Rackham Student Government
Board Meeting: March 16, 2011
Agenda

I. Call To Order

II. Approval of Agenda

III. Approval of Previous Minutes
   a. February 23, 2011
   b. March 9, 2011

IV. Officer Reports
   a. Graduate Student Body President, Michael
   b. Graduate Student Body Vice President, Mayela
   c. Graduate Student Body Treasurer, Mindy

V. Elections Update
   a. Candidate Recruitment
   b. Elections Advertising
   c. Ballot Question: Rackham GPA Discussion

VI. RSG Town Halls Update

VII. Funding Request: Black Scholars and Professionals

VIII. SAGE White Paper Review

IX. Committee Reports
   a. Academic Affairs
      i. GSRA Email
   d. Elections
   e. Legislative
   b. Budgetary
   f. Student Life
   c. Communications

X. Individual Projects

XI. Open Discussion

XII. Adjournment
RACKHAM STUDENT GOVERNMENT
GENERAL BOARD MEETING
FEBRUARY 23, 2011
RACKHAM GRADUATE BUILDING
7:15 P.M.

I. CALL TO ORDER

A regular meeting of the Rackham Student Government General Board Meeting was held on
Wednesday, February 23, 2011, at 7:15 p.m. at the Rackham Graduate Building.

RSG President Michael Benson called the meeting to order at 7:16 p.m.

Members Present: Michael Benson, Mayela Montenegro, Mindy Waite, Josh Bow, David Cottrell,
Yu Zhang, Katherine Fisher, Eli Eisman, Bob Nyambati, Alex Toulouse, Ethan Eagle, Lily Mancour, Tien-Huei Hsu

Guests: Darlene Ray-Johnson, Directo/Resolution Officer, Graduate Student Affairs,
Rackham Graduate School
Rachel Brusstar, The Michigan Daily
Chen Li, former RSG Representative
Dorothy Pirtle, Representative of the Students of Color of Rackham (SCOR)

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA / MEETING MINUTES

Lily motions to approve the meeting’s agenda. Ethan seconds the motion.
No objections.
Agenda approved.

Josh motions to approve the RSG Board Meeting minutes from February 16, 2011. Mindy seconds the motion.
AYES: 12
NOES: 0
ABSTAIN: 1

III. OFFICER REPORTS

a) PRESIDENT

MICHAEL:
Today’s Guest Speaker is Ms. Darlene Ray-Johnson from Graduate Student Affairs at the
Rackham Graduate School. We will also be having a SCOR Representative come to speak about a
funding request.

Chen Li has come to appeal her removal from the RSG Board. As President, I can remove
members from the Board for failing to meet attendance requirements. Chen has accumulated a
total of 4 unexcused absences: January 19, January 26, February 9, and February 16. At no point did
I receive notification about Chen missing meetings. Chen was on the RSG list and was a member of
the Budget and Communications Committee. She has not participated in any of the Budget
Committee’s email conversations on funding requests or in committee meetings. As a result, action was taken to vacate the seat.

CHEN:
I didn’t know until the end of January that I was a member of the Budget Committee. I’ve been traveling for the past 2 weeks and had sent an email to Mindy saying I would be gone. I was never informed about how many absences were accumulated due to illness or travel. The first absence was for the week I was sick with a cold. I never received an email, even when I had already I wouldn’t be coming to the meetings. I asked Michael about the responsibilities for Representatives since this is my first semester, but I wasn’t told about the attendance requirement. I’ve been tracking the emails, but because I was away, I was not aware of the participation expected by a committee member. I feel there should be transparency to these processes, informing Representatives of their duties. I feel this is something that was not informed to me. Even after 4 weeks of absence, I did not receive an email from the RSG Executive Board, so I was not aware this was an issue.

JOSH: Did you get the meeting minutes via email?
CHEN: Yes, but I was out of town and didn’t have email communication.
JOSH: But you had an opportunity to read it?
CHEN: I read the emails when I came back, 2 days ago.

ELI: Were you informed that you were elected to the RSG Board?
CHEN: Yes, I was informed I was elected, but I was not informed about the attendance requirement or the absences. I believe I should have been informed.

[Chen leaves the room while the Board discuss the possibility of re-admitting Chen to the RSG Board.]

ETHAN: Mindy, did you get an email from Chen?
MINDY: Yes, I got an email saying that she wouldn’t be able to communicate with the Budget Committee.

JOSH: I remember being told of the attendance requirement at the first meeting. I’d be more willing to be more forgiving if there were personal accountability involved instead of “this was not my fault.”

MINDY: Michael’s weekly emails always say that if you’re not going to the meeting, to let him know.
MICHAEL: Yes, and most people are very good about that.

ALEX T: How rapidly would we be able to fill her vacant seat?
MICHAEL: The Communications Committee has been asked to draft an announcement about the vacant seat. We can choose to appoint someone who’s interested in the seat, or just leave it vacant until elections.

LILY: Is Chen only a member of the Budget Committee?
MICHAEL: She’s also a member of the Communications Committee.
MICHAEL: If Chen shows an interest to get involved, she can become an Associate Member and then become a full Member after several meetings. If she comes back to a couple of meetings to participate, she can, which would be my recommendation.

MINDY: I received the email from her about 1½ - 2 weeks ago.

ETHAN: I’d like to believe the best in people. She was here regularly at the end of last semester so she’s showed interest. I don’t see a reason to keep her out of the seat.

MICHAEL: We can bring her absences down to 2 or 3 absences, so the next unexcused absence will be reason for her removal.

ETHAN: She’s asking to come back now.

LILY: But if you knew you wouldn’t be here, you should’ve emailed.

Michael chairs the voting to overturn his Executive Decision of removing Chen, to give Chen her RSG seat back.
AYES: 5
NOES: 3
ABSTAIN: 4
Motion passed. Michael’s decision is overturned. Chen is re-admitted as a RSG Representative.

Mindy motions to reduce Chen’s absences from 4 to 2; the next unexcused absence will be basis for her removal. Ethan seconds the motion.
AYES: 10
NOES: 1
ABSTAIN: 2

[Chen enters.]

MICHAEL:
Chen was voted to be reinstated. Had 4 unexcused absences, but the Board voted to lower it to 2. 1 more unexcused absence, and she will be removed from the Board. She is required to participate in the committees she’s a member of, including the Budget Committee.

Moving on to another issue, we’ll soon be discussing issues relating to the health insurance. I’m working on rescheduling Dr. Winfield to be a guest speaker at one of our meetings.

The Academic Affairs Committee will be meeting tonight after the Board meeting.

Please take a look at the Graduate Student Bill of Rights. We need to move on this quickly.

b) VICE PRESIDENT

MAYELA:
No report.

c) TREASURER

MINDY:
No report.

