

3-20-2017

MCSA Forum minutes 03/20/2017

Morris Campus Student Association

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

Recommended Citation

Morris Campus Student Association, "MCSA Forum minutes 03/20/2017" (2017). *Morris Campus Student Association*. 69.
<http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/mcsa/69>

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 March 20th, 2017.

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

I. Open Forum

A. Green Dot - Bridget and Tara

B. Background: why become Green Dot facilitator?

1. Bridget: Positive people in life that work with Green Dot people, so when I started at UMM as the first violence prevention coordinator I got to start working with Green Dot to UMM. Wanted to be able to talk to students and be credible, so started joining Green Dot to learn. Students are assets to be Green Dot bystanders.
2. Tara: Had been doing Green Dot like things her whole life (in college, had a girl code with friends) and didn't even know it. It is really simple, so decided to implement something and give it a title.

C. Red Dot Review:

1. What is a Red Dot?

- a) When you see a situation where someone could be getting hurt or harmed in the future.
- b) Could be a preventative thing. Situation building over time.
- c) Scenario where a potentially dangerous situation might arise.
Someone following someone down the street, physically assaulting someone, consuming alcohol in a way they shouldn't.
- d) Acts of discrimination or hate against individual or group
- e) What would prevent someone from interjecting from intervening?
A potential barrier?
 - (1) Happening to a stranger and don't want to cross boundaries
 - (2) Potential of violence

(3) Fear of misinterpreting situation. For example: If 2 people are arguing, maybe they're in a relationship, but just fighting

2. What is a Green Dot?

- a)** Recognizing signs, becoming comfortable in own self to check in on others.
- b)** Things that you can do within your comfort zone that reverses the red dot. Taking a potentially harmful situation and making it positive. Stepping in and asking hey what are you doing?
- c)** Used to use college challenges: a skit for students where a person was drinking too much and another was coercing them to drink more so later they would be taken advantage of. Showing college students how to step in. Having students yell "Cops are coming", etc. Delegating focus off something.

3. What is a Proactive Green Dot?

- a)** Reactive Green Dots = Direct, delegate, and distract
 - (1) Direct: go right up to person and tell them to stop
 - (2) Delegate: tell a CA or friend that their friend is doing something wrong
 - (3) Distract: example: yelling that police are coming,
- b)** Proactive Green Dots = Do ahead of time, before red dot happens
 - (1) Example: asking what's your plan for the night? Are you going home for the night? Putting a Green Dot on a door, to start conversation
 - (2) This Booster is a proactive Green Dot
 - (3) Building healthy relationships with friends and significant others.
 - (4) Talking about sex in the first place with your significant other

(5) A colleague has a question in her email signature. Putting something on news feed on social media

(6) Asking friend to say “call me when you get there?”

4. It’s not about doing huge events, but it’s about what we can do in small places. Talking with kids, teens, colleagues,
5. *Watched videos without sound and discussed the situations*

II. For Action: Approve Agenda

- A. approved

III. For Action: Approve Minutes

- A. <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Yi7C-9ScIzAB20R7erEyjNsCnf90LUee8j3tbRKfEpU/edit>
- B. approved

IV. President’s Remarks

- A. Welcome back from Spring Break
- B. Congrats to all new MCSA leaders for next year
- C. We will for sure have forum next week (3/27), and maybe in 2 weeks (4/3)
- D. Thanks for sticking with us this year

V. Committee Reports

A. MCSA Committees

Academic Affairs - *Millard*

- Met 2 weeks ago and will keep working on ENAS resolution, Dean Finzel is very supportive of it.

Campus Relations - *Wray*

- Will be meeting after forum to get everything finalized for logos, banners, and pins

Executive Committee

First Year Council

Resources and Operations

- *Dickhudt*: Still working on Food Resolution Have met with Brian Hermann and Sandy Olson Loy. It is possible to keep moving forward after resolution passes.

Student Services

B. Campus Assembly Committees

Assessment of Student Learning Academic Support Services

Consultative

Curriculum change

- *Elinson*: Approved a change in course catalogue to help find service learning tag easier.

Faculty and P&A Affairs

Faculty Development

Finance

- *Hakala*: Went over every change in the budget for this year. Looked at operating expenses for next fiscal year by department.

Functions and Awards

International Programs

Membership

Multi-Ethnic Experience

- *TwoBears*: DiversiTEA this Thursday, 3/23, 3-4:30 in MRC lounge. Everyone is welcome

Planning

Scholastic y

- *Trieu*: Talked about creating policy for the program that allows any U student to take classes at any other U campus. Right now we only have a procedure, not a policy, so there are many petitions every year. A policy would decrease number of petitions

Steering

Student Affairs

VI. Organization Reports

AISES

Chemistry Club

- *Trieu*: Still working on March for Science, 4/22. Have teamed up with Bio Club to knit brain hats.

