RACKHAM STUDENT GOVERNMENT
Academic Affairs Committee Meeting
February 1st, 2012
6pm Espresso Royale, 322 S. State St

I. Roll call of members
Present: Eli Benchell Eisman, Kaitlin Flynn, Chris Tom, Eugene Daneshvar, Michael, Anna, Adam, Stephen Raiman, Haven Allen, Andrew
Absent (excused):
Absent (unexcused):

Called to order: 6:13pm

II. Special Business

• Student I.P. Rights
  o Tien introduces the issue that Eugene brought forward to the general board regarding an unethical professor. Eugene gives his background regarding his advisor infringing upon his IP ownership rights. Summary: as a finishing master’s student, Eugene shared an idea unrelated to his research with his advisor. Unbeknownst to Eugene, his advisor used this idea to file a patent for an invention and did not disclose the conflict of interest to the university. After 4 years of patent filing and applications, his advisor only just now let Eugene know what was going on. Additionally, a second round of IP infringement did not include Eugene’s name on the patent application or publication for this second idea. Finally, Eugene won a student business competition for $20,000 and his department still will not let him access the funds. Eugene has pursued multiple rounds of conflict of interest hearings, lawyers, and trying to pursue evidence that suggests his advisor acted unethically and has not had much success. He feels as if he does not have representation within his department or within Rackham. Lynn Cook was contacted (part of conflict of interest committee) and Eugene did not hear back from the committee. Also it should be noted that his advisor sits on the committee. His advisor also sent him an email suggesting Eugene has not been working enough in the lab and he retorted immediately with proof of his experimental work. The current status of Eugene’s work is that he is in a new lab as a sixth year student. Eugene has plenty of email and other evidence that proves the timeline of presenting the idea prior to the patent application being filed.
Tien asks what ideas Eugene has for creating solutions or opportunities for him or students in this situation, and how RSG can help. Eugene answers that he feels that he had misrepresentation and even pleading to the deans got him nowhere. He suggests that UM does not follow the policies that exist. Eugene asks about the enforcement part of our in-progress Graduate Student Bill of Rights. Fellow attendees of the meeting ask how he’s funded and what organizations have funded him in the past. Tien asks about how the conflict of interest committee is constituted and Eugene answers that it is comprised of mostly science professors.

Eugene says that he went to all of the appropriate avenues over the timeline and his IP issues to no avail. He’s now had to hire an attorney and recognizes that this is unrealistic for many graduate students and asserts that graduate students shouldn’t have to hire outside support to protect their rights at the University.

Michael mentions that the GSBOR is being developed to address some of these issues. He suggests that educating incoming students about their rights will be important. Eugene says that for his situation specifically the committee can address the issue of IP ownership.

Eli asks specific questions regarding Eugene’s timeline for graduation, idea presentation, acceptance for PhD program, etc. Eugene details his timeline. Eli asks if the patent could have been filed without Eugene’s thesis work. Eugene says that the contributions of his work completed or drove the project and idea toward completion. Eli mentions that there are definitions on the Tech Transfer website that define student and employee and that might clarify Eugene’s situation.

Michael reads off some definitions and policies from the Tech Transfer website and the definitions of student and employee as they have been modified as of 2007.

Eugene continues to outline the issues he has had getting the OTT to comply and act ethically and appropriately. He also mentions that this whole issue has derailed his graduation date, thesis research and progress.

Michael (not Benson) asks Eugene why he disclosed this invention to his advisor. Eugene responds that he had a compelling idea and wanted to share the excitement with his advisor (as a sole mentor). Michael (not Benson) suggests that if RSG can identify and make clear what the line of IP and who owns what is.

MB mentions that RSG may be able to help Eugene directly regarding the issues of the faculty on his committee and they should talk offline about that issue. Eli mentions that the fact that Eugene is in academic limbo is
unacceptable. Eli suggests that the Biomedical Engineer department chair should figure out how to appropriately award Eugene a degree.

- Michael Benson says that as RSG can help further individuals with these problems but to directly help Eugene we might only be able to clarify the lines of IP and the lines of where students with such concerns should go. Eugene also mentions that there are some issues of who’s name takes claim for which patent, idea or project (because some faculty mentors appeared on the patents and publications and Eugene wasn’t, even when he contributed.) Eugene thinks that making this issue clear is something RSG can do. Additionally, the OTT does not treat the graduate students as equals to professors with regards to our rights. Another thing we can do is have a standard of expectations. Eli suggests that there could be a Graduate Student Coordinator within the OTT or at least have training for the administrators within the office.

- Conflict Resolution boards: reorganization of existing boards, expansion of duties/coverage of boards/what kind of power boards have

  - Tien outlines the ideas that we’ve come up with for addressing such issues. Currently, we have the continuous enrollment dispute board that addresses issues around continuous enrollment and this board is populated with students and faculty members equally. Michael outlines that student opinion generally has priority at these meetings. Eugene agrees that a similar board comprised of people who are informed about such resources would have been beneficial to him. Michael also mentions that there are some Rackham emergency funds that could have been applicable in this situation. Eugene recommends that the Ombudsperson should be required to meet with students who have to sign conflict of interest statements. Additionally, Eugene mentions that there are other graduate students in this particular advisor’s lab who believe the advisor is acting unethically. Chris mentions that we now as a committee need to brainstorm and figure out how to best move forward with this. Eli mentions that there is another document on the OTT website called the Student Ownership Policy that outlines student derived IP. Eli believes that there are unclear definitions overlapping these policies. Eugene asks the visiting students from Say No to GEO who Eugene should have contacted or who would represent him from their perspective outside of a possible GEO union.

  - Delegations: should we pursue a conflict resolution board? Should we attempt to merge the two ideas? Michael outlines the kinds of boards that are currently in place and we agree that perhaps keeping these putative resolution board topics separate. Michael suggests that perhaps two people can assist him in figuring this out. Tien, Haven and Eli volunteer. Tien
mentions that we need to figure out what boards currently exist and how we can help.

- **University-wide conflict resolution flowchart/process**
  - This is something that should be clearly outlined and isn’t. Chris volunteers to work on this and Eli mentions that Darlene Ray Johnson (ombudsperson) probably has the flowchart and that this should be included.

- **Town Halls (have final date(s) by February 15th for planning purposes)**
  - Eli mentions that most of the deans are on board for the April 3rd date for the town hall from 12-1pm. Kaitlin and Eli will work on organizing and coordinating this. The total budget is $400.

- **MSU-Wayne-UM Symposium: details, transportation, time, volunteers**
  - 68 UM students accepted abstracts.
  - Transportation will be provided. We will need to email and ask for transportation interest. Kaitlin will get the information from the MSU contact.
  - Time slots for presentations—might need two busses.
  - Volunteers: it was suggested that we bring at least 2 volunteers at a time.
  - Prizes: Possibly from Janet Weiss, otherwise from RSG discretionary fund (as we did not budget it from AAC). Eugene makes a good point that most grad students care more about recognition than prize money.

- **Graduate Student Bill of Rights (optional for board members to participate)**
  - Chris presents the background of the GSBOR.

- **Say No to GEO:** they ask for RSG to make sure the students are informed and perhaps create some sort of town hall or forum. Stephen says that their group does not have the capacity to set up an event, but they are looking to have a joint event with GEO. Eli mentions that RSG could host an event with GEO and SNTGEO and have a yes and no side and a moderator. We agree that this is a good idea. The executives will take control of this issue. Members of the organization also suggested that we conduct graduate student surveys every semester in order to gauge graduate student happiness and to give students with problems a chance to speak out.

### III. Open Discussion

### V. Next meeting

February 15th, 2012, 6pm
VI. Adjournment

VII.
Optional Meeting.
Made changes to the Graduate Student Bill of Rights and Responsibilities.
Michael will email Chris changes. Chris will add remaining changes from Right #16 onwards and upload document onto Google docs.
Haven will change all passive voice to make the rights assertions and not suggestions.
RACKHAM STUDENT GOVERNMENT
Academic Affairs Committee Meeting
March 7th, 2012
6pm Espresso Royale, 322 S. State St

I. Roll call of members
Present: Eli Eisman, Chris Tom, Michael Benson, Kaitlin Flynn, Tien-Huei Hsu
Absent (excused):
Absent (unexcused): Haven Allen, Christopher Armstrong
Called to order: 6:05 pm

II. Special Business

1. Town Hall (Final tally of Deans, venue and food, registration email to be drafted)

Deans that will be attending the Town Hall:
Dean Howard, Dean Engelke, Dean Godfrey, Dean Stewart
We are still waiting on Dean Love (Div II). Michael has left a note on her door, but Dean Love
has not yet responded. Michael will attempt to contact her again.
Secretary for Janet Weiss mentioned that both dates were still being held open for her. We will
email her back and let her know that she only needs to show up for the 4/3 event.