**IV. GUEST SPEAKER: Darlene Ray-Johnson**

- Director, Graduate Student Affairs
- Been in Rackham for 8 years
- Has administrative oversight over things like workshops, social activities
- Health & wellness initiative
- Wears another hat – resolution officer
- Rackham's Academic Integrity and Resolution Policy
- Revise Academic Dispute Policy a year ago; new policy
  - Encourages academic programs to ensure they have a policy and that it adheres to basic principles; confidentially, timeliness, earnest, process is transparent, and students aware of policies
- Met with Michael this week and shared that Rackham is looking at its Integrity Policy
  - Would love our feedback and input on it, after we've taken a look at it
- An issue with both policies is time it would take for students to file a complaint or have an allegation against hi/her, and the time the issue was actually heard
  - Would like to make policies more efficient; user-friendly for students and academic units involved
  - Thinks it's a good policy
- Other role as Resolution Officer – meet independently with students and address issues/concerns/connect them with resources
- Looking at Grad Student Bill of Rights; several students have asked about this
  - Hopes that soon there will be
  - Typically talks to students about faculty-advisor relationships; if students are having difficulty and thinking about switching advisors; talk about implications and what options are
  - Sees role to offer options, asking how long student has had relationship with advisor, who are experts in the field
- Spends time meeting individually with students
- Works on several projects, including continuous enrollment
- Sees role as providing support services to students
- Considers herself doing some advocacy on behalf of grad students

**Questions:**

ETHAN: I know it's fairly common when disputes come up, there's a crime report that comes out listing number of crimes, a public record of what's taking place. Any thought on doing this with the dispute process, to describe the situation and the outcome?

DARLENE: There is a Resolution Board with Resolution Officers who are appointed. Also 4 grad students part of the Resolution Board. Struggles with making sure its prominent. Some programs are so small that any description of the dispute can give it away for the student. Has heard that there's some merit, especially sharing with faculty so it can hopefully change some of their behavior. Given large number of Rackham students, there's a very small number who go through resolution. In the formal process, there are less than 10 Rackham students who participate. On average, 80-90 in a calendar year who come in for different types of reasons.

LILY: Has it ever happened that a faculty member has been reprimanded in some way as a result of dispute resolution with student?

DARLENE: Doesn't see process as one to reprimand, however the whole purpose of these types of policies and having transparent policies so if a program/department doesn't adhere to
policy, then there’ll be consequences. Yes, the Resolution Board has determined that programs have not acted properly and set of recommendations are imposed, going to the Dean to impose them.

MICHAEL: let’s say there’s a situation where professor/advisor is tormenting a student (mental anguish, etc), more than average. What recourse exists for grad students in these types of situations?

DARLENE: Conversations are confidential so students can speak freely. Outgrowth is how to manage so student doesn’t feel there’s a repercussion against him/her. Rarely is there an outcome where faculty member has found or mistreated a student – pretty rare. However, students are seeking an outcome where they can remain whole, so they may decide to switch advisors or programs – this has happened. So I can’t go in and investigate because I can’t share what’s happened without the student’s permission. Determining an outcome that’s best to students, and really try to work that out. If there’s a systemic problem, will address in a way that doesn’t involve the student at all; in some cases, may be a conversation with the Dean. Conduct reviews of programs, so makes sure to keep track who’s being review2ed at certain times to see if certain behavior surfaces.

MICHAEL: This year will be the 5th year of the annual program review. This will be the first time we’ll see if any progress has been made. Will share information that has been allowed to become public.

ETHAN: Darlene mentioned she publicizes information to the Dean. Thinks that data would be valuable to grad students who want to work on certain causes. We see areas we want to improve. To have Rackham as a teammate exposing what Rackham’s recommendations has been suggested so we can work together. Wants a public way of having these issues disclosed.

DARLENE: How would we share the information?

ETHAN: When people come to you asking services, do they share how they found out? A lot of people don’t know what to do or where to go.

DARLENE: Mostly it’s been through word of mouth, talking to friends who have used the services from the office. Has been better in sharing what the resources are at Rackham and within the department. Most students are reluctant to start in their department, so my office is a neutral place.

JOSH: Would like Darlene to be part of our Town Halls so students know about the services from her office.

MINDY: What is the difference between Darlene’s office and the Ombudsman?

DARLENE: Ombudsman is a neutral party with no authority to impose policies while Darlene can uphold policies. He can go in, ascertain whether a program has adhered to policy or not and make recommendations to make systemic changes; they won’t advocate on students or programs, just to try to get to the truth and try to fix what’s wrong with an issue. I work closely with the Ombudsman; we refer students to each other. His office has no authority to impose policies.

DARLENE: In regards to the health insurance premium, is the RSG Board discussing this at a meeting?

MICHAEL: We’ll be discussing this in about 2 weeks.
V. ETHAN’S GSRA UPDATE

ETHAN:
GEO’s website has a form that you can fill out so they can come to your department for an informational meeting. They came to my department and talked for an hour, and at the end, my sense is that there are problems that need to be addressed, but rather than addressing problems directly they need to unionize because that’s their mechanism to try to solve the problem.

MICHAEL: What was overall sentiment after the meeting?
ETHAN: Basically, 3 sorts of issues that they’re bringing up.

MINDY: Tien and I went to a talk of GEO. They said there’s no policy in place for students to address issues, but I didn’t know Darlene’s office existed.

MICHAEL: I’ve attended a meeting and provided my opinion as a student. Students asked different questions, but answers received were vague. GEO were unwilling to provide some responses or unwilling to track those who have complained about GEO’s processes. We as a body are neutral until we pass a resolution stating otherwise, but it’s important to educate the student body as well we can. An email will be sent out after the Break. If Ethan wants to draft an email, please feel free to.

VI. COMMITTEE REPORTS

a) ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

TIEN:
March 7, 1st Town Hall, Div I. Med Sci I, 5330. 6pm-8pm.

MICHAEL:
Please draft an email to send to the student body.

Expectation of the Board is for each Board member to go to the town hall of your corresponding division. Food will be provided. Academic Affairs Co-Chairs are organizing, so let them know if you can’t go and that’s your division. The Representatives in attendance at each of these will be introduced.

JOSH: Can at least one member of Exec be at all?
MICHAEL: Yes!

MICHAEL:
Hopes to have people planted in the audience to ask questions and get the ball rolling.

JOSH:
Each town hall will take place at a building in its corresponding Division. Will have moderated Q&A. Open to the idea of moderators.

DARLENE: March 10th, 12pm, lunch provided. Forum for doctoral students, open to any doctoral students. Encourages us to attend. Has sent an email to grad coordinators. Will email it to
Michael to forward to doctoral students. Asking for questions in advance to make sure there will be answers at the meeting.

b) COMMUNICATIONS

MAYELA:
A newsletter will be emailed out soon. Please contribute!

MICHAEL
Yay! Newsletter! Oodles of information for next time.

c) BUDGET

[Enter guest Dorothy Pirtle.]

MINDY:
There's a funding request from the Students of Color of Rackham (SCOR) for $1,000. Dorothy Pirtle will be speaking on their behalf. The funding request is for a Conference that will be open to the student body.

DOROTHY:
I am here to request $1,000 in funding for the upcoming SCOR Conference. Will be open to grad students and undergrads. Total budget of $8,000. The $1,000 request from RSG will help with the rest of the requested funding. RSG requests $500 for the facility rental and $500 for honorarium. Partners are: School of Social Work, School of Public Policy, Center for African American Studies, Center for Women, etc. Has collaborated to help come to $10,000 goal. Speaker comes from University of Illinois-Chicago, a faculty member in the sociology department; will discuss universal topics anyone can relate to. Will be talking about tenure, which applies to doctoral students, but also professional development, work-life balance. Her keynote address encompasses several concepts for all students. It's also incorporating Masters candidates in one of the presentations of the Conference.

MICHAEL: Is the location the assembly hall in this buildings?
DOROTHY: Yes

MICHAEL: How long has the program been going on for, and past attendance?
DOROTHY: Organization was rejuvenated in 1994 and has been highs and lows. Is not sure about the most accurate numbers of membership. So far, 85 students signed up to the conference, but doesn't know about past conference attendance.

