Rackham Student Government
Board Meeting: December 6, 2012
Agenda

I. Call To Order

II. Approval of Agenda

III. Approval of Previous Minutes
   a. November 15, 2012* (p. 2)
   b. November 29, 2012* (p. 7)

IV. Officer Reports
   a. Graduate Student Body President, Michael
   b. Graduate Student Body Vice President, Kaitlin
   c. Graduate Student Body Treasurer, Alex

V. Guest Speaker / Discussion: John Heiftje, Mayor of Ann Arbor* (p. 62)

VI. RSG Election – Recap* (p. 21)

VII. SAGE Fall Summit – Recap* (p. 25, 29)

VIII. Building a Better Michigan – Discussion* (p. 71)

IX. MLK 2012 Kickoff Event – sponsorship Request* (p. 64)

X. Committee Updates
   a. Academic Affairs* (p. 9)
   b. Budgetary* (p. 11, 13, 15, 16)
   c. Community Outreach & Social Action
   d. Elections Committee
   e. Legislative Affairs* (p. 17)
   f. Student Life Committee
   g. Graduate & Professional Student Assembly Steering Committee

XI. Open Discussion

XII. Adjournment

* - Item included in packet
** - Item will be provided on Day of Meeting or at Meeting
*** - Item was included in a previous packet
a. CALL TO ORDER: 6:39pm
b. Present:
c. Absent:
d. Excused:

II. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

a. Motion to approved, moved by Dan and Seconded by Chris
b. Matt F moves guest speaker of officer reports
   a. Approved unanimously
c. Amended agenda approved unanimously.

III. APPROVAL OF THE PREVIOUS MINUTES

a. Motion to approved, moved by Alex E and Seconded by Matt F
b. Approved unanimously

IV. Executive action to nominate Chris and Eli to the post of vice president pro tem

V. Policy on sexual harassment

a. Background- University title 9 1972, recipients of fed funds cannot be discriminated by gender. Wallesby is title 9 coordinator for 10 years
b. Dear colleague letter to all Universities across country outlining sexual assault and harassment. April 2011. If between 2 students, police must be involved. Universities were reminded that the Institution must investigate regardless of police involvement, rather than deferring to police. At the time, OSCR would handle those issues.
c. Under old system, complainant would be required to be involved in the information gathering process.
d. Evidentiary standard Clear and convincing, less severe than beyond a reasonable doubt. Preponderance of evidence is the standard used in the sexual assault. Dear colleagues letter reminded that preponderance was the correct standard and should be evidentiary. Investigative model
e. Temporary plan put in place for the year of 2011 and would author a permanent plan. Spoke to a variety of student groups, held several town halls also inviting faculty and staff. Fully drafted in October. 4 town halls held once published. 49 responses to online publication of the list (i.e. executive summary because 17 pages is lengthy)
f. If we know or should have known, we move forward. Use preponderance of evidence
g. Wallesby opens to Qs
h. **MB:** How does this policy relate to the one used by Faculty and Staff?

**Walls:** Very Similar. Definitions are very similar. All authors worked on both. Student Affairs was involved. Make sure both parties have access to resources. Built in due process to ensure all parties are supported. A little different in that if a staff member is alleged, Must be separated, but how? Res Hall, courses, friends...etc. Have nuance within housing.

i. **VC:** Remove victim or perpetrator? **Walls:** Situation dependent. Have done both. Challenge is in the classroom assignment.

j. **PS:** On what level if any do the police and U investigation coincide? **Walls:** Lots of coordination. Met with UM and AA police. Police are focused in criminal aspect. UM must do its own investigation. Occur in parallel. Detective is called. UM respects policy process, but will not defer or postpone investigations. Hope is that if a student has been exposed, the individual has faith in the Police and the U process. Parties are never interviewed together. Just trying to find the facts. Hope that there is no discomfort. If the person doesn’t they are made sure to have other resources available. Under this model two examples. 1. If assaulted and wants to move forward. If UM knows about the issue. Person to roommate to RA to UM admin but complainant backs out. Person doesn’t have to, but is informed of all available resources, but UM has obligation to investigate. Review panel is convened to determine process moving forward. Panel is comprised of Wallesby, legal council, OSCR, SAPAC, law prof on behalf of the accused and the Police department. Title 9 coordinator makes decision.

k. **MF:** Physical preponderance of evidence...What are the punishments? **Walls:** Office does the investigation. Office of student conflict resolution takes recommendation from title 9 coordinator, but makes the decision independently. Can range from training to expulsion. Takes into account University community, as a whole, AA safety etc., but again all steps are takes to immediately separate the parties.

l. **MF:** How many per semester? **Walls:** Tough to say because loose definitions over an investigation. Review DNE investigation. Since August 2011 over 60 total in varying processes of review. Again resources and support are ensured to all participants.