Food:
Last year a total of 115 students (75 from I, III and IV; 40 for II) registered for Lunch with the
Deans event. We expect more at this meeting because it will be a combined meeting with all
Deans present. And we also expect more people due to the update in GSRA unionization
situation.
We’re planning on getting food from Jerusalem Garden, enough for 150 people. Which means
enough food will be provided for 75% of that number, 113 people.
Food was $6 per person, $6.75 with drinks. We decided to pick drinks up separately (at Meijer).
$6 \times 113 = 678 (+ \text{drinks would be } \sim$700)
We will be asking board to increase our budget by $300 to make it up to $700 total.

Registration:
We will ask Natalie to setup registration email. Registration email will include the following:
name/department/division, suggestions/questions/topics of discussion section, dietary
preferences. Registration link will sent out as a separate email and also be included on newsletter

Room:
Michael will reserve 4th floor amphitheater and the “big” room across from it.

2. MSU/UM symposium bus details
In the works. We’re currently looking at Getaway Trails (cheapest option so far, Blue buses would be $1100, but they offer trips back and forth): will take up to 60 people, leave UM at 11:30am, leave MSU at 6:30 (get back at 7:30) - $592
To come back during the day will be a couple hundred more. We didn’t think it was worth the extra cost.

3. GEO/SAGU forum
We will have the meeting tomorrow at 6pm, Rackham Building West Study Hall North Alcove. All committee members are welcome to join. We will have a conversation about what’s the current situation and how to best address GSRA concerns given recent developments.

4. GSBOR and the Non-discrimination policy resolution
Students have expressed interest in participating in the drafting of the GSBOR. We will send out flyer about getting involved in the AAC. Chris will put email together.

We would like to send the GSBOR on to the general board. Committee members will do a final reading tonight and send Chris and me an email after reading the document REGARDLESS of if changes are needed.

Kaitlin moved to return the bill of rights to the board, seconded by Eli, approved unanimously. Michael moved that the committee recommend passage of the bill to the board, and recommend to the board that they direct the executives to devise, implement, and execute the enforcement policy. Seconded by Chris, approved unanimously.

We discussed resolution for the inclusion of “sexual practice” into the non-discrimination policy. Chris will make changes and provide Michael with final version prior to tomorrow evening’s meeting (preferably tonight, latest noon on Thursday).

Chris moved to put the resolution forward to the board, seconded by Eli, approved by 3 out of 4 committee members. No objections. 1 abstention (Michael).

Motion passes; the academic affairs committee supports the resolution and its passage to the board. It will be on the agenda for tomorrow’s meeting.

Chris will send the spreadsheet of the composition of the non-discrimination policies of different institutions to Michael for inclusion to the board agenda.

5. Conflict Resolution flow chart
Chris has not yet heard back from Darlene and will follow up on the matter.
6. Advisory committees to Associate Deans

We will read through the applications and will nominate potential candidates to the board. An email will be sent out this Friday to solicit people to join 6 different boards: Continuous Enrollment Board, Academic Integrity Board, Advisory Committees to the Associate Deans of each Division. Students will have to provide a short blurb on why they want to be part of the board. A reminder email will be sent out, and this will also be included as part of the newsletter. The deadline for application will be March 23rd. We will have a special meeting on March 28th to go through the applications.

III. Open Discussion

Rackham Study Hall hours will be extended!

Update on infringement of graduate student’s I.P. rights. We will be setting up a meeting with the Office of Tech Transfer and other relevant parties to make sure everyone is on the same page about the language and the scope of student I.P. rights.

We discussed whether we should have an I.P. right in the GSBOR. Perhaps the inclusion of it was reactionary to the issue brought forward to RSG. Eugene’s issue is a conflict resolution issue, which we are currently attempting to address through other means. However, we will have the meeting with all parties and make decision afterwards of whether to include it.

V. Next meeting

March 21st 2012

VI. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned: 7:02 pm
Roll Call of Members:
Present: Chris Tom, Tien-Huei Hsu, Michael Benson, Kaitlin Flynn, Eli Eisman
Absent (excused):
Absent (unexcused):

1. Call to order: 6:10 pm

2. Specific Business
   a. MSU-GAC:
      Kaitlin: MSU wants to know if people are willing to be judges.
      Gave them that information, RSG reps will be willing to judge (Eli, Kaitlin, Chris).
      We discussed how much we plan to give as poster awards. According to the MSU source, UM will be likely to win 6 to 7 awards. We had talked to Dean Janet Weiss, who was willing to consider giving awards but most likely not $500 (which is what MSU is giving out). We suggest giving $50 awards, if Rackham cannot cover it, RSG can cover the cost. We decided that we will take care of the cost and not rely on MSU.
      Buses have been booked and scheduled. Revisions to the contract in progress with regard to the time and place of pickup and dropoff.
      Kaitlin will send out email by the latest by Friday with information on where to go and where to get onto the bus.
   
   b. Town Halls/Lunch with the Deans
      Tien will draft an email for town hall announcements (due Sunday). The results of the registration link were sent to Chris’ spreadsheet, which he will share with the committee. Currently, we have 4 people registered. 2 division 1, 2 division 3.
      Michael’s presentation is in progress and has been timed to be 3 ½ min.
      Mary would like an email from Eli to all the Assistant Deans with all the information that he had previously sent her. Michael will book the rooms, email has been sent to Karen.
      Eli spoke with Ali (Jerusalem Garden). Current order is 90 total sandwiches, 5 lbs of hummous and 12 lbs of fattoush. Total cost is $741.40. This is over the budget for town hall. Therefore, we will order fewer sandwiches, 80 instead of 90 sandwiches, 3lbs of hummous, 9 lbs of fattoush. We will pick up the flatware (otherwise 25 cents per person).
      Should come out to be <$700. Eli will place the order, Tien will put it on her card. Food will be delivered at 11 am in front of the Rackham Building to allow time for setup. Eli and Michael will go together to
Meijer’s to pick up flatware and soda.

Graduation timeline issue has been discussed between Michael and Dean Janet Weiss and a public statement has been prepared regarding the matter.

Mandatory attendance for all RSG reps for town hall; Kaitlin will be in charge of excusing people.

c. Conflict resolution board & flowchart

Chris talked to Darlene about flowchart. Will send to the committee and it will be discussed next week.

d. Conflict resolution workshops – Brainstorm ways to increase turnout

Skipped for now.

e. Meeting with IP/OTT

Not done yet. Soon (after SAGE).

f. Reschedule visit to NCRC

Rescheduled to occur during the summer.

g. GEO/SAGU follow-up

GEO was not happy with the email sent out. They were invited to place something in our newspaper with a disclaimer that it is not of the opinion of RSG.

h. Assistant Dean Committee

Emails will be sent out Tuesday. Michael has template for the email and Kaitlin will edit the email prior to the sending. A second email will be sent out. AAC will nominate the candidates to the board.

3. Open Discussion

4. Next Meeting – March 28th 2012, 6pm

5. Adjournment: 6:45 pm
Roll Call of Members:
Present: Tien-Huei Hsu, Michael Benson, Kaitlin Flynn, Haven Allen, Eli Eisman
Absent (excused): Chris Tom
Absent (unexcused):

1. Call to order: 6:05 pm

2. Specific Business

   a. MSU-GAC
   Bus will pick people up in front of Rackham at 1145 am. Students were asked to be there at 1130 am. We will get to East Lansing at 12:30 pm. This gives students enough time to check in and go to their presentations/posters.
   A lot of people have cancelled on the bus. So we have around 50 going.

   Some people have agreed to judge. Kaitlin will ask when judges are judging their individual sessions.