ETHAN: How to register for the conference?
DOROTHY: There's a website, and the SCOR Facebook page which has a link to registration. Email blast for SCOR email listserve.

MICHAEL: I did receive an invitation from SCOR, which will be emailed to the Board.

JOSH: If adding $1,000, will fall a bit short of what's on the form. So where is $300 going?
DOROTHY: Discrepancy is how much has to be paid for facility management, in terms of incidentals, of coming to facility to clean up. The extra $500 anticipating from MSA is to meet the $300 gap for incidentals, just to be safe.
LILY: Of the students registered so far, what fraction are undergrad vs grad students?
DOROTHY: Not sure if registration of students include undergrad, but may be able to get info.

JOSH: If you have part of the money left over, how will that work?
MICHAEL: RSG, if you’d like, can potentially co-sponsor the event to get the room for free.
DOROTHY: Will have to discuss with SCOR E-Board, but sounds great.

[Dorothy leaves the room while the Board deliberates.]

MINDY: Technically, the Budget Committee hasn’t had a chance to review and discuss.
JOSH: Think we should fund $700 (since if they co-sponsor, they’ll be saving $300).
DAVID: Concerned about the amount of money spent per person.
ETHAN: Would like RSG to help promote event through our email listserve, to help them with their 150 student target.
MAYELA: Second Josh.
MICHAEL: Given scope of event, want to validate we can actually get room for free.
JOSH: Can’t we reimburse them after the fact? Just give them $700 now, and then the remaining $300.

Josh motions to support SCOR’s funding request for $700 provided that they choose to co-sponsor with RSG to get the room for free, or $1,000 if RSG cannot provide the free room. If they choose not to co-sponsor, then only $700 will be allocated to them. Ethan seconds the motion.
AYES: 10
NOES: 0
ABSTAIN: 3
Motion passed.

d) ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

MINDY:
We interviewed Elections Director yesterday. We interviewed 4 candidates – all were fantastic candidates. The candidate chosen by the Committee is Dorothy Pirtle – she’s very friendly, eloquent, and has done this before.

[Dorothy enters.]

MICHAEL: The Elections Committee has nonominated you for Elections Director. Any questions?
DOROTHY: No questions.

Josh motioned to hire Dorothy Pirtle as Elections Director. Lily seconds the motion.
AYES: 11
NOES: 1
ABSTAIN: 1
Motion passes. Congratulations, Dorothy!

MICHAEL:
Elections are March 22nd 23rd. We look forward to working with you!
VII. GRAD STUDENT BILL OF RIGHTS:

MICHAEL:
Please review the Graduate Student Bill of Rights in your agenda packet; this is Berkeley's version, which we can modify and adopt. Many of these points exist, but we want to turn it into a policy.

VIII. ADJOURN

The Rackham Student Government General Board Meeting was adjourned at 8:26 p.m.

Meeting minutes prepared by: Mayela Montenegro, Vice President
I. CALL TO ORDER

A regular meeting of the Rackham Student Government General Board Meeting was held on Wednesday, March 9, 2011, at 7:15 p.m. at the Rackham Graduate Building.

RSG President Michael Benson called the meeting to order at 7:15 p.m.

Members Present: Michael Benson, Mayela Montenegro, Tien-Huei Hsu, Josh Bow, Bob Nyambati, Lily Mancour, Yu Zhang, Alex Toulouse, Chen Li, Phil Esposito, Ethan Eagle, Alex Emly, David Cottrell, Kristy Figel, Katherine Fisher

Guests: Dorothy Pirtle, Elections Director & Student, Division 3
        Marisol Ramos, School of Public Policy and School of Education (Division 3)
        Garret Goh, Student, Division 1

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Josh motions to approve the agenda. Ethan seconds the motion.

AYES: 15
NOES: 0
ABSTAIN: 0

III. OFFICER REPORTS

a) PRESIDENT

MICHAEL:

Academic Affairs will speak about the Town Hall, Division 1.

Student Life Committee tomorrow night at Grizzly Peak.

There’s a number of guest speakers set for the remainder of this term. Folks from the University’s IT will be coming in to speak about technology.

b) VICE PRESIDENT

MAYELA:
No report.

c) TREASURER

MICHAEL:
Mindy is not here today due to religious observations, but she did email a budget report. There’s a little over $20,000 in the account.

IV. ELECTIONS UPDATE

DOROTHY:
Has had 1 joint nomination for President/Vice President position. Hasn’t received any other statements from other candidates. If anyone’s interested in running for re-election, please email me.

Is organizing candidate information sessions. Split between Central and North campuses. Only one other person showed up at today’s information session; the rain may have discouraged attendance.

Plans to do a paperless process. Last time I was Elections Director, a lot of flyers were printed and is not sure how much of that was helpful or participation was generated.

MARISOL: What Divisions are open?
MICHAEL: All the Divisions have open seats. Half are elected each term. For those who have one-term seats, your term will

MAYELA: Deadline to file for candidacy is this Friday. Will an extension be necessary?
DOROTHY: Will make suggestions to amend the bylaws regarding the election timeline.
JOSH: Maybe extending the deadline for a week?
DOROTHY: That would be appropriate if the Board approves.

DOROTHY:
Wants to put together a candidate forum, or a party to encourage people to vote. Will also be at the SCOR Conference and will use that opportunity to encourage elections.

MICHAEL:
Student Judiciary can compel RSG to abide by its bylaws. Suggests that the Elections Committee convene and make a recommendation before the Board to approve.

Josh took an informal straw poll to see who would favor pushing back the deadline.
AYES: 13
NOES: 0
ABSTAIN: 2

MICHAEL:
Next week, we’ll discuss the issue Rackham is considering of changing the GPA system from a 9-point to a 4-point system.

V. DIVISION I TOWN HALL

TIEN:
21 individuals and 8 Representatives showed up. Audience was interactive. Division II Town Hall will be organized soon.

MICHAEL:
Reminder that Representatives need to participate in at least 2 non-meeting events. Each Rep please go to your corresponding town hall. Div II will be next Friday and Div III will be next Wednesday.

JOSH:
Div I got 83% of its Reps there. Will buy candy for the group who got the most attendance.

MICHAEL:
Please make sure your constituents go. It’s important we hear from them.

ETHAN:
Careful with segregating the Divisions when the only thing that’s changing is meeting location.

VI. GRAD STUDENT BILL OF RIGHTS

MICHAEL:
Which points do you think should be carried over to Michigan, and which ones should not be. Student Life will consider it tomorrow and then go to Academic Affairs, and then to Exec for approval.

Please take the draft home, look it over, and be ready to discuss items for potential adoption.

VII. RSG LOGISTICS

MICHAEL:
New website. Just found out that minutes and other links aren’t working, so he’ll work on it this weekend. Also, committee meeting minutes will be posted. Please log in.

MAYELA:
Thanks again to Kristy for hosting the Social Gathering! When an event is being hosted at someone’s home, if you can’t go, either RSVP no or let the host know.

VIII. COMMITTEE REPORTS

a) ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

TOWN HALL

JOSH:
Please go to Town Halls – please encourage others to go.

Josh motions to move next week’s meeting to 7:40pm-8:40pm. Alex E seconds the motion. Ethan offers friendly amendment to not purchase food for RSG meeting since food will be provided at Town Hall. Alex E seconds the motion.

