own section.

Brown- We are one of top sustainable campuses in US but we could lose it in 10 years if we don't explicitly say that we want to keep doing it.

Brichacek- in the vision statement we use the word innovation. If we're saying we're an innovative campus it should be focused on part where we're being innovative and doing things not everyone is doing.

Bauer- sustainability is not easy to do and takes a while, we need to work on solutions and plans because it takes a long time, we should tell future people why we're researching this.

Brown- goal 6 about community members, what does it mean having the local community in contributing to our decisions and infrastructure?

Nelson- to foster community engagement will include involving community members in decisions, UMM has a pretty big reach past just campus. We'll need to do little bit of both, going out into the community and bringing them in, it's hard to say how were going to go about this because it's hard to plan for it. She feels like there should be talk about mutual contribution from the UMM community to the Morris community.

Rosemark- that gets talked about in the goals above goal 6.

C. Goal 5

Bauer- likes goal 5 because it works to establish ourselves and says look how cool we are. We can throw innovation into this section of the goals.

Hunt- goal 5, searched other campuses' visions and they better say what they're here for and what people should be doing here (for example, Duluth has a focus on health science and tells people not to come if they're not health science).

Brown- UMD doesn't just say that they don't want people who don't do health science.

Nelson- we need to have a statement about what are we doing; we can claim liberal arts as our own stake in the UMN system.

Smith- The CLA at the UMTC also does liberal arts, we shouldn't see bombardments about liberal arts unless it is backed up, we don't want to melt into pack of all campuses who claim they do liberal arts.

D. Goal 1:

Bauer- loves the concept on bullet point 1, also appreciates the campus-wide interdisciplinary capstone experience. It's not all structured in the same way though.

Rosemark- should put more emphasis on the interdisciplinary experience and make it more valued like possibly have double majors incorporated into the goal.

Brown- we should look at requirements.

Nelson- we should include things required for freshman, Native studies, writing, and liberal arts.

Smith- the UMD vision is 3 paragraphs long and we have 3 sentences that have no context.

Nelson- everyone loves a bullet point, we should include a whopping 5 sentences and keep bullet points.

Brown- like what they're doing because they have a buzzword and define it.

Brichacek- ours talks about what we're currently practicing while UMD has what they will be doing.

Hunt- we shouldn't get too caught up in UMD's goals.

Brichacek- there is nothing wrong with having goal you don't meet.

Smith- in the campus strategic plan, we need to say what we're gonna be so it can be included when we make decisions about our future.

E. Brown- any other specifics that people have about goals?

Bauer- sustainability should be in its own bullet point.

Brisbois-Haubrich- is it possible to make the longer vision statement?

Brichacek- we will bring this feedback back to the committee.

Rosemark- in regards to a timeline, we will present at Campus Assembly and its still not finalized. It will be taken out to community over the summer and will be implemented in beginning of the school year. The task force's recommendations are that not all committees have to do these things and is led by Chancellor Behr (but is not being explicitly led by her but rather by the task force and she oversees it).

VIII. New Business

A. For Information:

1. Meeting with Chancellor Behr on Friday. Last meeting of the year. If you want us to ask her anything, send an email to ummMCSA@morris.umn.edu.
2. First Forum of 2018-19 Academic Year - Monday, September 3rd at 6-7PM.

B. For Action:

1. Approve [Tech Fee Guideline Updates](#)
Brown- Do we want to approve it or discuss the amendments?
Smith- we should put it off until fall because we can't set aside 75% of the funding until we know what tech fee will be in the next year. We should have a discussion next fall for the following year and update allocation guidelines after that.

IX. Announcements

- A. Last Campus Assembly of the Year is this Wednesday, May 2nd in the Science Auditorium at 4:30 PM.
- B. Science Wall of Graduates (explained by Bauer)
 1. Wall in atrium of who is graduating this year, you should be excited about this and tell people so it is appreciative to Peh for letting students make decisions, there will also be spot for alumni.
- C. Talk by Stoneridge Software CEO Eric Newell (UMM Alumni, Former MCSA President) in IM 109 (Cow Palace) from 3:30 PM to 4:30 PM on Wednesday, May 2nd.
 1. Wife will be in it too who is also an alumnus.
 2. They are also interested in bringing in interns to their company.
 3. Promoted by the Economics and Management department.

X. Adjourn.

7:04 pm