   Student awards for Umich students will not be $500; we can’t afford it. MSU money can only fund MSU students. Unfortunately, we haven’t done fundraising for this event. Outside sponsors can cover but we prefer to front it ourselves. However, Kaitlin will ask the MSU contact what sponsors can provide. Acknowledge prize winnings and then hand over the cash award later. Cash awards to be given a week later. Acknowledge winners in our newsletter and also sponsors (if we intend to go that route).

   Conference ends at 6, buses leave at 630 pm.

   Reminder email will go out Thursday with details on bus schedule etc. Chris and Lauren will be chaperoning on the bus on both ways.

   Send out survey afterward (Tien will design questions for survey).

   Haven why wouldn’t we host next year’s GAC? We need a lot more people to coordinate the effort. This discussion will have to happen over the summer on whether we want to do it.

   b. Town Halls/Lunch with the Deans

   Email has been drafted, needs to be sent out. Tien will send to exec@rsg-umich.edu.

   Total food order (Eli): 90 sandwiches, halved. 36 falafel/36 chicken/18 kafta. Although
original plan was 80 sandwiches, Ali’s cutting us a deal on the hummus and fatoush with this size order. 3lbs hummus + 1lb free. This includes pita. 8lbs fatoush + 1lb free. This includes the baked pita chips. No flatware included.

Delivery to the basement of Rackham (off East Huron) at 11.05-11.15, 3, April 2012 Total 691.47. Everyone plan to be there at 11am. Michael and Eli still need to get drinks + flatware for <$9 if possible.

Complications: Darlene will be late for the event. She has another meeting that will not end until 12 pm. We will need to fill in the time.

Questions from survey box and questions from survey. Also suggestions from newsletter will be used. Michael will moderate and he has a powerpoint presentation ready to go. “Sexual Practice” addition to the non-discrimination clause will be brought up at this Town Hall. Students will be invited to public hearing on following Thursday.


Make facebook/twitter event. Publicize like crazy to your department/program!

All RSG reps are expected to show.

Michael will bring suggestion box to town hall. Ask Heidi to bring quarter sheets to the meeting tomorrow.

c. GPA issue
Dean Weiss said that a weighted GPA fine. Ford School students favor a weighted GPA scale, do not oppose having a 4.0 scale otherwise.
It’s going to the Rackham Executive Board and will be talked about there.
Haven will type it up on how it will work by 2pm tomorrow.

3. Open Discussion

4. Next Meeting – Stay for briefing after Town Hall

April 11th 2012, 6pm

5. Adjournment: 6:40 pm
RACKHAM STUDENT GOVERNMENT
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Thursday, June 14th 2012
6:30 pm, Espresso Royale Cafe, 324 State St.

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS

Representatives Anna Belak, Chris Tom, Eli Benchell Eisman, RSG President
Michael Benson, Haven Allen, Kaitlin Flynn, Andrew Crawford, Alex
Toulouze
a. Present: Absent (excused): Representatives Pete McGrath
b. Absent (unexcused): Representatives

III. CONFLICT RESOLUTION BOARD – INITIAL DRAFTS

a. Mission Statement (rough draft attached)
b. Powers/enforcement
c. Composition

IV. CONFLICT RESOLUTION FLOW CHART

a. Revisioning with CRB in place

V. OPEN DISCUSSION

VI. ADJOURNMENT:

Adjourn–
Next meeting at 6.30 June 14th at Espresso Royale on State.

VII. ITEMS & IDEAS IN QUEUE (NOT DISCUSSED THIS MEETING)

a. Rackham administers faculty awards for mentorship
b. The mechanism of funding for first year students should be standardized
   across Rackham
c. List of Academic Resources for Twitter (Chris)
d. Student Ombuds
VIII. ATTACHMENTS

1. Mission Statement for Conflict Resolution Board

The purpose of this Board is to act as an unbiased resource to formally resolve the interpersonal conflict between students and faculty. These are cases where there is no clear-cut definition of right and wrong, e.g. academic dishonesty or sexual harassment, which are handled appropriately by the Academic Integrity Board and the Office of Institutional Equality, respectively.

The jurisdiction and responsibilities of this Board include:
- Formal complaints brought by faculty or staff for resolution. This will be a catch-all system for all matters not handled by other bodies. It is operates in what is essentially a 'grey area' for the existing bodies.
- The complaints and conflicts that exist are individual and subjective, and thus the solutions are handled on a case-by-case basis.
- Should the complaint fail to be resolved in such a way that is amiable to both parties, the Board can make recommendations to the Deans, who will be vested with the authority to modify and enforce appropriate recommendations.
- Serve as an intermediary mechanism of communication of the complaint from the student body and faculty to the Administration that bypasses the program/departmental channels.
- A necessary channel for all matters of graduate student expulsion for non-academic/non-code of conduct violations. In this way the burden responsibility does not rest solely on the PI, nor can the decision be made exclusively by the PI. In this way as well, a solution can be sought after that does not include expulsion from school for reasons that are not explicitly codified.

The limitations of this board are:
- Will not have any jurisdiction over Academic Integrity or other well-defined code of conduct violations.
- Will not have any authority over legal matters, and the resolutions are not legally binding
- Will not have the authority to directly deal or enforce resolution

The board will be composed of:
- Excess faculty members appointed by SACUA and Rackham
- Excess student members appointed by RSG
- If any member of a given board has a conflict of interest in a given case, he or she will be replaced by someone from the pool of extras.
2. Conflict Resolution Flowchart

- Student seeks informal mediation from S/C Resolution Officer
  - Resolved
  - S/C Resolution Officer organizes formal dispute resolution process under school/college procedures
    - MOU
    - No agreement: Dean requests Rackham's Dispute Resolution Process
      - RRO organizes formal dispute resolution process under Rackham procedures
        - MOU
        - Rackham Dean determination of resolution
      - Student asks Rackham Resolution Officer for reconsideration
        - RRO and Resolution Board asks school/college to reconvene mediation
        - RRO and Resolution Board sustains MOU
I. CALL TO ORDER 6:46 pm

II. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS
   Kaitlin Flynn, Anna Belak, Eli Benchell Eisman, Andrew Crawford,
   Michael Benson, Alex Toulouse
   a. Present: Representatives
   b. Absent (excused): Representatives Pete McGrath, Haven Allen, Chris
      Tom
   c. Absent (unexcused): Representatives

III. CONFLICT RESOLUTION BOARD
   a. Mission Statement
   b. Flow Chart
   c. Resolution to give power to the Deans for enforcement
   d. Timeline for implementation
   e. Other Boards, Committees, and operating bodies

IV. GRADUATE STUDENT BILL OF RIGHTS
   a. Status update
   b. Timeline for submission for Rackham/implementation

V. OPEN DISCUSSION

VI. ADJOURNMENT:

VII. APPENDIX:

Conflict Resolution Board

1. Statement of Purpose
   The Conflict Resolution Board (henceforth known as ‘the Board’) provides
   a formal venue to resolve the interpersonal conflict between students and faculty.
   This includes cases where no laws or codes of conduct have explicitly been
   broken (e.g. academic dishonesty or sexual harassment), but where resolution of
   this conflict is necessary to maintain a safe, productive, and comfortable work and
   research environment at the University of Michigan.

2. Powers and Responsibilities
   a. The Board addresses complaints brought before them by faculty and/or
      students. The Board hears cases brought by faculty against student,
      student against faculty, and student against student. The Graduate
Ombudsman processes incoming cases and decides if the Board is the appropriate body for the case.

b. The Board may decide to direct proceedings to a more appropriate Boards and resources as necessary; e.g. such as Academic Integrity Board, the Graduate Ombudsman, and the Office of Institution Equality. The Board has full knowledge of these other resources.

c. The Board hears each complaint on a case-by-case basis, and works with the parties to find appropriate solutions for the situation.

d. The Board [will/will not] have subpoena power to bring faculty or students into discussion.

e. Should the complaint fail to be resolved in an amiable manner, the Board makes recommendations to the Deans, who are vested by [Resolution XX-01] with the authority to enforce appropriate recommendations.

f. The Board may serve as a means of communication from the student body and faculty to the Administration when the traditional means of conflict resolution through the Department fails.

g. All attempts to expel a graduate student from the Rackham Graduate School for non-academic and non-code of conduct violations must pass through the Board. In this way, a solution can be sought after that does not include expulsion from school for reasons that are not explicitly codified.