AYES: 7
NOES: 0
ABSTAIN: 5

Motion approved. Reminder email will be sent out. Meeting will begin at 7:40pm, and food will not be provided at the meeting.
GEO

ETHAN:
Will be meeting with GEO tomorrow about their budget. Will bring info to Academics and the Board.

b) BUDGET

MICHAEL:
Aware of at least 3 requests on the works. Another ad will be sent out to student body reminding them that we fund activities and programs.

c) COMMUNICATIONS

MAYELA:
No report.

d) ELECTIONS

MICHAEL:
Dorothy already spoke.

e) LEGISLATIVE

MICHAEL:
SAGE is coming up. At least one person from Michigan State University may be attending. MSU is attempting to take the lead of forming an alliance with MSU, Wayne State, and UM.

There will be a committee meeting next week.

MAYELA:
This week, I chose to resign from my position as Committee Co-Chair because of the time commitment.

Josh motions to appoint Mindy as Co-Chair of the Legislative Committee. Alex E seconds the motion.
AYES: 15
NOES: 0
ABSTAIN: 0

f) STUDENT LIFE

LILY:
Concerned that Natalie’s emails haven't been replied to.
MICHAEL: I already spoke with her.

MICHAEL:
Meeting tomorrow, 7pm, Grizzly Peak.

ALEX E:
March 22\textsuperscript{nd} bar night – on Election Day.

LILY:
Is Spring Picnic still taking place?
MICHAEL: May still be taking place, but Rackham has expressed interest in withdrawing from co-sponsoring events. Funding from Rackham is undetermined.

g) I ALREADY GRADUATED DAY

MICHAEL:
Will take an executive decision of cancelling the event. New committee chair will be appointed in the summer.

IX. INDIVIDUAL PROJECTS

PHIL:
Rob from GEO has gotten back to me.

KRISTY:
Still working on getting YMCA discounts for grad students.

X. OPEN DISCUSSION

PHIL:
For the last couple of weeks, we’ve been sending out a lot of emails.
MICHAEL: Yes, because of more pressing issues.
PHIL: Suggest that emails go through graduate coordinators.

XI. ADJOURN

The Rackham Student Government General Board Meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

*Meeting minutes prepared by: Mayela Montenegro, Vice President*
I. CALL TO ORDER

Meeting called to order at 8:25 p.m.

Members Present: Michael Benson (Graduate Student Body President), Mindy Waite (Graduate Student Body Treasurer), Joshua Bow (Co-Chair), Eli Eisman (Division 1), David Cottrell (Division 1), Tien-Huei Hsu (Co-Chair), Katherine Fisher (Division 4, Emeritus Chair), Robert Nyambati (Division 3), Marie Puccio (Student, Division 3), Rob Gillezeau (Division 3 student and GEO president)

II. GEO GSRA Unionization Informational Email

MINDY: Tien and I met with several GEO members at the GEO office last Thursday and got a lot of good information for the email. We are looking to send this out ASAP.

ROB: I’m happy to help. Also, RSG should think about the idea of whether or not GSRAs have a right to unionize and summarize the MERC case.

TIEN: Let’s meet at 6:00pm at Ambrosia Café on Monday, 2/28/11 to discuss and finalize the email.

ROB: Gave an update on GEO’s current position. There are 2400 U of M GSRAs and GEO needs the majority of those to sign yellow cards in order to make the next move. They have now received 800 yellow cards out of 1000 students approached, mainly on North Campus and will now move to the main Campus. Central Campus is more union-friendly, so they anticipate getting the necessary 400 yellow cards easily. Hope to avoid a vote and utilize accretion instead.

III: TOWN HALL

JOSH: We need volunteers for the town hall on March 7th from 6-8pm.

- Prepare questions – ELI
- Food – Minday
- Advertising – Tien
- Moderator - Michael
- Will also need execs to show up
- Room is already rented

We have several Deans showing up and have also invited GEO, if they are interested.

MICHAEL: Eli, has the student life committee discussed advertising this at events?

ELI: They haven’t gotten back to me.

IV: GSRA Bill of Rights

MICHAEL: Please read the GSRA Bill of Rights and send me ideas. The professional schools at U of M may be interested in getting in on this. Also, we’ll have to word things carefully when it comes to graduate students as employees and refer to the GEO documents on the subject.
ROB: I would like to join the Academic Affairs email list

ELI: Can I veto Rob joining our email list?

MICHAEL: Nope. To get on the list, go to: http://directory.umich.edu/ldapweb-bin/urlldap://cn=rsg-academics,ou=User%20Groups,ou=Groups,dc=umich,dc=edu
Click “bind” and then “modify” and add yourself

VII. ADJOURN

The Rackham Student Government Academic Affairs Committee was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Meeting minutes prepared by: Mindy Waite, Treasurer
I. CALL TO ORDER

Meeting called to order at 6:15 p.m.

Members Present: Joshua Bow, David Cottrell, Tien-Huei Hsu, Robert Nyambati, Ethan Eagle

III: TOWN HALL

Our first town hall meeting occurred this Monday (March 7th) and we had 21 graduate students in attendance along with 9 RSG representatives (all Division I reps except one showed up). Our next town hall meetings will be held on March 16th (Division III and IV) in the Rackham amphitheater and March 18th (Division II) Boeing auditorium, FXB Building. Both will be from 6 to 7:30pm. Division reps were reminded that they are expected to attend their respective town hall meetings.

We discussed how to encourage graduate student attendance in future town hall meetings. We agreed that improvements could be made to previous emails to encourage attendance. We agreed that fewer emails should be sent out. In addition, the emails should have a catchy subject line like “Dinner on RSG”. We also agreed that division representatives need to strongly encourage participation from their departments. We will not only send out mass emails, but also ask division reps to send out separate emails regarding the town halls to their respective departments.

David will draft emails.
Mindy will be in charge of food.
Josh will provide beverages.

List of attendees attached below.

II. GEO GSRA Unionization Informational Email

Mindy, Ethan and Tien have been meeting with Rob and Katie from GEO to come up with questions and answers to send out to graduate students with regard to the GSRA unionization issue. The document currently comprises of the following parts: brief introduction, history behind GSRA unionization, advantages and costs of unionization and miscellaneous questions.

Our next meeting with GEO is tentatively set to be on Tuesday evening at 7pm at Café Ambrosia. Final changes will be made and we plan to have the email ready by next Wednesday to present to the RSG board.

IV: GSRA Bill of Rights
Bob, Josh and Tien have volunteered to look into drafting the Bill of Rights. A Google Doc has been set up for this purpose. We are planning to have the first draft ready by the next Academic Affairs committee meeting (in 2 weeks).

VII. NEXT MEETING

March 23rd 2011, 8:15pm

VIII. ADJOURN

Academic Affairs committee meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

*Meeting minutes prepared by: Tien-Huei Hsu, Co-Chair*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Garrett</td>
<td>CSRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Nicole Broekema</td>
<td>MICRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sara Cassidy</td>
<td>M+I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Nathan Raynid</td>
<td>BIOCHEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mike Engstrom</td>
<td>M+I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Lebin Wang</td>
<td>MCDB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Isha Patel</td>
<td>CSAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Gretchen</td>
<td>CMB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Gabrielle Todd</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Jon Giebel</td>
<td>M+I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Shandee Dixon</td>
<td>M+I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Tyler Nunsca</td>
<td>M+I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Lily Mancour</td>
<td>BIOCHEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Marijo Roiko</td>
<td>CMB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Liu Benechej</td>
<td>MNBL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Daul Lund</td>
<td>CHEM BIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Fraulk Wiutowon</td>
<td>BME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Sacil Elahi</td>
<td>BME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Ethan Eagle</td>
<td>RSG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Juliana Cunle</td>
<td>MICRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Jacqueline Higuera</td>
<td>NURSING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Union FAQ

Over the last several weeks many of you have talked with representatives of the AFT and/or the Graduate Employees Organization (GEO), the union that represents both GSIs and GSSAs at the University of Michigan, with regard to inclusion of GSRAs into GEO. Rackham Student Government (RSG) and GEO have compiled the following list of frequently asked questions about this ongoing campaign so you can be more informed about the process and issues surrounding it.