Biology Club

Sport Leadership at Morris

CNIA

- *TwoBears*: Pow Wow is 4/8 in PE center

Student Democratic Farmer-Labor Party

Morris Marksmanship Club

International Student Association

MPIRG

MoQSIE

University Register

- *Hunt*: An issue will be sent out this week

Women's Rugby

Organic Gardening Club

- *Dickhudt*: Barn Dance on Friday, 3/24, 7-10pm in Oyate, \$2, live music and caller and can learn how to square barn dance.

CAC

- *Prio*: To help MCSA advertise as a club, could MCSA help host a welcome week event next fall? This could help get freshmen involved.
 - *Alam*: MCSA helps host Casino Night

VII. Old Business

A. For Information:

B. For Action:

VIII. New Business

A. For Information

1. Tech Fee Revisions *presented by* Parliamentarian Hakala
2. <https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/19asNzzuddMRxsau6VKlgK6pB-mBwq-IrD2Whog1q-Gw/edit#slide=id.p>
3. *Hakala*: This is a proposal for revision to Tech Fee. As we were part of it, it's obvious to everyone it is a long and grueling process and guidelines are meant as guidance, but there should be more thought put into the

policy for Tech Fee. Guidelines could become more strict wording. Over last couple of weeks, and even years, I have talked with directors of library, IT, IMT [The Tech Partners] about their thoughts on Tech Fee. I have worked with IMT for 2 years and worked with IT over the summer. Seen a lot of projects they've proposed and a lot that have gotten turned down.

4. *Hakala presented slideshow with proposals*

a) Why?

(1) People are frustrated and it wouldn't take a lot to make things better.

b) Proposal:

(1) Reviewing tech fee guidelines, renaming it to policy and guidelines, and separating these out more.

(2) Looking into what should be approved by chancellor as this is the largest discretionary allocation of money on campus

c) SLIDE 3: Updated guidelines: we are not rigid, but we act rigid.

We need to look at other campuses that we compare ourselves to for mission, values, and size

(1) Tech Policies with guidelines that we follow

(2) Tech Partner (directors of library, IMT, IT) attend hearings and deliberations.

(a) Library maintains a lot of software and database

(b) IT: labs, recording studios, infrastructure

(c) IMT: checking out cameras, other equipment, etc.

(3) Business office finds it frustrating we don't have policy when people are using the funds. We want people to use money for what they want as soon as possible.

(4) With some exceptions such as facilities mgmt.

d) SLIDE 4 - Tech Partner

- (1) Want 50% of [of total Tech Fee money] to be allocated to Tech Partners
 - (2) Tech Partners can do things that are core to our campus and technologies we use every day that we need as a campus.
 - (3) This could help long term projects that we can't see strategic plans (10-20 year plans).
 - (4) Right now it is difficult for students to see purpose of updating entire labs
- e)** Amend tech fee guidelines
- (1) Tech partners get 50% every year. We don't vote for it to change every year. They go off of surveys and research for what they decide to update.
 - (2) The other 50% will be ours,
 - (3) Optional resolution to admin because there is critical lack of tech funds on this campus
- f)** SLIDE 6 - Why this much?
- (1) Looking at past percentages of what we have allocated to IMT and IT during tech fee it is usually around 50% anyways
- g)** SLIDE 8 - Tech Fee Summary provided by Matt Senger
- h)** SLIDE 9 - The amount needed if everything was to be updated on correct 4 year cycles
- i)** SLIDE 10 - What they need is not what they would get from this proposal
- j)** SLIDE 11 - Consistent funding will help them get on regular 4 year cycle
- k)** SLIDE 13 - Need to consider future students who will get the same presentations from Tech Partners
- (1) Money does not leave our control

l) SLIDE 14 - Allows ability for MCSA to get funds back if needed

5. Questions and Discussion:

a) *Dice*: Why does it need to be a policy that 50% of funds need to go to these departments. It takes away from people who may need the money in future?

(1) *Hakala*: This makes it easier for them to upgrade labs and get their work done. If they had consistent funds and they knew they had it in the next year they can make better decisions about funding

(2) *Dice*: This takes away opportunity for others to apply to Tech Fee and receive funds

b) *Hunt*: is it possible to make incentives/policies for those specific departments?

(1) *Hakala*: We could earmark funds and give them suggestions so they can only use money for specific things, but where do we draw the line between us trusting their decision and telling them what to do?

c) *Alam*: mostly agree, but looking the 47% they proposed and the reason things go for IMT/IT, we know where money goes, but we also put into consideration where others can get more money. Not allocating money would allow students to know where the money would be spent. It should stay with us, but we could give them more power, but not 50%. Money should go through MCSA.