3. Limitations of Power

a. The Board has no jurisdiction over Academic Integrity or other well-defined code of conduct violations. As per the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), the Board will not view academic documents, nor are they admissible as evidence.

b. The Board has no authority over legal matters, and the resolutions are not legally binding.

c. The Board has no power to directly deal or enforce resolution. That power is left in the hands of the Deans.

4. Composition

a. Seven faculty members appointed by SACUA and Rackham Graduate School, which includes a reserve of extras for conflicts of interest, scheduling issues, and other unforeseen reasons.

b. Seven student members appointed by Rackham Student Government, which also includes a reserve of extras.

c. For each case that comes before the Board, three students and three faculty are randomly selected from the Board. These members form a sitting Board.

d. If any member of the Board has a conflict of interest in a given case, he or she must recluse himself or herself and be replaced by someone from the pool of extras. This includes but is not limited to: friendships and relationships with either of the parties, financial interest, or departmental
affiliation. If any member of the Board has a time conflict, they may also ask to be replaced.
e. Either of the parties coming before the Board has a right to request that a sitting member of the Board be replaced.
f. The Graduate Ombudsman in the ways of Conflict Resolution trains all members of the Board.

5. Examples of Use
   a. Eugene
   b. Jennifer

Resolution steps

MOU = Memo of Understanding
RRO = Rackham Resolution Officer
RACKHAM STUDENT GOVERNMENT
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Thursday, May 31st 2012
6:30 pm, Amer’s Delicatessen, 312 State St.

I. CALL TO ORDER
   a. Convene at 6.35

II. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS
   a. Present: Representatives Anna Belak, Chris Tom, Eli Benchell Eisman, RSG President Michael Benson
   b. Absent (excused): Representatives Haven Allen, Kaitlin Flynn, Pete McGrath
   c. Absent (unexcused): Representatives Andrew Crawford, Alex Toulouse

III. CONFLICT RESOLUTION (active/reactionary)
   a. CT-Two major goals are conflict Reolution. Board is the reactionary, Active. Training component is the more passive function.
   b. MB- We will likely be considering the diabanding of the CEDRBoard. Suggested by Rackham and with the consent of RSG. Will establish a new board. What is the function of the new board why is it important what gap is it filling and how do the effect recommendations from the board (where does the power come from) and how do they interact with departments and administration. Needs to be broad.

   CT-informal ConfRes is handled by Darlene and the Ombuds office

   EE-How does a formal grievance get made? An informal grievance transitions to a formal grievance when both parties agree to undergo the formal dispoute process.

   AB- How does Rackham create a new board. MB- RSG and Rackham write the policy

   MB- So why is the board necessary. AB- we just had the whole Union thing. CT- and all of the other events that could be benefit from the the office

   MB-we need to highlight the deficiencies in Rackham. CT- SACUA should also be involved. MB- Rackham can appoint Deans, SACUA can appoint university wide faculty and RSG will elect the students.

   CT- we need a well defined mission. MB suggests a qualitative pie chart indicating the types of conflicts and those that are covered under Rackham and

   MB we will also need a centralized intake – informal and formal- maybe on the website, that we can then advertise to entire student body. MB suggests DRJ’s office. AB- mentions a grievance wherein the student’s assumed confidentiality may have been breached and highlights its importance.
Let’s not discuss the power of the committee for right now, but MB has been meeting with Janet Weiss. MB suggests an initial drafting for
   c. Conflict Resolution Board – Composition/Structure, Defined Purpose/Mission Statement, Powers/Limitation of Powers

IV. CONFLICT RESOLUTION (passive/preventative)

A remake the resolution steps flow chart by August 10, to be included with the Rackham orientation packet along with RSG information.

MB- Peer ombuds- some students go through training and function as an information source, not to recommend course of actions, but to inform of option

Content will include- contact information, websties adna resources, CAPS information and related groups, resolution steps

MB – What is the grab that will entice people to open and read the form. CT suggests that this if more of a reference
Anna volunteers to reconstruct the flowchart when the committee provides the approved text.
   a. Orientation Handout (DRJ version attached)
   b. Training/Workshops

V. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & GRADUATE STUDENT BILL OF RIGHTS

Brought up at the last board meeting.
EE Suggests CTools as the means of information conveyance.

CT –IP in the GSBOR. MB- let’s hold off until Janet comes back.

VI. OPEN DISCUSSION

   a. The mechanism of funding for first year students should be standardized across Rackham
   b. MB- Rackham administers awards. For faculty awards for mentorship.
      RSG will create an RSG administered Semesterly award. All advisors nominated get the award, the list will be published and the winners will be given a certificate. At the ends of the year Rackham will be asked to recognize those individuals. This responsibility will be tasked to the Academic Affairs committee.
   c. CT suggests that a seminar sponsored by Rackham, similar to the Golden Apple series, to highlight graduate student achievement.

VII. ADJOURNMENT:
Adjourn – 7.17
Next meeting at 6.30 June 14th.
Resolution steps

1. Student seeks informal mediation from S/C Resolution Officer
2. S/C Resolution Officer organizes formal dispute resolution process under school/college procedures
   - MOU
   - No agreement: Dean requests Rackham's Dispute Resolution Process
     - MOU
     - RRO organizes formal dispute resolution process under Rackham procedures
       - RRO and Resolution Board asks school/college to reconvene mediation
         - MOU
         - Rackham Dean determination of resolution
     - Student asks Rackham Resolution Officer for reconsideration
       - RRO and Resolution Board sustains MOU

MOU = Memo of Understanding
RRO = Rackham Resolution Officer
RACKHAM STUDENT GOVERNMENT  
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE  
Thursday, June 14th 2012  
6:30 pm, Espresso Royale Cafe, 324 State St.

I. CALL TO ORDER  
6:31 pm – Eli is eating a sandwich

II. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS  
   a. Present: Representatives Anna Belak, Chris Tom, Eli Benchell Eisman, Kaitlin Flynn,  
      b. Absent (excused): Representatives Pete McGrath, RSG President Michael Benson, Haven Allen.  
      c. Absent (unexcused): Representatives Andrew Crawford, Alex Toulouse

III. CONFLICT RESOLUTION BOARD – INITIAL DRAFTS  
   a. Mission Statement (rough draft attached) – Edits of rough draft was undertaken by the committee. Minutes of discussion follow. Additional edits were made on paper and submitted to CT for revision.

IV. CONFLICT RESOLUTION FLOW CHART  
   a. Eli will meet with Darlene Ray-Johnson re: the existing resolution boards. In this way the flow chart will be a complete reference for all sorts of conflict, regardless of whether CRB is utilized.

V. OPEN DISCUSSION

VI. ADJOURNMENT:  
Adjourn –  
Next meeting at 6:30pm June 28th at Espresso Royale on State.

VII. ITEMS & IDEAS IN QUEUE (NOT DISCUSSED THIS MEETING)  
   a. Rackham administers faculty awards for mentorship  
   b. The mechanism of funding for first year students should be standardized across Rackham  
   c. List of Academic Resources for Twitter (Chris)  
   d. Student Ombuds
VIII. ATTACHMENTS

1. Mission Statement for Conflict Resolution Board

The purpose of this Board is to act as an unbiased resource to formally resolve the interpersonal conflict between students and faculty. These are cases where there is no clear-cut definition of right and wrong, e.g. academic dishonesty or sexual harassment, which are handled appropriately by the Academic Integrity Board and the Office of Institutional Equality, respectively. This statement is unclear and needs to be reworked.

CT-Michael suggests having the Deans enforce conflict resolution. AB- is on board with enforcing, but doesn’t think the Deans will necessarily agree. CT- hopefully most things will be amiable to both parties, the Board will be employed.

CT and AB- mention that policies in place by the department are not necessarily followed and need to be reconsidered.

AB- Are individuals expected to contact the ombuds office (eg DRJ) prior to contacting the Board? CT- yes. And Darlene is all over this.

AB- Recommends that we provide discreet examples of cases in which this board would be utilized.

Edits were made.

