I. Call to Order (5:33pm)

II. Approvals

   I. Tuesday, January 20, 2015 Minutes
      i. Bundled and approved by acclimation

   II. Tuesday, January 27, 2015 Agenda
      i. Bundled and approved by acclimation

III. Open Hearing

   a. ZachPivko (CUSG Veterans Affairs): I know the school is behind on funding a renovation and I believe addressing the creation of a better Veteran’s Lounge is pushed towards being 15 years in the making. It is quite a bit away and was wondering if there was a way to prioritize this. I believe the Veteran’s Lounge needs to be more visible in the UMC.

IV. Chair’s Report

   a. Spring Student Involvement Fair
      i. It is Feb. 4th from 11am-2pm.

   b. Volunteering
      i. Previously we’ve discussed about the UMC Board volunteering in the community and I think the Relay for Life run by the American Cancer Society would be a great way to do so. We would be helping out with registration and passing out water and protein. Aaron: I think it’s a great idea. There was a great turn out last year.
ii. Lora: Since we are the veteran state memorial, I thought we could help write letters to armed forces. It’s not specifically for Valentine’s Day but would be going on around that time.

c. Feedback at UMC Board Meetings
   i. There’s always a section at the end for feedback. The reason for this is because a previous chair was concerned that the board was not providing feedback to UMC Administration and so we have a section in the agenda to put it in the structure of what to address. An issue or compliment can be brought to attention anytime but particularly in the feedback section whether it is your opinion or of people you know.

d. UMC Special Subcommittee Recommendations
   i. Austin: The goal was to be more effective where their office hours are geared towards community hours and etc. We thought it was a lot so we dropped a couple of hours where they can focus on the busiest times. Are there groups with a lot usage of past those hours? 6 room checks are now down to 5 where the last check is dropped. Aaron: I was going to describe it like Austin.

ii. Jack: We can say that we still expect more than 10 hours but will hold them accountable for 10. Austin: Yes that sounds like a good idea. Hannah: We are not saying that they should only use for 10 but it will help the groups that don’t need the office for that amount of time. Emily: If they only use the spaces for that amount of time, are they using it effectively? Jack: It seems more realistic this way. Carlos: Only happens 3 weeks of the semester. We can also check how much they use the space through the key use and security guards. We have history of groups that struggle or have lulls so effective office use per group really fluctuating.

iii. Debbie: There are a lot of assumptions being made. Part of problem is seniors leave and there is a struggle to start over again. So the new student activities office would help address
this issue. I’m not against the reduction of hours but thought that there should be test drive this with new office for a year. I think other things are at play and that these things may not make this change necessary. Lora: I think we should be cautious of living and dying with SAO because it will have its own bumps. I like the idea of minimal 10 hours, but expecting more. It is a good common ground. I’m willing to push to 12 hours. We wouldn’t really know how SAO would help until 3 years. Jack: Maybe we should say that 10 hours and see how they react differently. Carlos: This is all public knowledge.

iv. Lora: What are we looking to communicating? Email? We need to put something like ‘communication to be determined by the board’. How is it being tracked? Sometimes bylaws don’t work because they are vague. Aaron: The goal is for board members to be active. There will be assigned groups where we have section in agenda to update on groups. I would like people to go to office and not just communicate by email.

v. Jack: Aside from that idea of, how would this be different from the support of the SAO? Lora: SAO would not be mandatory for students to use. This would be keeping a connection with the groups. Jack: If we are helping student groups, this might be creating a bias. Debbie: I’m concerned with basing this off a current issue. Could we try it out and survey groups if it helped connection? Hannah: The point was that feedback told us that we are an ambiguous group. We don’t have to guide them but be more of a face of opinion.

vi. Lauren: We need to define our purpose and figure out our role in communication. Lora: I think it would create a bias but it may not be a bad thing. This could help people advocate for groups when doing the budget or knowledgeable about help. I like the hands-on approach what. It does not need to be face-to-face
every time. Austin: We definitely need to define role. It’s more for our purposes than to help and guide them; for us to know how they are doing and if they are using offices the way they should. It also allows us to be a point of contact to navigate the UMC and bureaucracy. It could help with our decision making.