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS:

BACKGROUND
What is a union?
Who is the AFT?
What history do GSRAs have with the union?
How has the university responded to past efforts to unionize?

OPERATIONS
What legal advantages does having a union offer?
How does collective bargaining work?
How do grievance procedures work?
How does a union run and how does it operate?

DUES
Who pays dues?
How are dues set?
What are dues used for?

OTHER QUESTIONS
Why is the union asking for a neutrality clause from the university?
Does having a union mean there will be strikes?
Do unions typically bargain a minimum standard or a mandatory level of benefits?
How do you get more information on this topic?

BACKGROUND

What is a union?
It is an organized group of employees who have joined together to bargain with their employer with regard to workplace issues.

How does a union run and how does it operate?
Unions can be structured and operated in a number of ways. GEO is structured as a democratic association with an emphasis on participation and shared decision-making. Rather than relying heavily on paid staff, GEO members work together to use the collective bargaining process to improve their working conditions. This is to be contrasted with the approach of unions
which operate as representative agents and bargain on behalf of employees. Through GEO, we represent ourselves.

The issues that GEO deals with and the actions that it takes are reflective of the priorities of and decisions made by the members. Day-to-day affairs are generally run by officers (who are elected by the members), committee chairs (who are elected by the Stewards Council), and active members. Paid staff are hired by GEO to help with contract administration, organizing, office management, and finances. The Stewards Council is comprised of representatives who are elected from each department at department meetings. All major decisions are made by either the Stewards Council or General Membership Meetings.

All GEO meetings are open to all members.

**Who is the AFT?**

GEO is affiliated with the American Federation of Teachers, a labor union that was founded in 1916. The AFT comprises 1.5 million members from a diverse range of professions, including local, state and federal workers, higher education faculty, graduate employees and staff and health-care professionals. AFT represents 25,000 graduate employees at 20 institutions.

**What history do GSRAs have with the union?**

GSRAs were covered by the first GEO Contract, signed in 1975.

The University of Michigan refused to negotiate a second contract and filed suit with the Michigan Employment Relations Committee (MERC), arguing that graduate employees did not have the right to engage in collective bargaining. In 1981, MERC decided that GSIs and GSSAs should be considered workers under the law, but that GSRAs should not. The basis of the MERC decision to exclude GSRAs was the claim that the research of GSRAs did not constitute a service to the University.

In the thirty years since GSRAs were removed from the GEO bargaining unit the University of Michigan has consistently (though usually after a delay) transferred to GSRAs the salary and benefits negotiated by GSIs working through GEO. Thus, GEO has been acting as a de facto bargaining agent for GSRAs even though they are not formally included in the GEO bargaining unit.

**OPERATIONS:**

**How does a union provide legal protection for employees?**

An employee who is a member of a union has the legal protection of the collective bargaining agreement (the contract) and access to a formal grievance procedure. The contract guarantees
wages, benefits, leave time, workplace safety, work schedule, job security, access to job resources (office space, printers, etc.), and a fair and open hiring practice. The employment contract negotiated by GEO differs from the funding offer letters received by most graduate students at Michigan because the GEO Contract creates enforceable obligations. By contrast, the University can and sometimes does renege on the promises made in offer letters.

Graduate Employees who are represented by the GEO Contract have access to a grievance procedure ending in binding third-party arbitration. This means that disputes about rights or obligations under the GEO Contract are decided through a formal process which operates independently of the University. By contrast, “A GSRA with questions or concerns about any aspect of his or her appointment,” is, according the the U-M Academic Human Resources website, “encouraged to raise the concerns with his or her mentor, supervisor and/or department chairperson.”

Of course, some disputes -- maybe even most -- are best resolved through informal conversations with immediate supervisors. When that isn’t possible, a union grievance procedure gives the employee access to an advocate who will prioritize the employee’s interests rather than balancing them against other interests of the University or Department. Without a union, employees must fend for themselves in disputes with employers, sometimes at a significant financial cost to the employee (i.e. hiring a lawyer).

**How does collective bargaining work?**

Collective bargaining is the process by which a group of employees represented by a union negotiate with their employer the terms and conditions of employment that will apply to the workers collectively. The product of the bargaining process is a legally enforceable contract binding on all parties.

Numerous aspects of the collective bargaining process are mandated by law. For example, each side in the negotiations is required to bargain in good faith. This means that the parties should be seeking to reach agreement and may not modify their formal positions in ways that move further from agreement. Another legal constraint on collective bargaining is the union’s duty of representation. The duty of representation is the requirement that the union represent the interests of all employees equally rather than favoring the interests of some at the expense of others.

The law also constrains the issues which may be negotiated, dividing them into mandatory and permissive subjects of bargaining. Mandatory topics of bargaining are wages, hours and other terms and conditions of employment (such as medical and dental benefits), and being mandatory both sides are legally bound to work in good faith to reach agreement. Permissive topics are issues that either party may refuse to bargain over. Some topics which are vital to our working conditions are considered permissive. For example, in Michigan the inclusion of a grievance procedure in a contract is a permissive subject of bargaining.

**How does GEO approach bargaining?**
GEO’s approach to bargaining is informed by the organization’s emphasis on member participation and democratic decision-making. GEO drafts its bargaining platform using a procedure that involves surveys of members, meetings in numerous departments, discussions at Stewards Council and General Membership meetings, as well as hundreds of one-on-one conversations. GEO then elects a committee of members to represent graduate employees in negotiations with the Administration. Negotiations are open to all GEO members and during breaks in the proceedings (which occur frequently) the bargaining committee consults with members in the room about the issues at the table. Decisions about priorities among issues are not made by the bargaining team, but are instead sent to the Stewards Council or to a General Membership Meeting for a vote.

**Does a union offer workers any protection to cuts to granting agencies or legislation that negatively impacts public employees?**

A union can offer some protection. A union contract can provide a ‘safe harbor’ which insulates employees from the immediate effect of changes to the law, and can set minimum standards which the employer must meet regardless of funding contingencies.

**DUES:**

**Who pays dues?**

Under the current GEO Contract, every individual represented by GEO pays a portion of their salary to the organization. Full members pay slightly more.

**How are dues set?**

A union’s dues is set by its members through a democratic process; changes in dues are voted on by the entire membership. Dues have traditionally been set at around 1% of salary plus the amount needed to meet AFT, and AFT-MI member dues. In the present academic year this equates to GEO membership dues of 1.63% of gross pay, while non-members pay a representation service fee of 1.53%. If GSRAs are included in the union, all members (GSIs, GSSAs, GSRAs) will need to determine a new dues rate.

**What are dues used for?**

Dues allow the union to function. As a percent of the GEO budget, last year dues were used to employ staff (~30%), pay legal fees (~10%), pay office expenses (~10%), and cover other overhead (~20%) necessary for enforcing the contract. In addition, ~30% of revenue collected pays dues to state and national affiliate unions. The vast majority currently goes to the state union. AFT-MI, GEO’s affiliate, provides support for this contribution in the form of skilled staff, covering the majority of legal expenses, and support in dealing with university and government institutions.