The jurisdiction and responsibilities of this Board include:
- Formal complaints brought by faculty or staff for resolution. This will be a catch-all system for all matters not handled by other bodies. It is operates in what is essentially a 'grey area' for the existing bodies.
- The complaints and conflicts that exist are individual and subjective, and thus the solutions are handled on a case-by-case basis.
- Should the complaint fail to be resolved in such a way that is amiable to both parties, the Board can make recommendations to the Deans, who will be vested with the authority to modify and enforce appropriate recommendations.
- Serve as an intermediary mechanism of communication of the complaint from the student body and faculty to the Administration that bypasses the program/departmental channels.
- A necessary channel for all matters of graduate student expulsion for non-academic/non-code of conduct violations. In this way the burden responsibility does not rest solely on the PI, nor can the decision be made exclusively by the PI. In this way as well, a solution can be sought after that does not include expulsion from school for reasons that are not explicitly codified.

The limitations of this board are:
- Will not have any jurisdiction over Academic Integrity or other well-defined code of conduct violations.
- Will not have any authority over legal matters, and the resolutions are not legally binding
- Will not have the authority to directly deal or enforce resolution

The board will be composed of:
- Excess faculty members appointed by SACUA and Rackham
- Excess student members appointed by RSG
- If any member of a given board has a conflict of interest in a given case, he or she will be replaced by someone from the pool of extras.

2. Conflict Resolution Flowchart

[Conflict Resolution Flowchart Diagram]

- Student seeks informal mediation from S/C Resolution Officer
- S/C Resolution Officer organizes formal dispute resolution process under school/college procedures
- No agreement: Dean requests Rackham's Dispute Resolution Process
- Student asks Rackham Resolution Officer for reconsideration
- RRO organizes formal dispute resolution process under Rackham procedures
- RRO and Resolution Board asks school/college to reconvene mediation
- Rackham Dean determination of resolution

MOU
RACKHAM STUDENT GOVERNMENT
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Thursday, July 11th 2012
6:30 pm, Espresso Royale Cafe, 324 State St.

I. CALL TO ORDER 6:37 pm

II. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS
   Present: Representatives Kaitlin Flynn, Anna Belak, Eli Benchell Eisman, Michael Benson, Eugene Daneshvar
   a. Absent (excused): Representatives Pete McGrath, Haven Allen, Chris Tom, Andrew Crawford
   b. Absent (unexcused): Representatives

III. CONFLICT RESOLUTION BOARD
   a. Mission Statement
      i. Michael does not like the part of the mission statement in which we say ‘this includes cases…’. Eli mentions that the board doesn’t necessarily have ‘teeth’ but could serve as more of a guideline or suggestion for the conflict resolution. Eugene suggests that outlining common problems that graduate students face (perhaps by doing a poll) we might be able to describe some issues and potential solutions in this document. Michael responds that this board could or should be used for a large variety of concerns. Eugene mentions that this board could work as a compliance board for faculty members and other administrators to report if/when the administrators/faculty members do not follow protocol for dealing with and reporting such situations. Michael suggests that this board could direct Rackham and departments to follow these guidelines—could function as a ‘superboard’ (as termed by Eli). Discussion suggests that perhaps the board could have two arms: one advisory catch-all for hierarchical issues, depending on if the issue is stalled at the faculty/administrator level or another arm at the informal ‘student presentation of an issue’ stage. Eli says that centralizing these responsibilities also streamlines the process and allows for uniformity between departments to say that for instance, if at any point there is a conflict, this is what should happen. Eli says also that in his discussion with Darlene, they identified that there is not a point person in each department to be trained in and responsible for these issues. Eugene mentions too that having an unbiased party is the key requirement in this board, especially in order to protect against conflict of interest issues. Michael suggests either a ‘checklist’ option that each faculty member has to fill out and respond to the department chair. Michael also suggests identifying point persons in other departments that would allow for addressing of concerns in a professional manner but outside of a department (IE: a chemical engineer has a problem with a faculty member and chooses to discuss the issue with a professor in
EECS). Anna brings up an EECS prof who has a policy in his lab that allows for this type of interaction when students or lab members feel that there is a conflict of interest. Eugene and Michael like this idea. Michael also suggests that we could have people address issues at a college level, i.e. college of engineering, LSA, etc. Eugene emphasizes that there needs to be training within the departments such that concerns and confidentiality are maintained, from the faculty to the administrative assistant level.

ii. Action items: consider checklist, training for departments, identifying point people within departments (talking to Darlene about how to implement?), refine mission statement. Michael would like to take on the rewriting of the conflict resolution board. Eli mentions that Darlene is interested in having this board be a recommendation and not enforcement, whereas this committee agrees that it should have teeth and the board should not have to operate through the Deans for enforcement. Michael agrees and mentions that we will be meeting with Janet when she returns from vacation to discuss how we can implement enforcement.

b. Flow Chart- Kaitlin brings up that the flow chart is less than optimal for distribution to students during fall orientation that shows how to deal with conflict and what offices exist for conflict resolution on campus. Email this out?? Michael agrees and Kaitlin and Anna will work on this.

c. Resolution to give power to the Deans for enforcement—scratching this and will update once we meet with Janet.

d. Timeline for implementation- timeline: meet with Janet, meet with John Godfrey to hammer out policy details, present to RSG board in Thanksgiving with hopeful implementation in fall 2013.

e. Other Boards, Committees, and operating bodies—we will wait on the advisory boards and committees. We will need to also appoint students to the Dean’s advisory committees in the fall.

IV. GRADUATE STUDENT BILL OF RIGHTS

a. Status update: the GSBOR was approved by the RSG board and we are waiting to meet with Janet to discuss the next steps.

b. Timeline for submission for Rackham/implementation: Fall 2012

c. Identification/classification of all policies that are already covered in other documents—will be assigned over email.

V. OPEN DISCUSSION

a. Rackham graduation/dissertation policies have been passed and updated! Thank you Rackham Executive Board! Michael outlines some of the changes—we are no longer requiring students to use ProQuest, dissertations will be submitted online to Rackham, and the deadlines have been extended. Also the embargo requirements have been changed to allow anyone to embargo their dissertation for one year, no questions asked. To extend beyond this, patent applications and other documentation must be provided.

b. Eugene asks what else he can do now as a student with conflict. Michael
says that it seems he is doing everything he can (including addressing the Reagents, etc). Eugene might be interested in an investigation at the University level, in order for the university to perhaps determine what they can do to undo the damage that had already been done in this situation. We begin discussing what Eugene will say when he addresses the Board of Reagents.

c. We will add Eugene to the committee list-serv.

VI. **ADJOURNMENT**: 7:24pm

VII. **APPENDIX:**

**Conflict Resolution Board**

1. **Statement of Purpose**
   The Conflict Resolution Board (hereafter known as ‘the Board’) provides a formal venue to resolve the interpersonal conflict between students and faculty. ((This includes cases where no laws or codes of conduct have explicitly been broken (e.g. academic dishonesty or sexual harassment),)) but where resolution of this conflict is necessary to maintain a safe, productive, and comfortable work and research environment at the University of Michigan.

2. **Powers and Responsibilities**
   a. The Board addresses complaints brought before them by faculty and/or students. The Board hears cases brought by faculty against student, student against faculty, and student against student. The Graduate Ombudsman processes incoming cases and decides if the Board is the appropriate body for the case.
   b. The Board may decide to direct proceedings to more appropriate Boards and resources as necessary; e.g. such as Academic Integrity Board, the Graduate Ombudsman, and the Office of Institution Equality. The Board has full knowledge of these other resources.
   c. The Board hears each complaint on a case-by-case basis, and works with the parties to find appropriate solutions for the situation.
   d. The Board [will/will not] have subpoena power to bring faculty or students into discussion.
   e. Should the complaint fail to be resolved in an amiable manner, the Board makes recommendations to the Deans, who are vested by [Resolution XX-01] with the authority to enforce appropriate recommendations.
   f. The Board may serve as a means of communication from the student body and faculty to the Administration when the traditional means of conflict resolution through the Department fails.
   g. All attempts to expel a graduate student from the Rackham Graduate School for non-academic and non-code of conduct violations must pass through the Board. In this way, a solution can be sought after that does not include expulsion from school for reasons that are not explicitly codified.
3. Limitations of Power
   a. The Board has no jurisdiction over Academic Integrity or other well-defined code of conduct violations. As per the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), the Board will not view academic documents, nor are they admissible as evidence.
   b. The Board has no authority over legal matters, and the resolutions are not legally binding.
   c. The Board has no power to directly deal or enforce resolution. That power is left in the hands of the Deans.