vii. Chris: It would not only provide knowledge of what’s going on but also a connection. It would give groups more resources and responsibility instead of something that comes up occasionally. It would help with communication and networking. How they are divided (randomly or grouped) could be a concern. Emily: I think it’s a great idea but I think we should wait until we test it out. Would we group environment groups together? Carlos: I think we need to be careful of it, like how it would work to assign groups to Isra who’s seemingly in 1000 groups.

viii. Kelsey: A person who does face-to-face is a lot of time commitment. We can just email a list of a few groups where we introduce ourselves where we can help. People may be intimidated by face-to-face talks where emails are more casual where we have face-to-face contact if necessary. Debbie: There are advantages to both kinds of communication. Sometimes there are a lot people on the board and sometimes there are not so many. If there are less people, they would have more groups and need to have more time commitment. Lauren: We have to figure out how many student groups there are per person since it could be a lot of extra work to be put on. Jack: I agree with Kelsey where people are sometimes intimidated in face-to-face conversations. I am an RA where I have to have individual time with residents and found it is not effective. Lora: I think communication should be at discretion of the board where it gives flexibility for the board, like letting them be responsible for their own workings. Carlos: If we had group assignments today,
each student would have 3-4 groups. Chris: I’m in agreement with time allocation because of students. Communication should be at people’s discretion where it is considered effective.

ix. Isra: Maybe there should be at least 1 face-to-face meeting. I don’t want them to feel audited but I want us to be a face to them. I want us to have human understanding of their group. I don’t think it should be just email or if someone is leaving the board, someone introduce another board member as a liason. Kelsey: I think we should just have discretion since the board side hasn’t been addressed. We have to keep in mind the groups that board members have since people on Program Council or etc. are really busy. Lora: I think 1 face-to-face at the beginning of a semester is reasonable, but email is more accessible. It can’t be every month but at beginning is reasonable. It can be more if possible. I think it would be a compromise. Jack: I think 1 face-to-face contact at the beginning of term or semester would be good. Carlos: They should be at the start of semester since students are here. Debbie: Does this count for staff? Joseph: It’s just student members. Carlos: When Joseph and I talked, we thought staff members might be too intimidating. Robin: How far into the semester are we thinking?

x. Lora: Who is in charge of making this happen? Carlos: It tends to be my role. Lora: What is the accountability? An email tracking? Would every agenda have a reporting back section? Carlos: Everyone’s going to be a little different in the quality and involvement with the communication with student groups.

xi. Let me summarize what I think the conversation is going towards. This may not be as a bylaw change but as a practice. We have a variance on 10,12, or 15 hours. Point 3 on the recommendation is a good, but the first 2 need more discussion. Joseph: It is not a bylaw but a policy change. Jack: How did we
decide on 10 hours? Austin: We were between 10 and 15 but chose the smaller number. We are committed to reducing hours. 10 or 15? We had the 9am-7pm idea since lowering the hours goes along with reduction of office hours. Shambhavi: I think 10 is drastic and 12 is more reasonable. Carlos: Realistically, it should be around 10-12 hours. Emily: I think 15 hours is better since it's harder to raise it back up. Diana: I agree with Emily. Motion to vote on 12 hours. Motion approved. Jack: We should stress that it should be a minimum of 12 hours.