GEO is obligated by law to use the money collected from non-members only for the purposes
of representation and not for ideological purposes. A certified audit is conducted each year to review GEO’s finances and ensure that non-member fees have not been spent inappropriately.

OTHER QUESTIONS:

Why is the union asking for a neutrality clause from the university?

Most employees believe that they should be allowed to make their own decision regarding unionization. A neutrality clause ensures that the employer does not campaign for or against a union. This is especially important for GSRAs, whose employment supervisors also frequently serve as academic advisors.

Does having a union mean there will be strikes?

Not necessarily. Whether a strike will occur is decided upon by members of the union, and usually the decision to strike is made only when no other options exist. There are other methods a union can adopt to pressure the employer. In addition, it should be noted that public employees in the state of Michigan are legally prohibited from striking. The UM/GEO contract (Article III) also prohibits strikes or work actions by the employees and lock-outs by the employer.

Do unions typically bargain a minimum standard or a mandatory level of benefits?

Unions generally only bargain minimums, but can bargain either depending on the decision of the members. GEO typically only bargains minimum standards. Salary rates outlined in the current GEO contract are only minimum rates (Article X, Section B); each employing unit has the option to pay employees at a higher rate.

How do you get more information on this topic?

Go to: http://www.umgeo.org. Also, see the current UM/GEO Contract that covers GSIs and GSSAs at http://contract.umgeo.org/
http://www.springerlink.com/content/ctv464xxn3n5a1pn/fulltext.pdf

GEO holds open meetings on Wednesdays at 6pm in the GEO office (330 E. Liberty, Suite 3F). RSG holds open meetings on Wednesdays at 7:15pm on the 2nd floor of the Rackham Building
ENDING SUBSIDIZED LOANS FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS WILL HURT THE U.S. ECONOMY

The Administration budget proposal for FY2012 proposes to eliminate subsidized loans for graduate students, in order to make up for the shortfall needed to fully fund Pell Grants. If this change is made, graduate student loans will begin to accrue interest from day one, rather than the current system, where interest begins only after graduation. The Administration argues that these subsidies are “poorly targeted,” but the elimination of subsidized loans will significantly add to the already impressive debt graduate students face upon graduation (approximately 22% more debt for a five year academic doctoral program.) Given that subsidized loans are based on demonstrated financial need, the proposed change will particularly affect lower income students.

SAGE Recommends: Keep the subsidized federal loan program for graduate students and find alternate means of funding the Pell Grant.

Background
Title IV of The Higher Education Act of 1965 authorizes a loan guarantee by the government for eligible students (those at accredited American institutions of higher education) to supplement other fund sources towards education expenses (see item A). Federal Loans such as Stafford and Perkins loans are available to colleges and universities to disburse directly to students. These loans contain a provision for in-school deferment, that is to say, students do not start repaying the loan while enrolled at least half-time in an accredited American university. In addition to disadvantaging lower wage earning families, the increased debt burden will make it more difficult for individuals interested in pursuing careers in low-paying public service jobs to afford graduate education.

1. The cost of accrued interest. A $1,000 loan taken by a student in the first year of a graduate degree will accrue $141 of interest by the time the student makes the first payment for a two-year degree (masters), or $389 for a five-year program (doctoral). In reality, students take much more costly loans year after year of study.

2. UC Berkeley—A Case Study. At UC Berkeley, in the 2009-10 academic year, for example, 2771 graduate students took a Subsidized Direct Loan with an average loan of $7,736. For students in a two-year program, the interest on these loans would amount to $1,090, and for students in a five-year program, $3,013, and these figures are only for one year of education expenses. In practice, about 30% of Berkeley’s graduate students took a combination of subsidized and unsubsidized Direct Loans as well as the Grad PLUS Loans, for an average of $23,184 for last year alone. Such a loan will accrue $3,260 over two years (typical of a masters degree program such as a Masters of Social Welfare, M.S.W.), $5,058 over three years (typical of a law degree program, J.D.) $6,979 over four years (typical of a medical degree program,

---

1 This assumes the current 6.8% APR and constant yearly loan request for 2 or 5 full years respectively. Some doctoral disciplines can be shorter (4 years) and some can be much longer (up to 8+).
2 This assumes the current 6.8% APR for 5 full years.
M.D.) and $9,030 over five years (typical of a doctoral degree program such as a Doctor of Public Health, Dr.P.H.).
FEDERAL GRADUATE EDUCATION INCENTIVES ARE TOO NARROW

Federal programs incentivizing graduate education are intended to promote the competitiveness of American research, strengthen the American workforce in the global market, and remove the barriers preventing individuals from pursuing careers in public service. Current tax law and limitations on loan forgiveness are stifling graduate study in the U.S. Graduate training allows Americans to receive new skills and training, and is critical to sustained economic growth. In the current climate of fiscal uncertainty, supporting graduate education is all the more necessary.

A. REDEFINE “QUALIFIED EDUCATIONAL EXPENSES” AS THEY WERE ORIGINALLY INTENDED

The Higher Education Act of 1965 (HEA) defines the cost of attendance for higher education as the total cost of education, including tuition, fees, books, supplies, housing, and other education-related expenses. This definition determines the amount of student financial aid and higher education incentives, such as subsidized student loans and tax deductions, for which a student is eligible. In 1986, changes in tax law limited this definition in a way that uniquely disadvantages graduate students, making portions of fellowship and student aid, such as room and board, taxable income.

**SAGE Recommends:**

Amend Title 26, Sec. 117 of the tax code to exclude from gross income the cost of attendance—as defined by the HEA—received through qualified scholarships, fellowships, or other merit-based awards.

**Background:**

Current tax law, in determining a graduate student’s tax liability, limits “qualified expenses” to tuition and registration fees only. This limitation places an added financial burden on graduate students, and has a direct impact on the affordability of graduate education, by excluding income used for basic living expenses such as room and board from a qualified educational deduction.

1. **Taxation of Fellowships and Scholarships.** Education expenses paid with fellowship and scholarship monies can be deducted from gross income, but the current definition excluding room and board reduces the benefit by about a one to one-and-a-half months’ worth of scholarship funds. Notably, education awards do not take this tax burden into account.

**UC Berkeley—A Case Study.** At UC Berkeley, the yearly cost of a graduate student room and board at the I-House (measuring 9X13 feet for a single occupancy room with a mandatory meal plan) ranges from $16,049-$20,303 depending on room location. This translates to approximately $1,990-$2,630 of potential deductions under the lowest taxable income bracket\(^1\). This tax credit would pay for a month and a half of room and board.

\(^1\) This assumes the entire amount of room and board qualifies as a deduction.
2. Lifetime Learning Credit. The Lifetime Learning Credit is one of the few education tax incentives for which graduate students may qualify. It is equal to 20 percent of the taxpayer's out-of-pocket education related expenses up to a maximum of $10,000 in expenses (that is, $2,000 in benefits). However, because of the narrow definition of “qualified expenses,” most graduate students do not qualify for this credit.

This amendment will furthermore make the definition of “qualified education expenses” consistent across all forms of federal education assistance. This includes programs such as the Coverdell education savings account and 529 plan distributions—which are tax exempt when used to pay for the cost of attendance as defined by HEA—and student loans, whose interest is subsidized by the federal government and may be eligible for the lifetime learning credit (qualification for federal loans is determined by the HEA cost of attendance).