4. Composition
   a. Seven faculty members appointed by SACUA and Rackham Graduate School, which includes a reserve of extras for conflicts of interest, scheduling issues, and other unforeseen reasons.
   b. Seven student members appointed by Rackham Student Government, which also includes a reserve of extras.
   c. For each case that comes before the Board, three students and three faculty are randomly selected from the Board. These members form a sitting Board.
   d. If any member of the Board has a conflict of interest in a given case, he or she must recluse himself or herself and be replaced by someone from the pool of extras. This includes but is not limited to: friendships and relationships with either of the parties, financial interest, or departmental affiliation. If any member of the Board has a time conflict, they may also ask to be replaced.
   e. Either of the parties coming before the Board has a right to request that a sitting member of the Board be replaced.
   f. The Graduate Ombudsman in the ways of Conflict Resolution trains all members of the Board.

5. Examples of Use
   a. Eugene
   b. Jennifer

Resolution steps
MOU = Memo of Understanding
RRO = Rackham Resolution Officer
I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS
   Representatives, Anna Belak, Eli Benchell Eisman, Chris Tom, Division II student Eugene Daneshvar

   Present:
   Absent (excused): Representatives Pete McGrath, Haven Allen, Andrew Crawford, Michael Benson, Kaitlin Flynn
   Absent (unexcused):

III. CONFLICT RESOLUTION BOARD
   a. Current action items:
      i. Michael – Revise the CRB language/mission statement, talk to Janet re: CRB enforcement
      ii. Anna & Kaitlin – CR flow chart

IV. UPDATE FROM EUGENE DANESHVAR

V. OPEN DISCUSSION

VI. ADJOURNMENT

VII. APPENDIX:
I. CALL TO ORDER 6:35 pm

II. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS
Present: Representatives Chris Tom, Anna Belak, Eli Benchell Eisman, Absent (excused): Representatives Pete McGrath, Haven Allen, Andrew Crawford, RSG Vice President Kaitlin Flynn, RSG President Michael Benson
Absent (unexcused):

III. CONFLICT RESOLUTION BOARD
a. Anna and Chris begin with discussion of the CEDR board policies, and it’s decided that most of the policies can be adapted nearly verbatim into the CRB. However, because CEDR deals exclusively with a student-oriented board, it has no method of enforcement for faculty that would be a necessary component of the CRB. This leads into a discussion on the enforcement aspects of the CRB. Specifically, whether or not the deans should get involved. The pro’s are that that power already resides there, and no other mechanism of enforcement is needed to be implemented. The con’s are that it takes power away from the board.
b. It was restated that ALL matters of student expulsion must go through the CRB checkpoint to look for solutions.
c. When Eli Benchell Eisman arrives, he provides an alternate solution, by giving the ‘teeth’ to the Office of Insitutional Equity, which monitors harassment and discrimination and by virtue of being non-academic, completely bypasses the professor-student bias. OIE is the body that would be able to actually enforce faculty compliance on CRB decisions. This was well received by the committee.
d. EBE also goes on to give a significant update on his ongoing conversation with Darlene Ray-Johnson, with several recommendations for the mission statement and the language for the CRB. These include timeline for decisions, methods of gathering statements, accommodations that will be made for the students, etc. He will email the suggestions to the committee. It is noted by the Chair that Eli has done an excellent job.
e. The question of ‘what problem is too small’ for the CRB to handle, and the general consensus was ‘none’. Informal conflict resolution should always be the first step, but if those methods fail to arrive at an amiable conclusion, then any issue can be brought to the board.
f. Eli suggests that AAC host a graduate student Ombuds training event, put on by DRJ. This puts additional, grassroots resources on the ground for conflict resolution. This was also well received. Early on in the fall semester is an appropriate time, so we will begin planning and budgeting for that. Eli will talk with DRJ about this, and this is expected to be met with enthusiasm.
g. Kaitlin will e-mail progress on the CR flowchart to the committee.

IV. **ADJOURNMENT**: 7:15pm, the committee goes to Red Hawk
RACKHAM STUDENT GOVERNMENT
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Tuesday, September 18th 2012
8:00 pm, Espresso Royale Cafe, 324 State St.

I. CALL TO ORDER: 8:04pm

II. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS
    Present: Chris Tom, Alex Gutierrez, Kaitlin Flynn, Anna Belak, Michael Benson
    Excused: Eli Benchell Eisman

III. COMMITTEE BUSINESS
    a. Selection of Chair – Chris Tom, with co-chair Anna Belak, and unofficial exec-chair Kaitlin Flynn.
    b. Attendance Policy – 3 unexcused absences before it has to be reported to the board. To be excused, email Chris or Anna (preferably Anna).

IV. FALL EVENTS PLANNING
    a. Town Halls/Lunch with the Deans – Split up divisions between North and South Campuses. Lunch-time with catering. Division 2 North, division 1 Med, division 3 & 4 Central (preferably, but the deans can choose; e.g. a div4 at North for theatre). Sandwich boxes or pizza for catering. Around $1400=($7/person)(200 people) across all sessions. Tentative dates: Nov. 30 – Dec. 2. [Action:] Michael Benson contact deans.
    b. Student Ombuds Training – Michael will send out an email tomorrow and applications are due a week from Monday. Appointments announced that week.

V. CURRENT INITIATIVES & STEPS TO COMPLETION
    a. Conflict Resolution on Campus – Michael will talk to provost about policy language.
       i. Conflict Resolution Centralized Resources – Kaitlin flowchart approved. Important to get to students as soon as possible, but we are waiting on DRJ final approval.
       ii. Conflict Resolution Board – MB will meet with to discuss language and implementation, we should ask next guest speaker who will talk about inappropriate sexual advances about other forms of harassment from faculty.
       iii. Disbanding Continuous Enrollment Dispute Resolution Board
    b. Graduate Student Bill of Rights – Will discuss implementation plan next committee meeting or the one after, once Michael talk to Rackham.

VI. OPEN DISCUSSION
    a. 5 academic questions for Masters/Ph.D. survey emailed to Chris.
    b. Chris to send out doodle for moving committee time to a more reasonable hour, if one can be found.
VII. ACTION ITEMS
   a. [Chris] Doodle poll re: new meeting times
   b. [Michael] Send out email to student body re: student obmuds
   c. [Michael] Get in touch with deans/deans secretaries regarding town hall
   d. [Everyone] Email Chris re: 5 questions

VIII. ADJOURNMENT: 8:41pm
I. CALL TO ORDER: 8:07 pm

II. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS

Chair Chris Tom, Co-chair Anna Belak, Unofficial Vice-Chair Kaitlin Flynn, Secretary Alex Gutierrez, President Michael Benson, Eli Benchell Eisman, Pete McGrath

Present: Chris Tom, Anna Belak, Alex Gutierrez, Eli Benchell, Kaitlin Flynn, Michael Benson
Excused: Pete McGrath
Unexcused:

III. COMMITTEE BUSINESS

a. Fill out Doodle for new meeting time
Alex G needs to fill out poll. Chris to forward Doodle to him. Meeting will still occur at 8p at Espresso Royale for now.

b. Standardizing pay schedule for fellowships to once a month
Different depending on each fellowship. Some are scheduled by department/college individually. Already trending towards standardization... slowly. It should still be put forward as an issue. Anna will take point on writing a resolution.

c. Printers in Rackham for grad students
Bring it up to Provost and other invited speakers as an topic to be pursued. Printers and computer lab in Rackham building is desirable. Particularly useful for master’s students who don’t have a lab to take care of printing needs.

d. Remove ‘Letter of Recommendation’ requirement from the Rackham emergency fund
Find out what other schools do in this regard to decide whether or not reform is necessary. Research other SAGE schools to see how it should proceed. Email to Chris by Friday (along with survey question).

e. Signup sheet for graduate student tutors
Host information about applying tutors on RSG website as public information. We will not be screening applicants nor facilitating hiring. Name, program, subjects taught, up to what level (intro, 200, 300, etc),
experience (# semesters), and desired rate.

f. **Building open late during finals**
   This is likely already in progress, since it happened last semester, but we will check with Janet.

g. **Funding for non-traditional doctoral students**
   Bring up with Janet and push for additional funding for master’s and non-traditional students. Chris will write a memo to the execs so that they can bring it up with the Rackham executive board. He will also follow up with Jill McDonough.

h. **Class fees for candidates**
   Possible course/class/credit bank system so that graduate classes, some of which are offered only sporadically, can be taken two at a time without financial penalty. Come up with better name for program.

i. **Conflict Resolution**
   i. **Conflict Resolution Board**
   ii. **Subcommittee on SAGE conflict resolution** – Chris will join the calls & email discussion. Anyone else that wants to get involved can.
   iii. **Student Ombuds training**
       Late October/early November. Darlene will schedule once names are sent.
   iv. **Disbanding Continuous Enrollment Dispute Resolution Board**
       Discuss with board.

j. **Graduate Student Bill of Rights**
   Brought up with Janet on Thursday. Janet with Chris and/or Kaitlin to work together post-discussion.