m. **VC:** How well informed are people about the UM policy, also what self-defense courses are openly available to all students? Efforts on information dissemination? Old school offered self-defense courses and training to learn how to be an instructor. **Walls:** Would be helpful for efficient information dissemination and the classes. Hope to have permanent plan in January and then a year of rolling out. Will have an interactive website to access these policy. Policy is REALLY long. We need to generate a user-friendly guide. Will also roll out training to faculty and staff. In terms of self-defense, will check with SAPAC. **MB:** RSG offers those classes. 1 time workshop is less effective than a full course. **MB** notes that a UM review committee concluded more programs were needed. **Wallesby** notes that students are taking increasing
responsibility. Investigations typically result in similar stories, but the question about consent is the major issue

n. **CT**- Previously authored a resolution to expand the nondiscrimination policy. The U is an exemplary. Up for review in 2013, can you comment on the process? (The term the CT is referring to “relationship status” into the nondiscrimination clause. Marriage is protected, but other forms of the relationship should be). **Walls**- OIE has nondiscrimination policy. NonDisc statement comes from Regents bylaws. Categories are brought to the attention by student groups and typically follow federal civil rights policy. Gender form is protected from NonDisc by 6th circuit. Title 7 protects marriage protection. Pregnancy under pregnancy discrimination act. UM protects sexual identity, sexual orientation under gender discrimination policy. Marriage is protected under those same policies. Will look under Gender ID policy

o. **MB**- Mentioned 4 town hall meetings that MB didn’t hear about that. Publicized in the Daily and the Record. Probably poorly scheduled. Would you be willing to hold a final in December? **Walls**- Definitely. Also going to hold one for health and human services

p. **VC**- Is the same policy in place for vising scholars? **Walls**- Our policies apply. If one of our students are on another program? Our policies apply. Policies apply to summer programs for juveniles on campus as well

q. **CT**- interesting key word is the issue of consent. Freely given consent, conflict between consent and criminal sexual assault laws. How does the OIE handle that? **Walls**- OIE focuses on consent. Total v. some v. none. What is making out? What is stuff? Did you say no more? Consent v. coercion. Sexual harassment happens between all genders. As an example a female had an agreement to do some stuff, but what her male partner wanted to do more. She responded by repeatedly saying, “Yeah, I don’t to do that”, but after mounting pressure from her partner, concedes. Does the perpetrator understand that what he is doing is not reasonably consented to? Incapacitation is never consent.

r. **PS**- Follow-up from last Question- Interest of the UM and Police are mostly congruent. Can you imagine an instance in which conclusions would be different based on the facts, and how would you reconcile? **Walls**- Very likely and the difference is evidentiary standard. Police and lawyer may not prosecute based on the differences in the standards used to determine guilt.

s. VI. **OFFICER REPORTS**

a. President Michael Benson. KF and AT cant be here. 80 people attended the north campus town hall. Registration and questions are in the agenda. Please review so we can slate to committees. 8-7 judgment that proposal 2 is illegal and will be overturned. AAC and SLC will put together a FAQ. SAGE in LegAff update. Elections are coming up in the 27-29th of this month. Committees start thinking about leadership for the winter term.
Lots of candidates so we are asking for platforms in advance. We will email the student body after Thanksgiving outlining the platforms. A lame duck is still duck and a duck can still quack.

VII. Grad and prof steering committee
   a. Law school 15-1 to place on their ballot.
   b. PH- 9-0, 5 absent to place the text on the ballot
   c. Motion to Put on Ballot: **MB Please copy the text here.** Alex E moves, Seconded by MF, Thirded by DT
   d. **PS**- Does the school of nursing have grad program? **MB**- Under Rackham, but will double check. Goal is to have every grad student to vote.
   e. **MF**- Process if passes on ballot? **MB** if approved over the next semester, committee will form and meet to draft a constitution for the graduate and professional student body. Outline function, operation, fee structure, etc. Once approved by committee, approval by grad student body will be required. Regents will determine whether the motion and vote is valid. The regents determine fee component and various UM committees.
   f. **Passes 11-1-0.**
   g. **PS**- Will RSG take a position? **MB** if a member would like to make a motion.
   h. **DT** moves, seconded by Alex. Objected to by **VC**.

**Debate:**

**CT**- As a representative body, it is better to allow our constituents to make their own, though informed conclusions. **MF**- Believes other schools voted to place on the ballot. Supports Dan motion, better to punt it down to discuss with constituents.

**VC**- We should stay neutral, and avoid voting shortcuts. Want to avoid decentralization.

**AE**- If we’re taking a stance, may be better to get 12-14%. If I were an uninformed grad student I might not even vote. RSG taking a stance could help encourage voter turnout.

**CT**- In the discussions Daily’s forum, someone raised allegations of self-serving MB’s interests (**DT**- inconceivable!) CT personally supports, but feels that the initiating body should remain neutral.

**PS**- If it’s already known that RSG started the push for secession, believes that RSG should lead with it. Believe we should be proud of our efforts

**MF**- We were elected to lead. Taking a year to do this then backing down seems half-hearted

**VC**- Comes down to how we view voters. RSG is known to have initiated this, therefore already know. Know that this is predicated on MB’s beef with the CSG.