Emily: How do we put it into policy? Kelsey: Will it start this semester or in the fall. Joseph: It will be up to the board. Carlos: We need to fix the applications. Hannah: We can do a trial run and then put more official. Kelsey: I think it would be good to do trial run w/o the student activities office and one w/ it in the fall. Austin: I think it would be good to start now so we don't flood groups with SAO and ourselves. Joseph: It will happen on passage of this semester. Isra: I think the 1st and 3rd points should be on a trial run but make point 2 official. Carlos: We would have to vote on 2 and 3. If want to start now, we would have to vote now. This would not be in the bylaws but would be policy of UMC. Motion to approve on the hours for this semester. Motion approved. Motion to approve points 1 and 3. Motion approved.

e. UMC Board Members

i. The cost center was coming up with joint member board and wanted to prioritize diversity. I thought a lot about us having an ex-officio from the underrepresented student group council. It might be good for us to remember the UMC as a multicultural center and memorial center. The UMC doesn't have a Jewish or Queer group and so having a member represent them is important. Isra: I think it's Hard to ask student to be expert on multicultural groups. Carlos: They wouldn't necessarily have to
be an expert, just someone that represents them. Isra: I think it’s a good idea. Lauren: Also think it’s a good idea. Kelsey and Austin also agree.

f. Space Application
   i. Tabled.

V. Director’s Report
a. Budget Hearing at Finance Board
   i. After this meeting, the budget approved last week will be presented to Finance Board. We did not change anything. If they ask us to change things, we’ll have to do a revision.

b. Glenn Miller Ballroom Reopening Recap
   i. Around 300 people attended. Joseph and Lora gave awesome speeches. The Chancellor talked and there was a surprise that Glen Miller will be inducted into the Colorado Music Hall of Fame.

VI. CU NightRide
a. We finished deciding on our new hires and new assistant director.

VII. Student Veterans’ Association
a. We had our 1st meeting with the new leadership. We have more details to be discussed with the statement on veterans’ lounge. We think that veterans have a stigma on campus and wanted to address this stigma. As a result, we want to have a viewing on American Sniper, particularly since it’s good at addressing both the perspective of people who haven’t and have experienced military life. We have a need to know how to go about this. Zach: Have you thought about using? Fiske Planetarium. Kelsey: You could work with us to use CHEM 140 or use Old Maine. You could also use new ballroom’s projector.

b. April 11st is SVA state conference to bring networking of multiple campuses.

VIII. Food Service
a. We have great joy in moving into the new kitchen. It was chaotic for grand opening. We are starting off with a bang and are really busy where the menu chosen was geared towards students. I’m still working on the procurement on proposals regarding pizza its details. I have a meeting with Starbucks on Friday concerning construction and details on the process.

IX. **CU Gold**

a. Programs begin this week. CLP began today and ALP begins tmr. We are interviewing for a marketing coordinator.

X. **Program Council**

a. The film and concert went well. We have a screening this week and we are showing the Hunger Games. Buff Pool Party is in the works. People can walk up to table to sign up and have a google doc. We also have a tribute to Bob Marley.

XI. **Environmental Center**

a. I was at finance board regarding budget. We have a meeting tomorrow regarding sustainable funds or ways to use it. We are figuring out how to market it better. The large grant cycle coming up and the small grants are due the first Monday of February.

XII. **CUSG**

I. Executive

   i. We have put someone from legislative council on the UMC Board, but he has work during this time. He can make it most days but if not, we will find someone else to be a representative.

   ii. Hopefully by Feb. 10, we will bring the board options of space in UMC. We have locations in mind but have not talked about it to the implementation team. We are looking at the 3rd floor where the location will ‘kill multiple birds with one stone’.

II. Legislative

   i. Last week’s bill on funding was passed where we capped travel funding at $15000 with considerations for groups specifically
geared towards travel. We are decreasing gradually over 3 years.

III. Freshman Council

i. We had our 1st meeting last week. We are voting on who is President and Vice President tomorrow and discussing what to do this semester.

XIII. Feedback

a. Isra: The UMC ballroom reopening was fun and awesome. The Performances were great and ballroom looks beautiful. Lora: We should have a party like that every month 😊 Joseph: Thank you to Carlos, Robin, and Andrea for all the work you all did!

XIV. Old Business –(none)

XV. New Business –(none)

XVI. Adjournment (6:46pm)