V. **OPEN DISCUSSION**
   a. **Reopen the Resolution to expand the Non-Discrimination Policy**
       Committee has a number of things already slated to work on. Discussion postponed until after Grad Bill of Rights work is done.

VI. **ACTION ITEMS**
   a. [Chris] Doodle poll re: new meeting times
   b. [Michael] Send out email to student body re: student ombuds
   c. [Michael] Get in touch with deans/deans secretaries regarding town hall
   d. [Michael] Discuss provost about GSBoR language
   e. [Michael] Discuss conflict resolution implementation with Dean Weiss
   f. [Everyone] Email Chris re: 5 questions
   g. [Chris] Forward Doodle to Alex G and add to email list
   h. [Chris] Write memo to execs re: non-traditional fellowship funding
   i. [Eli] Message Antonio about deans regarding town hall
   j. [Anna] Fellowship payment schedule standardization resolution
   k. [Everyone] Email Chris by Friday re: other schools’ emergency fund requirements
   l. [Chris] Work on course/class/credit bank system.
   m. [Eli] Follow up with deans
VII. **ADJOURNMENT:** 8:50 p.m.

VIII. **APPENDIX**
   
a. **Berkeley’s Emergency fund**
   
i. **Emergency Loans** are available to help students with cash flow problems during the academic year. All registered students can apply for a short-term, interest-free loan of up to $775, which takes about one hour to process and is repayable within 60 days. There is a $20 application fee for all emergency loans (212 Sproul Hall; 510/642-0470).
RACKHAM STUDENT GOVERNMENT
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Tuesday, October 16th 2012
8:00 pm, Espresso Royale Cafe, 324 State St.

I. CALL TO ORDER: 8:09 pm

II. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS

Chair Chris Tom, Co-chair Anna Belak, Unofficial Vice-Chair Kaitlin Flynn, Secretary Alex Gutierrez, President Michael Benson, Eli Benchell Eisman, Pete McGrath

Present: Chair Chris Tom, Co-chair Anna Belak, Unofficial Vice-Chair Kaitlin Flynn, Secretary Alex Gutierrez, Eli Benchell Eisman

Excused: President Michael Benson, Pete McGrath

Unexcused:

III. CURRENT INITIATIVES & TASKS

a. Town Halls/Lunch with the Deans – see Appendix for available dates
   Either Nov. (15th & 16th) or (19th & 21st) depending on Dean of Engineering availability. Need to email this dean along with Laura Patterson (CIO / associate VP) about attending the town halls.

b. Printers in Rackham and Rackham building hours
   Building hours extended. Printers pending. Dean Weiss rocks.

c. Remove ‘Letter of Recommendation’ requirement from the Rackham emergency fund - See Appendix for responses
   After reviewing several other SAGE institutions, it is apparent that Rackham is already providing more than is usual and it is appropriate to require a ‘Letter of Recommendation.’ However, it is reasonable to loosen the requirements by opening up other venues or resources for acquiring this letter, eg from Ombuds, advisor, or other faculty or staff.

d. Signup sheet for graduate student tutors
   Need to figure out where to host the website and database. Find out who manages the Rackham website or someone else to develop and manage this page. There’s no reason to collect data from people when we don’t have the infrastructure to post/support it. Perhaps we can pair with CSG, since the service will be primarily for the academic benefit of undergrads, presumably.

e. Funding for non-traditional doctoral students
   Chris talking to people. In progress. No details to report. Essentially going to relegate this to Chris’s project.

f. Class bank for candidates
   In progress. Chris will meet with President Benson to figure out whom to
talk to about this.

g. **Conflict Resolution**
   No quorum at last RSG board meeting. It appears that the proper order to create the CRB is post-GSBoR, when the mandate to enact the CRB is present.
   
   i. **Conflict Resolution Board**
   ii. **Subcommittee on SAGE conflict resolution**
   iii. **Student Ombuds training**
   iv. **Disbanding Continuous Enrollment Dispute Resolution Board**

h. **Graduate Student Bill of Rights**
   No progress yet, need to set up the meeting with the deans to figure out implementation. Janet has a copy of the BoR.

IV. **OPEN DISCUSSION**

V. **ACTION ITEMS**
   a. [Michael] Send out email to student body re: student obmuds
   b. [Michael] Discuss provost about GSBoR language
   c. [Everyone] Email Chris re: 5 survey questions
   d. [Chris] Follow-up with Jill McDonough re: non-traditional funding
   e. [Anna] Fellowship payment schedule standardization resolution
   f. [Chris] Work on course/class/credit bank system.
   g. [Chris] Email engineering dean and Laura Patterson about availability for our tentative town hall dates.
   h. [Chris/anyone?] Find out who is the Rackham webmaster or website management group.

VI. **ADJOURNMENT:** 8:42 pm

VII. **APPENDIX**

a. **Potential Dates for Town Halls**
   i. § Tue., November 13th – Deans Weiss, Blair, and Hitchcock
   ii. § Thur., November 15th – Deans Weiss and Hitchcock
   iii. § Fri., November 16th – Deans Weiss and Chavous
   iv. § Mon., November 19th – Deans Weiss, Blair, and Hitchcock
   v. § Wed., November 21st - Deans Weiss and Hitchcock
   vi. § Mon., November 26th - Deans Weiss and Chavous
   vii. § Tue., November 27th - Deans Weiss, Blair, and Hitchcock
   viii. § Thur., November 29th - Deans Weiss, Blair, and Hitcheck
   ix. § Fri., November 30th - Deans Weiss and Chavous

b. **Emergency Funds:**
   i. Berkeley (Chris)
      1. **Emergency Loans** are available to help students with cash flow problems during the academic year. All registered
students can apply for a short-term, interest-free loan of up to $775, which takes about one hour to process and is repayable within 60 days. There is a $20 application fee for all emergency loans (212 Sproul Hall; 510/642-0470).

ii. Ohio State (Kaitlin)

1. They do not have emergency funds specifically for graduate students but have some for all students. There is no letter of recommendation required unless you are an international student (and need an immigrant coordinator) but you do have to pay the loan back. I think in Rackham it's a grant. They do not have grants like we do.

iii. UT Austin (Anna)

1. "Entirely dependent upon donations, the Student Emergency Fund provides limited emergency financial assistance to a small number of currently enrolled UT Austin students who are unable to meet immediate, essential expenses because of temporary hardship related to an emergency situation. Some funds are counted as income and are subject to federal taxes. Funding comes from the generous donations of fellow UT Austin students at the annual Party on the Plaza event, as well from faculty and staff support via the Hearts of Texas Campaign. Average award amounts range from $25-$150 per student.
   a. Applicant must be a currently enrolled student at The University of Texas at Austin and have temporary financial hardship resulting from an emergency situation
   b. Other possible resources have been considered and are either unavailable or insufficient
   c. Applicant must be able to provide sufficient documentation of financial hardship

iv. UNC Chapel Hill (Alex)

1. UNC Chapel Hill Emergency Fund: The fund is managed by the "Division of Student Affairs and Scholarships and Student Aid." This funding does not have to be repaid. REQUIREMENTS: 1) Must show financial hardship from an emergency, accident, or unplanned event. 2) Must be currently enrolled. 3) Emergency loans must have been considered and are insufficient/unavailable. 4) Complete all questions and submit supporting docs (financial aid). Average range of funding: $300 - $600. Larger requests require more reviews and personal meetings.