**AG**- While I support this, disagree with **VC**. But still shouldn’t take a stance. It’s crucial to transparency of the government. Does not preclude individuals from taking a stance.

**AB**- Even if we vote to not to take a stance, will still tell people that RSG has an opinion.
AE - Is probably better informed than most and we’ve been talking about this for a long time. Most people don’t know where their money gets spent. We should take a position and tell them, how we spend it on their behalf.

VC - This discredits us a governing body because of the close relationship to the leadership. Echoes AB’s point.

PS - An endorsement of the board is not reflective of MB’s opinions, but is the representative sentiment of the board.

AG - Asks about the email the Execs received from a student.

KF (by email) - nothing can be better than a universal sign of support. Public opinion does not.

DT - Voters don’t necessarily know RSG supports this action. Nothing to do with MB, but full board support is a strong endorsement.

HA - The whole process is to obtain more credence for what we are already pushing forward with? MB - If student body doesn’t support will have to revisit. What’s going to be on the FAQ sheet? KF and school of public health are working on it. Other student groups supporting, At law school senate, MB and CSG rep discussed some student services

VC - reopen vote, motion by CT, seconded by Eli. 6-2-4. Reopened

VIII. Michael please fill the final vote for whether RSG should take a position.

IX. Committee updates
   a. AAC - First town hall was a success. 4-5usd/ person for food so should be way under budget. Central campus will be in the 4th floor in Rackham.
   b. COSAC - H4H fundraiser is in the works. Starting to plan for the winter
   c. Election - one meeting after break
   d. LegAff - minutes and sequestration from the CBO are in the packet. Fall summit in a lot of detail. SAGE cost should be mindful of grouping rides to minimize the cost of reimbursement. MB - most cost effective fall summit. Only 3000usd hopefully will be under budget.
   e. SLC - working on trying to have one more event for the semester.
   f. GPSASC - met, minutes in packet. Will have one more meeting prior to elections. If ballot measure is approved, will reconvene.
   g. Motion to block approve minutes HA and seconded by DT.

X. Motion to Adjourn moved by CT, Seconded by Eli
   a. Adjourned at 8.16
RACKHAM STUDENT GOVERNMENT
BOARD MEETING
11/29/12
RACKHAM GRADUATE BUILDING
2ND FLOOR WEST CONFERENCE ROOM, NORTH ALCOVE
6:41 P.M.

a. CALL TO ORDER: 6:41pm

b. Present: Eli Benchell Eisman, Kaitlin Flynn, Michael Benson, Alex Toulouse, Pete McGrath, Alex Emly, Phil Saccone, Brandon Filter, Lauren Knapp, Chris Tom, Alex Gutierrez, Matt Waugh

c. Absent: Vanessa Cruz

d. Excused: Heidi Pedini, Haven Allen, Matt Filter, Dan Trubman

II. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

a. No quorum at the start of the meeting. Motion Alex E, second by Chris Tom.

III. APPROVAL OF THE PREVIOUS MINUTES

a. Minutes are not available yet so we will approve next week.

IV. OFFICER REPORTS

a. President Michael Benson. Thanks to everyone. Michael gives an overview of the RSG vs CSG CSJ case. We’re organizing the Michigan SAGE delegation for this weekend. Pistons game next weekend, we’re looking for RSG chaperones. Let Michael know if you’re interested.

b. Vice President Kaitlin Flynn. Newsletter going out next week. Elections are ongoing, thanks to everyone who has advertised, we have a 7.9% voter turnout currently [will rise to 9.5% by midnight]. We’ve had feedback both good and bad regarding the ballot survey question, and a graduate student wrote an opposing argument to our FAQ and we’ve included his words both in our email and online. Thanks to Alex E for coming up with the free lunch idea, we had money allocated for the Election’s committee.

c. Treasurer Alex Toulouse. Disbursements and requests are coming in, also will be using our SAGE money as the conference is this weekend.

V. RSG Election – November 27th, 28th, 29th Update

a. See Kaitlin’s Executive Report above.

VI. SAGE Fall Summit- November 30th, December 1st, December 2nd

a. Michigan Delegation: Alex T is the head of our delegation, has been nominated by Michael, no objections from the board. Everyone is welcome to come, but we’re looking to have an official Michigan delegation of 2 people. Chris nominates himself, Vanessa and Haven have been nominated by Michael. Michael motions to have 4 representatives in addition to the execs at the delegation, Matt W seconds. Approved unanimously. Kaitlin motions to add
Chris, Haven, Vanessa and Phil to the Michigan delegation, seconded by Lauren. Approved with 2 abstentions.

b. **Schedule of Events**: Phil Hanlon has taken the job as President of Dartmouth College, so he will not be able to join us. Martha Pollack and Elizabeth Warren will not be able to join us, but hopefully Jeff Irwin will be. We will also miss President James Duderstadt. Michael walks through the schedule day-by-day.

c. **New Advocacy Issues**: Vanessa is pushing the Michigan delegation to take on the issue of tuition equality. To approve this, there must be a unanimous decision—by consensus. Michael asks if anyone has other issues they think SAGE should be advocating for. Chris brings up advocating for Environmental policy. Discussion continues about this—should SAGE advocate based on educational issues or other issues? Alex E says that we could tie it into making the University’s more green and also tie it in to new jobs and the growing economy. Alex T brings up Coursera and online course issues and we should keep our eye out on this. Pete mentions that learning how to teach online was an issue when he was at Wayne.