The Higher Education Affordability and Equity Act of 2010, H.R. 5078 proposed making this exact change, but did not receive a vote in the 111th Congress. The fiscal impact of the change to the tax code was deemed to be so minimal that the CBO declined to score it. Thus a small change in overall revenue would make a major contribution to graduate education.

B. STUDENT INDEBTEDNESS
Graduate and professional students face an ever-increasing debt load upon graduation. This growing burden has a tangible effect on the number of students who apply to graduate school, and as a result, on the nation’s global productivity and economic competitiveness. The current loan forgiveness program is too narrow for its intended population to make use of it, and creates a heavy tax burden on the debt forgiven.

SAGE Recommends:
(a) Exempt forgiven loan debt from federal taxation; and (b) expand Income exclusion amounts covered under income-based repayment and income contingent repayment programs; and (c) reform the programs to take effect immediately after graduation.

Background
Congress created The Public Service Loan Forgiveness Program within the College Cost Reduction and Access Act of 2007, to encourage individuals to enter and continue to work full-time in public service jobs. Under this program, borrowers qualify for forgiveness of the remaining balance on certain federal student loans, once they have made 120 monthly payments and while employed by certain public service employers. Income-based repayment plans and loan forgiveness programs are intended to provide relief to a small segment of professionals who have chosen to serve the community in low-paying public service occupations, rather than use their education for lucrative careers. There are two main problems with the program:

1. The forgiven loan is considered taxable income. While the loan forgiveness program is intended to reward individuals serving the public good, the forgiven loan amount is considered part of the individual’s gross income, resulting in an added tax burden that is beyond what the individual can pay.

2. The program is too restrictive. Most federal education loans are 10-year loans, meaning that after 120 payments, there will be nothing left to be forgiven.
Attracting top international graduate students to our schools and workforce has a positive effect on domestic job creation and innovation. Unfortunately, visa restrictions often force many immigrant graduates to leave the country, robbing the U.S. of talent, skills, and educational investments. We believe that two key visa programs could be vastly improved, with minor adjustments and little cost.

I. H-1B Visa Reform

While the US economy has globalized, our use of talented US educated foreign students has not. The best international students in all subjects study at our higher education institutions, only to find employment abroad due to the restrictive visa policies. The export of some of the “best and brightest” to our international competitors is senseless and hurts our economy. Recent studies from the World Bank and National Foundation for American Policy (NFAP) have found that increasing the number of H-1B high-skill visas to graduate students would increase the number of patent applications and encourage job creation. Increasing the number of H-1B visas will encourage innovation and job creation in key sectors, a critical component to competing in a globalized economy. SAGE suggests two general reforms and one specific reform should:

- Exempt all Students who Obtain Advanced Degrees in the U.S. from the H1-B Cap.

- Grant Work Authorization to the Spouses of H-1B Holders (those in the H-4 category,) as is done for the spouses of L-1 visa holders.

- Pass H.R. 399, the Staple Act - The Staple Act would authorize international students who have earned a Ph.D. degree from a U.S. university in the fields of science, technology, engineering, or mathematics (STEM) to be admitted for permanent residence, and to be exempted from numerical limitations on H-1B visas.

II. F-1 Visa Application and Renewal Reform

The F-1 Visa is the primary visa foreign full-time students use to access education in the United States. Unfortunately, current regulations do not align with the realities of graduate education. Students from countries that can only receive single entry visas face difficulties returning to the country after traveling abroad for conferences, or visiting sick family members. Further, current work requirements and ABD restrictions make it difficult for foreign students to support themselves while attending a full-time academic program. The following reforms should be considered to strengthen the program:

- Grant Waivers to Students with Single Entry Visas, and Make Security Screenings More Efficient, to Permit Realistic Travel and Re-Entry While Enrolled in a U.S. Institution.

- Expand Off-Campus Work Allowances.

- Allow Students who are “All But Dissertation” (ABD) to Temporarily Withdraw Without Losing their Visa.
Rackham Student Government Funding Application

Organization Name: Black Scholars and Professionals (BSAP)
SOAS Account #: Project Grant: U030121 Shortcode: 933396

Registered with MSA? Yes No

Primary Contact Name: Jonetta Johnson
Title: PhD Candidate in Health Behavior & Health Education
Email: jonettaj@umich.edu
Phone: 678-485-5170

Secondary Contact Name: Amber Williams
Title: PhD student in Psychology
Email: amberdw@umich.edu
Phone: 281-804-3424

Please check any of the following that describe your organization:

- Academic/Professional ✓
- Creative Arts/Expression (Visual, Performance, and/or Exhibition)
- Community Service ✓
- Cultural/Ethnic ✓
- Environmental
- Graduate ✓
- Honorary
- International
- Political
- Publications/Journalism
- Religious ✓
- Science/Technical
- Social Justice

Describe the overall purpose/mission of your organization and the planned initiatives and activities intended to uphold said objective(s).

The Purpose of Black Scholars and Professionals (BSAP) is to establish and advance at the University of Michigan witnessing communities of students, working professionals, and faculty who follow Jesus as Savior and Lord: growing in love for God, God's Word, God's people of every ethnicity and culture and God's purposes in the world. Our objective is to create a space for and grow a diverse body of Christian students to help spread the word of Christ. Our activities are open to anyone that is a part of the University of Michigan community and have the goal of facilitating community and fellowship with each other. We meet monthly both on and off of campus to engage in large group fellowships (guest speakers), social gatherings (movies and discussions), and community service activities across the Ann Arbor and Detroit areas. For example, this semester we are tutoring youth at local churches and have joined Graduate Christian Fellowship to make Valentine’s Day cards for cancer patients at Mott Hospital and for a Spring Break service day church cleaning project in Detroit. Routine activities involve weekly men and women's bible study groups.

Email application to RSG Treasurer, Mindy Waite, at rsgtreasurer@umich.edu with subject “RSG Funding Request”.
# of active student members: 66
# of graduate student members: 66

Average attendance at group meetings (Board, committee, event planning, etc.): 8
Average attendance at similar events: 30
Average graduate student attendance at similar events: 30

How often does your group meet? 1/month

Does your group charge dues to members? Yes No

Do all of your activities/events take place on campus? If yes, where do you prefer to hold your programs? If not, where else do they take place?

Our events take place both on and off campus. We prefer to hold events in a variety of different places to increase the number and type of students we make ourselves to which we make ourselves accessible. We have had past events at the Campus Chapel and the homes of BSAP student members. We plan to have future events in the School of Public Policy and Palmer Commons. The weekly bible studies occur off campus, however both the men's and women's groups routinely gather on campus for events and meetings during each semester.

Does your group engage in political activity, i.e., electoral, partisan, etc.? If so, describe this activity.

No, we do not engage in political activity.

Does your group engage in lobbying efforts? If so, describe these efforts.

No, we do not engage in lobbying efforts.

Does your group work with any University department or other student organizations in any capacity? If so, please describe this collaboration.

Our group does not officially work with any University department. We often collaborate with Graduate Christian Fellowship (GCF) for large group meetings and community service activities. These activities are held on and off the campus of the University of Michigan. GCF and BSAP are both Inter Varsity Christian Fellowship (IVCF)/USA organizations at the University of Michigan.

Is your group affiliated with a national, parent, and/or umbrella organization? If so, please describe this relationship and how it plays a role in your organization's functioning.

Inter Varsity Christian Fellowship (IVCF)/USA is our national parent organization. BSAP's relationship with IVCF allows national and regional BSAP staff persons to assist the BSAP student leadership team at Michigan with mentorship and guidance as needed. Michigan's BSAP student members can also participate in national and internationally held BSAP conferences & events. IVCF/USA and BSAP staff persons through IVCF do not provide financial resource to BSAP at Michigan.