(1) *Hakala*: As student we would place trust in UMM employees hired to make good decisions about technology on campus. If we were unhappy it would be a management problem. They're getting hired and paid to ask for Tech Fee.

d) *Smith*: Interesting plan, but right now we gave them what you are saying they would need. You also probably have more trust in them than other students, but what if we give them 50%, and they only need 25%. Part of their job is to find funding for their technology. Right now money is still earmarked for them, but students still have oversight

(1) *Hakala*: Yes, I have worked professionally with them, but it is disheartening when we don't fund how they're trying to make campus better. Yes, sometimes they might not need as much money 1 year, but money would go into 4 year cycle, so labs could get changed more smoothly. Yes, there are lulls, but this gives them opportunity to make better plans

(2) *Hakala*: We could compromise

e) *Lenius*: This money would still be controlled by us and we could rescind it, but if we aren't given proposals and they are making really dumb decisions, we wouldn't see proposals. This process would not allow them to function as it was made to function as being the main way to fund tech. This fixes long term planning problem, but removes half of what tech fee is made to do. If we give them money wouldn't we need to make another policy that these departments cannot ask for any more money.

(1) *Hakala*: We would not bar them for requesting any more funds. There were peaks and valleys in the past. With 50%, if we earmark them money. We are still controlling money.

(a) *Lenius*: We don't have control over it, because we would never see what the proposals are

(b) *Hakala*: Yes, but that's not what we have control for

(c) *Lenius*: Shouldn't it be students jobs to decide where technology goes?

f) *Millard*: This is proposal premature. People may be hesitant because the deeper issue is that we don't agree or understand why Tech Partners make decisions or why larger UMM direction. Every time they have a new request we consider why they're asking for it. We need to consider how MCSA can be a part of the conversation about where technology can go. This needs to be considered more holistically and need to look into the idea of Tech Fee. We're not ready for this conversation until we talk about the Purpose of Tech Fee and how we fit in. Maybe Tech Partners need to have an MCSA rep., so we have more input. They could come back and say why Tech Partners are making their requests and everyone can have more faith in why they're deciding. You, Kyle, this is great you're here, but you are graduating. Yes, need to focus on guidelines and policies. How students can help Tech partners get work done and fund their initiatives.

(1) *Hakala*: Tech Partners put out a survey about how to make things better. Want to better communicate initiatives with technology on Campus. Things have gotten a lot better and they are trying to communicate better with students.

(2) *Hakala*: Now is the right time to get the ball rolling, so admin can see there is a need for a central fund for technology for these 3 department in order to have better long term planning. This strategically tests that out. Chances are we would allot that money to them anyways, but this could help admin hear our voice that we need review on how tech is funded no campus

(3) *Hakala*: Changing guidelines alone would not be enough

g) *Trieu:* Is there a failsafe if all technology breaks to rescind the 50% to revert the money back to us? Or would it take a year to get money back?

(1) *Hakala:* We could respectively ask them to submit tech fee applications. This funding would not apply next year. The likelihood of everything breaking is not high. There are backups right now, not for mass catastrophe, but yes.

Hypotheticals are hard right now

h) *Wu:* One reason for the proposal is a personal problem. This is how every org feels when they come to Tech Fee asking for money. 50% is not a fair number. Maybe they get to decide first, but then they don't spend the money. Does extra get sent back to MCSA?

(1) *Hakala:* Those who manage tech for a living despise Tech Fee the most. After this, student orgs could still apply and appreciate the opportunity. This could be a benefit to departments and tech on campus.

(2) *Wu:* Every org thinks their proposal benefits campus

(3) *Hakala:* But at what scale? The resources from Tech Partners reach campus wide.

i) *Wray:* Having worked in tech and someone who installs things in classrooms (help desk). Everyone loves tech until it breaks, and then they blame someone if it doesn't work. At old school, try to standardize classrooms. That's part of the reason why this needs to happen, so all equipment can be replaced before it breaks and it can be fixed. Agree with Parker's idea: there needs to be a way where we know where money is being spent because that is part of our job in Tech Fee. If there is some sort of expense report that could be recorded and given to us to see where it will go and why it is important

(1) *Hakala*: That would be helpful regardless I think

- j) *Elinson*: Agree that we're not relinquishing power. There is agency and reflexivity that we're trusting people to spend this money strategically in order to complete goals. Tech Partners would see areas of improvement that we wouldn't see from Tech Fee hearings, so we wouldn't need to approve in 1 session. There needs to be a better fallout plan. Just rescinding funds is a little flippant, what if they're having an ongoing project. Needs to a better plan for how we wouldn't be changing their whole course of action.
- k) *Gregg*: MCSA is built to be deliberative body and build consensus for the student body. This will be lost if MCSA ceases to lose power to say yes or no to things. This may be more expedient in long term planning, I don't trust students in future.

(1) *Hakala*: Better to place trust those who will be here much longer than us and for those who are here to support students and to support academics. If students asked why we're not giving consent for the way money is being spent certain ways it is because we trust others.

6. Look at presentation and add comments.
7. Look at presentations from Matt Senger about Tech Fee allocation summary

B. For Action:

IX. Announcements

X. Adjourn