VII. **First Reading: Proposed Amendments to the RSG Bylaws**

- **a.** As a result of the hearing on Monday, Michael has taken on the role to clarify some of the contentious issues and unclear language in our bylaws. Motion by Pete and seconded by Chris to approve the amendments. Michael walks through some of the changes. Lots of discussion ensues regarding the referenda and petition issues. Michael is proposing at least 5% (currently 400) of grad students are needed to petition. Many board members feel that number is too many. We could also have a binding petition or non-binding petition. Alex T votes to strike the entire petition issue. Motion by Pete to table this issue and seconded by Phil.

VIII. **Committee Updates**

- **a. Academic Affairs**: 160 people came out for the town halls. Had 3 deans at each one. Additionally, AAC is working on the 4.0 scale issue. Further AAC issues are conflict resolution, the graduate student bill of rights, and finalizing the new GPA scale. Michael asks for input on the GPA scale.
- **b. Budgetary**: We are well under budget this semester.
- **c. Community Outreach and Social Action**: H4H fundraiser happening a week from Saturday at Circus. As long as patrons say they are with Rackham they will donate $2 from door sales to habitat.
- **d. Elections: nothing to add.**
- **e. Legislative Affairs**: SAGE this week. Next Committee meeting will be Wednesday 12/5 at 8pm. We will be discussing state and local issues as well as recapping the SAGE fall summit.
- **f. Student Life Committee**: Co-event with COSAC
- **g. GPSASC**: CSG filed a complaint with the Central Student Judiciary. The parts of the complaint dealing with our survey question on the ballot were decided on Tuesday in our favor.

IX. **Individual Projects—Update:**

X. **Open Discussion**

XI. **Adjournment-** Motion to adjourn at 7:42pm by Chris Tom and seconded by Matt Waugh.
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
RACKHAM STUDENT GOVERNMENT
BUDGETARY COMMITTEE
November 8, 2012
Meeting Held Electronically

I. CALL TO ORDER November 8, 2012

II. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS
   a. Present: Kaitlin Flynn, Haven Allen, Matthew Filter, Brandon Erickson, Alexis Toulouse
   b. Absent (excused): Michael Benson, Vanessa Cruz, Chris Tom
   c. Absent (unexcused):

III. FUNDING REQUEST:
   a. Organization Name: Indian Students Association (ISA)
   b. Event name: Incoming Student Semester Meet and Information Session
   c. Event date(s): November 17, 2012
   d. Event location: Rackham
   e. Requesting: $670

IV. DISCUSSION:
   a. Alex: Attached is a request from the Indian Students Association for their "Incoming Student Semester Meet and Information Session" and what appears to also be a Diwali celebration. This discussion will be closed Sunday 11/11 at 10 pm so please respond before then. This request was submitted late, but I am making an exception because it is such a large event and we don't have any other pending requests. I am also trying to expedite our process because the event is next weekend. I would be in support of fully funding this event. They are asking for $670 and indicate that they have had average attendances of 250+ at similar events with apparently 95% graduate participation. This seems like a great opportunity, both cultural and academic in nature, and is open to everyone.
   b. Kaitlin: Motion to fully fund the ISA welcome event. With such a large student population attending, a unique and important cultural event, and targeting the large Indian constituency on campus, I fully support contributing to this event. Additionally, the group charges $10 admission per person, so that seems to offset some of their costs. A large portion of their budget goes to food but it seems to be pretty integral to the event.
   c. Brandon: I second the motion. Did they attach a copy of the flyer they are going to use to advertise? I'm not bothered by that, but would we ever deny a request on grounds along the line of not complying with *all* the instructions?
   d. Haven: I support fully funding them, but I am curious as to they can justify having 300 active members when they only have 10 people on their roster in Maize pages.
   e. Matt: I back the motion
   f. Alex: To Haven's point, Maizepages is still relatively new and I don't think everyone is using it to its full extent yet. I do know there is certainly a large graduate Indian community. Brandon, I have attached the copy of the flyer that I just received.

V. VOTE:
   a. $670: Alex, Kaitlin, Haven, Matt, Brandon
   b. Abstentions:
VI. The committee votes to fund $670 for food, advertising, equipment and room rental for ISA’s event.