Email application to RSG Treasurer, Mindy Waite, at rsgtreasurer@umich.edu with subject “RSG Funding Request”.
Event Description

Event name: Saturday Morning Conversations: Work and Faith
Event date(s): Saturday March 26th, 2011, 9 – 11:30am
Event location: Palmer Commons, Great Lakes South Room

1. Briefly describe this event. What is its overall purpose?

This is a morning panel discussion with faculty, students and post docs at the University of Michigan. The idea for this event came from BSAP members who wanted to hear from and dialogue with Christian faculty about how to uphold Christian values, share Christ with colleagues, respect religious differences and also be successful in vocation.

2. Describe how this event will affect our campus and the graduate student body.

We expect this event will impact the graduate student body and greater university community by starting an ongoing dialogue regarding questions of work and faith between faculty and students. This event will provide an open and comfortable environment for students to learn from Christian faculty about the ways in which they balance and/or integrate their chosen profession and Christian faith. Thus, the main goals of this panel will be to (1) identify the foundational issues concerning the integration of academic work and faith, and (2) allow faculty from diverse departments to share knowledge and experiences concerning work and faith with university students.

3. Describe how this event will include other groups or departments.

This event features a panel composed of faculty from across the University of Michigan. Confirmed panelists are from the Psychology Department, School of Public Health, and Ross School of Business. Panelists external to the university are from Earlham College, the greater Ann Arbor Community and the University of Toledo. While the event is open to everyone, we are targeting graduate students of diverse academic disciplines and backgrounds.

4. With which other groups or departments are you sponsoring this event, if any?

We are not co-sponsoring this event with any other organizations, groups or departments.

5. If your organization is traveling, explain why this is integral to your event and how it will impact the graduate student community.

We are not traveling for this event.

6. If your organization is purchasing food, explain why this is integral to your event and how it will impact the graduate student community. Also, what is the approximate food cost/attendee?

We are requesting funds to purchase breakfast for this event. Due to the nature of having an event centered on panel and roundtable discussions, a format geared towards graduate students, and the time of the event at 9am on Saturday morning, we feel providing breakfast is

Email application to RSG Treasurer, Mindy Waite, at rsgtreasurer@umich.edu with subject “RSG Funding Request”.
an integral part of the events success. In addition, providing breakfast will help facilitate an
inviting and comfortable atmosphere that will encourage questions and interactive dialogue.

We have confirmed Palmer Commons, Great Lakes South room as a space for the event. To
cover these costs, we have received funding from the Michigan Student Assembly and the
Budget Priorities Committee. However, these sources prohibit the provision of funds for food.
Palmer Commons requires the use of a select group of catering partners in addition to a facility
fee equaling 10% of the total catering order. For these reasons we are requesting funds from
the Rackham Student Government to provide breakfast at the event. We will order food from
Angel Food Catering (www.angelfoodinc.com). The approximate food cost per attendee is $10.
We estimate a total cost of $695.75 including sales tax, gratuity, delivery service and set-up
fees, and the facility fee for Palmer Commons.

7. If your organization is bringing a speaker, performer, DJ, photographer (or any other paid
individual for services rendered), explain why this is integral to your event and how it will impact
the graduate student community. Please explain how the amount he or she will be paid was
determined based on similar services. Additionally, attach a short biography to the end of this
application.

We are not bringing in individuals paid for services rendered.

8. If your organization is applying for capital goods (anything that can be reused after the event
has taken place), explain why such goods are integral to the event.

We are not applying for capital goods.

9. Who is eligible to participate? (Keep in mind the more diverse the graduate student
participation, the more likely RSG will fund)

Saturday Morning Conversations: Work and Faith is open to everyone at the University of
Michigan campus and community, including but not limited to graduate and undergraduate
students, post docs, staff, and faculty.

10. How many participants do you expect? 50

11. Are your date and location confirmed? Yes No

12. Will you charge admission?  
   If so, how much per person?
   Yes No

13. Will this be donated to charity? Yes No
   If yes, what percentage will be donated?

14. How do you intend to advertise, in particular to graduate students?

We will advertise using student organization and department list serves and personal/word of
mouth invitations. We have found that email communication is the best way to communicate
events with graduate students and faculty.

Email application to RSG Treasurer, Mindy Waite, at rsgtreasurer@umich.edu with subject
“RSG Funding Request”.

15. To what other funding bodies have you applied and/or have received funds from? Please note each funding body here, the amount for which you applied, the amount that was granted, and to what purpose you intend to put those allocated funds. Requests of funding for the majority of events cost solely to RSG will rarely be fully funded, please seek out additional funding sources as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Body</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
<th>Amount Granted</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Student Assembly- Budget Priorities Committee (BPC)</td>
<td>$ 661.75</td>
<td>$ 216.75</td>
<td>Room Rental in Palmer Commons &amp; Supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. If RSG does not fully fund your event in the amount requested, how do you intend to cover those costs? Will the event still be held?

If we do not receive funding from the Rackham Student Government, we may change the location of the event. The required use of specific catering partners identified by Palmer Commons, limits cheaper options for the provision of food for the event. This location does, however, provide space, tables, and technological equipment (e.g., microphones, projectors, power supplies) that will facilitate proper execution of the event. Due to commitments from several faculty members to serve on the panel, the event will not be cancelled.
Event Budget

List all expenses. Please use the notes section below each category to explain costs in greater detail. Be sure to cover ALL costs, not just those you are asking RSG for funding for.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Amount Requested from RSG</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advertising &amp; Publicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Please attach a copy of emails/fliers to the end of this application.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Posters/fliers</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Other:</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Office supplies (please specify): Newsprint for easels.</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Other:</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Printing &amp; Publications</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Please attach a copy of the publication to the end of this application.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilities &amp; Equipment Rental</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Equipment (please specify):</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Other:</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Room rental</td>
<td>$161.75</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Speaker honorarium</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
<td>$105.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Speaker travel</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Speaker lodging</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Other:</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Travel</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Lodging</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Transportation</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Vehicle Rental</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Gas</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Goods</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● T-shirts</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Other:</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food: Breakfast</strong></td>
<td>$658.58</td>
<td>$695.75</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>$1017.50</td>
<td>$800.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please remember to attach a mock-up version of the flier, publication, or t-shirt design with the RSG logo or “Sponsored by the Rackham Student Government” statement to your application.

Email application to RSG Treasurer, Mindy Waite, at rsgtreasurer@umich.edu with subject “RSG Funding Request”.
Breakdown of use of funds:

**Breakfast:** As stated earlier in the application, the use of space in Palmer Commons limits our options for food to a Palmer Commons designated vendor. We will use Angel Food Catering.

$10.00 per person for an estimated 50 people.
- 7.5% gratuity for delivery and set-up
- 6% sales tax
- 10% Palmer Commons facility fee on food service
- Extra charge for disposable cutlery
- $65.00 Fee for delivery, set-up and clean-up
Total: $695.75

**Speaker Honorarium:** As a thank you to the panelists we would like to give a $20 gift Starbucks gift card to each panelist. We currently have four confirmed and 2 tentative panelists for this event.

Confirmed Panelists are:
Dr. Derek Griffith, Health Behavior and Health Education
Dr. Stephanie Rowley, Psychology
Dr. Valerie Myers, Health Management & Policy and Ross Business School
Mr. Robert Hunter, Professor of Peace and Global Studies, Earlham College