2. UNC Chapel Hill Emergency Loan: Loans are interest-free, short-term loans. They cannot be used to pay University charges, such as tuition (planned expense). Repay by first day of last month of the semester in which the loan is...
borrowed. No noted request ceiling. Late fees: $15/month.
Application processed in 2-3 days.

v. **University of Wisconsin (Eli)**
Emergency or Crisis loans up to $500 are available to any student who demonstrates the need. Funds are made available through external donations and are restricted to payments outside of the University system (i.e. not for use in covering tuition, fees or fines). Multiple loans are available, though previously obtained funds must be paid off in full. Individuals must currently be enrolled as students to apply for the program and funds awarding are subject to the approval of the Office of the Dean of Students.
RACKHAM STUDENT GOVERNMENT
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Tuesday, October 30th 2012
8:00 pm, Espresso Royale Cafe, 324 State St.

I. CALL TO ORDER: 8:08pm

II. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS

Present:
Chair Chris Tom, Co-chair Anna Belak, Unofficial Vice-Chair Kaitlin Flynn, Secretary Alex Gutierrez, President Michael Benson, Eli Benchell Eisman, Heidi Pedini, Pete McGrath, Ben VanGessel.

III. CURRENT INITIATIVES & TASKS

   a. Town Halls/Lunch with the Deans –
      Central Campus: 11/15 12-1p; North Campus: 11/19 12-1p
      1. Representative Requirements: will need to get help from all board representatives.
      2. Rooms: Rackham for Central, Pierpont for North Campus
      3. How many people? Talks of 75-100 students per campus.
         Action items defined below.
      4. Additional Deans: we have all of the deans we are interested. Invite Laura Patterson.
         Eli has the idea to invite someone from OSEH to address Division II about institutional training etc.
      5. Food/Budget: Food for events dependent on where the events are. Pizza is a possible option.
         Also Quizno’s can do boxed lunches. We will need to meet next week to keep going ahead with these plans.

   b. Remove ‘Letter of Recommendation’ requirement from the Rackham emergency fund
      i. Additional LoR sources
      ii. The committee is in support of changing the requirements to change the requirement from the program director to perhaps another faculty member, an ombudsman, SAPAC, Spectrum center, etc. Michael suggests a University employee (ombuds, SAPAC, advisor, graduate coordinator, CAPS, etc). Chris will write up a draft resolution and we will send it to John Godfrey.

   c. Signup sheet for graduate student tutors
      i. Hosting/information management- Michael has created the signup sheet and says that we will host it on the RSG website, Students with Disabilities and Rackham could mirror.
      ii. Michael has already coded this for the old website.
      iii. Michael has created a google form and then have people sign up.
Then Michael will import the data into the code and then open it up for use in December.

d. **Graduate Student Bill of Rights**  
i. Meeting with administration. Michael has requested and we are waiting to hear back from Janet on what time we can meet with her.

e. **Resolution for Accessibility of Technology**  
i. Heidi is here to discuss the drafting of her resolution for the ensuring that technology remains accessible for all students. In her words, the goal is to have a temporary fix such that all technology services are equal during the time of transition from the UM system to Google. Some statements to include: making sure office hours aren’t held exclusively online, making mirror sites for websites that exist on the Google Sites interface. Anna asks about enforcement of these policies and how the resolution will be enacted. Michael explains that we could have an anonymous tip line to ensure that people could report displeasure. Discussion ensues. The idea would be to make a very broad resolution to allow individual professors and research groups to decide how to go about things (ie: cannot just use Google Drive, must use CTools only or perhaps both, etc). Michael suggests making our resolution broad in order to ensure that the scope is appropriate and we are not stepping outside of our bounds as a committee or the board.

IV. **OPEN DISCUSSION:**  

a. Ben brings up his concern. He mentions that on North Campus the Urban Planning department is marginalized on campus. For instance, the building they are in is quite outdated and quite distracting. The technology is not up to par and really lacking considering the quality of Michigan. Architecture is in the same building, and they have insanely high tech machines and other opportunities. Another issue is that the tuition for the same programs is the same but the amenities are not.

V. **ACTION ITEMS**  

a. [Kaitlin] get room for Rackham  
b. [Michael] get room for North Campus  
c. [Chris] make registration for LwtD and email so we can advertise starting Friday.  
d. [Eli] call Palmer commons to see about LwtD  
e. [Michael] Contact Laura Patterson about attending LwtD  
f. [Chris] draft Letter of Rec resolution  
g. [Heidi] work on drafting accessibility resolution  
h. [Michael] Send out form link for getting tutors.

VI. **ADJOURNMENT:** 8:49pm. Meeting again next week!
VII. APPENDIX
I. CALL TO ORDER: 8:15pm

II. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS

Present:
Chair Chris Tom, Co-chair Anna Belak, Unofficial Vice-Chair Kaitlin Flynn, President Michael Benson, Alex Gutierrez

III. CURRENT INITIATIVES & TASKS
   a. Town Halls/Lunch with the Deans –
      i. **Rooms:** Have one in EECS but it might be too small so Michael is going to fix that tomorrow morning. Then he will move on to Central.
      ii. **Food:** Happy’s and Quizno’s both willing to take orders, having a mix of pizza and sandwiches to have variety and will stay under budget. Get drinks through either place. Will get sub trays, not lunch boxes. Both restaurants will deliver. $1200 in the budget, 140 people registered thus far. Chris is spearheading this.
      iii. **Deans:** Michael is going to email Janet an overview of the currently submitted questions after AAC tonight.
      iv. **Board member email**—Kaitlin will take care of this.
      v. **Logistics:** Michael will give overview, Janet will speak, then Michael will moderate the Q&As.

IV. OPEN DISCUSSION: Execs and chairs meeting with Janet re: BOR in December.

V. ACTION ITEMS
   a. Michael- email Janet question overview for LwtD.
   b. Kaitlin- Send reminder email, location email, and board member reminder email, facebook event, google doc with name program division unique name, email your platform with RSG elections. Also secession pamphlet.

VI. ADJOURNMENT: 8:31pm
I. CALL TO ORDER: 8:09 pm

II. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS

Chair Chris Tom, Co-chair Anna Belak, Unofficial Vice-Chair Kaitlin Flynn, Secretary Alex Gutierrez, President Michael Benson, Eli Benchell Eisman, Pete McGrath

Present: Chair Chris Tom, President Michael Benson, Alex Gutierrez, Haven Allen

Excused: Eli Benchell Eisman, Pete McGrath, Kaitlin Flynn

III. CURRENT INITIATIVES & TASKS

a. GPA stuff
Submitted brief on GPA systems of other universities and potential systems. Waiting on votes. After discussing with Haven, the committee supports the use of a 4.0 scale with an A+ being a 4.3 GPA. No points will be given for low (D/F) grades.

b. Lunch with the Deans wrap-up
   i. Review questions/concerns
      Janet commended the planning and execution of the town halls and suggests the same format for next time. Deans following up on every question. Once they are done with that we can go through any issues that we feel we are qualified to handle.

c. End of semester goals – one meeting left!
What do we want accomplish?
   Current tasks:
   i. Student ombuds
      Student ombuds training to occur if the plan goes ahead. Janet really liked this idea.
   ii. Graduate Student Bill of Rights
      We will be meeting with the administration regarding this next week. Michael to email Chris with details.
   iii. Conflict Resolution Board
      Once GSBoR is in the process of implementation, this will be our major goal for next semester.
   iv. Payment schedule standardization resolution
      To discuss with Anna.
v. Emergency fund resolution & Disbanding CEDR
   Chris will write these resolutions over the break and present to the
   Board the first meeting of Winter term.
vi. Graduate student tutors
   Starting first week of Winter term. It is being vetted by academic
   HR as we speak.
vii. Accessibility resolution
    Waiting for updates and resolution language from Heidi.
viii. Class bank
    No updates. Will work on this next semester.
ix. Printers in Rackham
    Need to check in with administration. Michael and Chris can do
    this when the discuss GSBoR.
x. Extended Rackham hours for finals
    Done. And Done.

IV. OPEN DISCUSSION

   Chris will likely bring up the matter of the Resolution to expand the Non-
   Discrimination policy of the University with the Committee. He plans to
   work with the university and the HRC of Ann Arbor.

V. ACTION ITEMS

   a. [Michael] Email Chris about Grad Students Bill of Rights meeting.

VI. ADJOURNMENT: 9:20 pm

VII. APPENDIX