VII. **ADJOURNMENT**: November 11, 2012
I. CALL TO ORDER November 14, 2012

II. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS
   a. Present: Michael Benson, Haven Allen, Matthew Filter, Brandon Erickson, Alexis Toulouse
   b. Absent (excused): Kaitlin Flynn, Vanessa Cruz, Chris Tom
   c. Absent (unexcused):

III. FUNDING REQUEST:
   a. Organization Name: Out in Public (OIP)
   b. Event name: Marriage Equality Panel
   c. Event date(s): December 4, 2012
   d. Event location: Annenburg Auditorium, Ford School
   e. Requesting: $350

IV. DISCUSSION:
   a. Alex: Attached is a request from the Out in Public for their panel event on marriage equality and the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA). This discussion will be closed Sunday 11/18 at 10 pm so please respond before then. I would be in support of funding $250 this event for the speaker travel portion which is integral to the event. This event appears to be strictly a panel discussion and does not appear to have any actual lobbying component. They're expecting approx 90 graduate students but it seems that many of these may come from the Law and Business school whose students are not Rackham students.
   b. Michael: This seems like a good event that will attract a number of students. I'm a bit concerned about the limited advertising that is planned. I understand that the group is focusing on the Ford School but I really think that this event would be of interest to the wider graduate student body. As such, I move that we fund $275 with the stipulation that none of our funding can go for food, and that at least $25 be used to advertise the event on facebook, to print flyers to be hung around the campus (not just in the Ford School), and the like.
   d. Matt: I support full funding.
   e. Brandon: I also support full funding.
   f. Alex: Thank you for your participation. By a vote of 3-2, the motion to allocate $275 for speaker travel and advertising passes. Going forward, I’d like to see us move away from the habit of making arbitrary stipulations for funding. Our role is to allocate funding for events based on their presented proposal and not to create benchmarks that must be met to attain funding.

V. VOTE:
   a. $350: Matt, Brandon
   b. $275: Alex, Michael, Haven
   c. Abstentions:
VI. The committee votes to fund $275 for speaker travel and advertising with the above stipulations for OIP’s event.

VII. **ADJOURNMENT**: November 19, 2012
RACKHAM STUDENT GOVERNMENT
BUDGETARY COMMITTEE
November 14, 2012
Meeting Held Electronically

I. CALL TO ORDER November 14, 2012

II. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS
   a. Present: Michael Benson, Haven Allen, Matthew Filter, Brandon Erickson, Chris Tom, Alexis Toulouse
   b. Absent (excused): Kaitlin Flynn, Vanessa Cruz
   c. Absent (unexcused):

III. FUNDING REQUEST:
   a. Organization Name: Optics Society at the University of Michigan (OSUM)
   b. Event name: Professional Writing Seminar
   c. Event date(s): December 3, 2012
   d. Event location: TBD
   e. Requesting: $150

IV. DISCUSSION:
   a. Alex: Attached is a request from the Optical Society at the University of Michigan for their professional writing seminar. This discussion will be closed Sunday 11/18 at 10 pm so please respond before then. I would be in support of funding $50 for this event for food. This event is relatively small, but it's a new organization and this may be a good opportunity for them to get some more exposure. The event is academic in nature and will primarily attract graduate students on north campus where we tend to have fewer active graduate student groups.
   b. Michael: I agree with Alex, while this is a small event the group shows potential. I move that we allocate $50 without restrictions for this event.
   c. Haven: I support both Michael and Alex's recommendations.
   d. Matt: I'm on board for 50 fun tickets as well.
   e. Chris: Yes. Do it.
   f. Brandon: Looks like I didn't make it in time... But I support the same thing everybody has said so far.

V. VOTE:
   a. $50: Matt, Brandon, Chris, Michael, Haven, Alex
   b. Abstentions:

VI. The committee votes to fund $50 food for OSUM’s event.

VII. ADJOURNMENT: November 19, 2012
I. CALL TO ORDER November 20, 2012

II. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS
   a. Present: Kaitlin Flynn, Haven Allen, Matthew Filter, Brandon Erickson, Chris Tom, Alexis Toulouse
   b. Absent (excused): Michael Benson, Vanessa Cruz
   c. Absent (unexcused):

III. FUNDING REQUEST:
   a. Organization Name: Political Scientists of Color (PSC)
   b. Event name: Distinguished Speaker Series
   c. Event date(s): November 30, 2012
   d. Event location: Haven Hall, Political Science Department
   e. Requesting: $700

IV. DISCUSSION:
   a. Alex: Attached is a request from the Political Scientists of Color for their Distinguished Speaker Series. This discussion will be closed Sunday 11/25 at 6 pm so please respond before then. This seems like a great event but given the smaller size I would support funding $250 the Speaker honorarium and travel expenses, in line with some of our previous allocations for this size event. I would also support allocating an additional $50 for advertising without any stipulations because I think if they were to publicize this event to the larger community they might find interest in places such as the Ford School or the School of Public Health.
   b. Matt: I back Alex. $700 for roughly 40 attendees is steep.
   c. Brandon: I also agree with Alex.
   d. Chris: Ditto affirmative ^_^
   e. Kaitlin: Yes!
   f. Haven: Yes.

V. VOTE:
   a. $300: Matt, Brandon, Chris, Kaitlin, Haven, Alex
   b. Abstentions:

VI. The committee votes to fund $300 for speaker honorarium and travel expenses and advertising for PSC’s event.

VII. ADJOURNMENT: November 25, 2012
RACKHAM STUDENT GOVERNMENT
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
DECEMBER 5, 2012
RACKHAM GRADUATE SCHOOL 2ND FLOOR WEST STUDY HALL
915 E. WASHINGTON ST.

I. CALL TO ORDER 8:09 pm

II. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS
   a. Present: Representatives Anna Belak, Vanessa Cruz, Brandon Erickson, Phillip Saccone, Chris Tom, Students at-large David Barton, and President & Chair Michael Benson
   b. Absent (excused): Representative Lauren Knapp, Treasurer Alex Toulouse
   c. Absent (unexcused): Representatives Dan Trubman, Matthew Filter, Haven Allen

III. Appointment of Secretary for 11/14/12 Meeting
   a. Chairman Benson was appointed to serve as the committee’s secretary for the 12/5 meeting.

IV. Chair’s Report
   a. Michael: Thanks for hard work with Fall Summit. In total, hosted over 20 graduate and professional student leaders from across the country. General consensus was that this summit was the best one yet.

V. SAGE Fall Summit – Attendees thoughts
   a. Phil - Loved the fall summit. Great to see students from different universities being into graduate education. Detail of some of the officer's knowledge. Some of the issues that inspired me to join RSG (Employment and post graduation issues, alumni steering committee in program) were discussed which made me pretty happy.
   b. Chris - There for the latter half of the day on Friday and Saturday. Great to see folks again, went to the spring Days on the Hill conference. The sharing of best practices was really valuable. Some schools have really strong lobbying and high participation. They get hundreds of people to go to their state senates. We, can think of how to build off of that model (LAC). Also, conflict resolution discussion was good. Would have liked to have had a less crazy weekend, apart from SAGE.
   c. Anna - Just there most of Sat. Good things first. Best practices chat was great. Also, a lot of schools didn't have things that we're working on and visa versa. Also, cool to see people were working really hard on the lobbying issues. Great to see the level of knowledge. Negatives - I wished it had been planned better on our side. e.g. the panels. While Jeff Irwin was funny and cool he was none the less a democrat that said stuff that would have been nice to have a balance.
   d. Michael discussed some of the macro issues with SAGE as well as some
of the lessons learned and referenced the minutes (29 pages!)

VI. State level advocacy with MSU
      i. Anna will draft a neutral note to the student body, encouraging
         them to read up on the issue and to contact their representative and
         senator with their thoughts.
   b. CCW – From SAGE
      i. Issue in Texas and other states. Two bills currently in the state
         legislature to allow concealed carry on university campuses.
         Passed the Senate. Pending in the House. Possible to come up
         during the current lame duck session. The committee will monitor
         this issue and will send a note (similar to RTW) to the student
         body if it looks like the house will take action this term.
   c. We will be coordinating with Suzy and Stephen at MSU – COGS.

VII. Local Issues
   a. The committee discussed recent lease signing activities.
   b. The committee was notified that Ann Arbor Mayor John Heiftje will be
      joining the RSG Board on 12/6 and are encouraged to attend.

VIII. Open discussion
   a. Chris: Get student bodies involved in state politics. Eye opening what
      other sage institutions do.

IX. ADJOURNMENT: 8:44 pm
RSG Fall 2012 Elections – Results

Results for each of the four elections run by RSG are displayed in their entirety below. Overall, 9.5% of eligible voters (students enrolled in the Rackham Graduate School this term) participated in this election.

The following Rackham students have been elected to serve on the RSG Board:

**Biological & Health Sciences Representatives**
- Michael Lang
- Lauren Knapp
- Chris Tom (write-in)

**Physical Sciences & Engineering**
- Alexander Gutierrez
- Janakiraman Balachandran
- Yiting Zhang
- Eugene Daneshvar
- John Forrest

**Social & Behavioral Sciences**
- Dan Trubman
- Pete McGrath
- Ryne Peterson (write-in)

**Humanities & the Arts**
- Steven Apotheker

**Survey Question:**
Shall the Graduate and Professional Student Body of the University of Michigan (including the Medical, Law, Business, Dental, Social Work and Public Health Schools) formally take steps to separate from the Central Student Government and be recognized by the University as a distinct self-governing body in regards to financial and representative capacities for graduate and professional students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biological &amp; Health Sciences</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities &amp; The Arts</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>490</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Detailed Results

Results for each of the four elections run by RSG are displayed in their entirety below. Overall, 9.5% of eligible voters (students enrolled in the Rackham Graduate School this term) participated in this election.

Candidates listed in blue were victorious and won full (year-long) terms. Candidates listed in green were victorious and will fill vacant seats for a half-term. Candidates listed in red have tied for a seat.

Per the RSG Bylaws, a candidate must receive a minimum of 2 votes to be eligible to win a seat on the RSG Board.

A note about the results from ITS:

The “Weighted” column is the sum of the weights assigned the preferences that each voter chooses when voting. For example, if a vote allows 4 levels of preference, then selecting a candidate as your first choice will assign 4 points to them. Selecting a candidate as your last choice will give them 1 point.

Exception ballots are ballots cast by voters not known to be eligible for that particular election. If they are later shown to be eligible, their votes can be marked as valid.

RSG Biological and Health Sciences Division

Total of unique users who voted: 183 (9.18% turnout)

Representative – 3 seat(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Weighted Votes</th>
<th>Exceptions</th>
<th>Weighted Total Including Exceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Michael Lang</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>139 9</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lauren Knapp</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>137 8</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chris Tom (write-in)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9 0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Andrew Haak (write-in)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Amanda Schuh (write-in)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ariell Joiner (write-in)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Brooke N. Horton (write-in)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ryne Peterson (write-in)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Eli Eisner (write-in)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Eli Eismann (write-in)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Biological & Health Sciences Survey Question:

Shall the Graduate and Professional Student Body of the University of Michigan (including the Medical, Law, Business, Dental, Social Work and Public Health Schools) formally take steps to separate from the Central Student Government and be recognized by the University as a distinct self-governing body in regards to financial and representative capacities for graduate and professional students?

Answer Votes Exceptions Total including Exceptions
Yes 139 7 146
No 25 3 28

RSG Physical Sciences and Engineering Division

Total of unique users who voted: 296 (8.26% turnout)

Representative – 5 seat(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Weighted Votes</th>
<th>Exceptions</th>
<th>Weighted Total Including Exceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alexander Gutierrez</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>166 3</td>
<td>587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Janakiraman Balachandran</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>164 3</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yiting Zhang</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>166 6</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Eugene Daneshvar</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>157 2</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>John Forrest</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>135 2</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>David Barton</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>103 4</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Andrew Benjamin Mansfield (write-in)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4 0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Zeng Qiu (write-in)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3 0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Votes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Yash Chitalia (write-in)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Andrew Mansfield (write-in)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Kyle Lady (write-in)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Walter White (write-in)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Stephen Raiman (write-in)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ben Alterman (write-in)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Leslie Upton (write-in)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Elaine Wah (write-in)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>A A (write-in)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Matthew Marcath (write-in)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Bryce Wiedenbeck (write-in)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Anna Belak (write-in)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Mit Romney (write-in)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>B B (write-in)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Peng Tian (write-in)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Michael Benson (write-in)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Kyle Lady (write-in)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Kyle Lady (write-in)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>C C (write-in)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Michael Logue (write-in)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Ben-Alexander Cassell (write-in)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Jun Liu (write-in)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Bartley Tablante (write-in)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Jason Rodgers (write-in)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>D D (write-in)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Meghan Clark (write-in)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Kyle Lady (write-in)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Ron Paul (write-in)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>E E (write-in)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Kyle Lady (write-in)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Yemin Tang (write-in)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Batman (write-in)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Mayank Agarwal (write-in)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Muhammad Siddiqui (write-in)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Barack Obama (write-in)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Meghan Leah Clark (write-in)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Garen Vartanian (write-in)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Physical Sciences & Engineering Survey Question:

Shall the Graduate and Professional Student Body of the University of Michigan (including the Medical, Law, Business, Dental, Social Work and Public Health Schools) formally take steps to separate from the Central Student Government and be recognized by the University as a distinct self-governing body in regards to financial and representative capacities for graduate and professional students?

Answer Votes Exceptions Total including Exceptions
Yes 203 4 207
No 73 3 76

RSG Social and Behavioral Sciences Division

Total of unique users who voted: 241 (11.76% turnout)

Representative – 3 seats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Weighted Votes</th>
<th>Exceptions</th>
<th>Weighted Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Daniel Trubman</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>150 4</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pete McGrath</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>151 6</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ryne Peterson (write-in)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36 0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Haven Allen (write-in)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>David Cottrell (write-in)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Erin Sullivan (write-in)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Chelsea Del Rio (write-in)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Patrick O’Mahen (write-in)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Daniel Marcin (write-in)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cassie Grafstrom (write-in)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Dan Hirschman (write-in)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Fan Fei (write-in)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>JONATHAN FRAKES (write-in)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>MO MONEY, MO B*TCHES, MO DEEZY (write-in)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Jamie Budnick (write-in)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Alton Worthington III(write-in)</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social & Behavioral Sciences Survey Question:
Shall the Graduate and Professional Student Body of the University of Michigan (including the Medical, Law, Business, Dental, Social Work and Public Health Schools) formally take steps to separate from the Central Student Government and be recognized by the University as a distinct self-governing body in regards to financial and representative capacities for graduate and professional students?

Answer Votes Exceptions Total including Exceptions
Yes 130 2 132
No 79 5 84

RSG Humanities and the Arts Division

Total of unique users who voted: 87 (8.74% turnout)

Representative – 2 seats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Weighted Votes</th>
<th>Exceptions</th>
<th>Weighted Total Including Exceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Steven Apotheker</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Michelangelo Trujillo (write-in)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MO MONEY, MO B*TCHES, MO DEEZY (write-in)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Humanities & the Arts Survey Question:

Shall the Graduate and Professional Student Body of the University of Michigan (including the Medical, Law, Business, Dental, Social Work and Public Health Schools) formally take steps to separate from the Central Student Government and be recognized by the University as a distinct self-governing body in regards to financial and representative capacities for graduate and professional students?

Answer Votes Exceptions Total including Exceptions
No 52 7 59
Yes 18 5 23
SAGE FALL SUMMIT 2012

Goals

● Publicize SAGE and the work of the coalition
● Focus on Sharing of best practices
● Prioritize Advocacy Issues for the coming year
● Successful meeting for SAGE members

Location of Events:

NOTE: all locations are circled in red in the map. The Blue lines demarcate suggested walking paths to get from location to location.

The group will leave from the Hotel Lobby 10 minutes before the start of each day. Please be there on time—try to be at the lobby 5 minutes before we leave.

Thursday:
● Reception is informal at the Campus Inn’s hotel bar (Victor’s Bar)

Friday:
● Morning Coffee is at Beanster’s Cafe which is located in the Michigan League adjacent to the Rackham Building (see map included in packet).
● SAGE Meetings will take place in the Executive Board Conference Room in the Rackham Building. Walk into the Rackham Building and proceed ahead and to your left. Enter the “West Wing” and turn left when you reach a reception desk. Our meeting room is ahead.
● Lunch is at the South Quad Dining Hall, just south of the Michigan Union
● The tour of the nation’s largest football stadium will take place in the Big House (Michigan Stadium) We will depart as a group from lunch to the athletic campus at 9:35am

Saturday and Sunday
● All meetings are in the Michigan League. We will meet in the Koessler room on Saturday and in the Henderson room on Sunday. Both rooms are located on the League’s 3rd floor.
● Lunch will be at the Hill Dining Center, another on-campus new dining facility.

General Agenda
**Thursday November 29th**
9 pm – Cocktail Welcome Reception @ Victor’s Bar (Campus Inn: 615 E. Huron St., Ann Arbor, MI 48104)

**Friday December 1st**
*Group will leave hotel at 8:25am for those of you that want to join us for coffee.*
8:30am–9:00am Coffee at Beanster’s Cafe or on your Own
9:00am – 9:30am SAGE Welcome
10:00am – 11:30am Tour of the *Big House* (Michigan Stadium)
11:30am – 1:00pm Lunch at South Quad (Meal Vouchers Provided)
1:00pm – 2:30pm SAGE Business Session 1
2:30 – 3:00pm BREAK
3:00pm – 6:00pm SAGE Business Session 2
7:00pm – Group Dinner & Evening Activities

**Saturday December 2nd**
*Group will leave hotel at 9:25am*
9:30am – 9:45am Coffee, Fruit and Bagel Breakfast / Mingling
9:45am – 11:30am SAGE Business Session 3
11:30am – 1:00pm Lunch at Hill Dining Center (Meal Vouchers Provided)
1:00pm – 3:00pm SAGE Business Session 4
3:30pm – 5:00pm Campus Tour (including the bookstore)
5:15pm – 7:00pm SAGE Business Session 5
7:30pm – Group Dinner at Sava’s and Evening Activities

**Sunday December 3rd**
*Group will leave at 9:25am*
9:30am – 10:00am Coffee, Fruit and Bagel Breakfast
10:00am – 11:00am Sage Business Session 6
11:00am – 12:00pm Closing Session/Next steps
12:00pm – 2:00pm Lunch at North Quad (Meal Vouchers Provided) or on your own

---

**SAGE Detail of Sessions**

**Session 1: Friday 9:00am - 9:30am & 1:00pm - 2:30pm**
1. Welcome & Summit Overview
2. SAGE History (Organization)
3. SAGE Advocacy History
4. Discussion with University of Michigan’s Assistant Vice Provost for Academic and Budgetary Affairs Lori Haskins on Funding Graduate Education
5. Update to Current SAGE Advocacy Issues (UT-Austin + UCLA)

Session 2: Friday 3:00pm-6:00pm
1. Current Issues Before the Congress - Overview
   a. Sequestration
   b. STEM Jobs Act
   c. Reauthorization of the Higher Education Act
   d. New Income Based Repayment (IBR)
2. Sharing of Best Practices - Case Studies (Alberto)
3. Campus Roundtable - Current Issues - 3 minute overview of issues on your campus
4. Additional Survey Question Generation

Session 3: Saturday 9:30am - 12:00pm
1. Presentation of potential new issues for the Coalition to consider (Michigan + UCSD)
2. Panel Discussion - Campus Aspirations
4. Future of SAGE 1: Where do we go from here?

Session 4: Saturday 1:00 - 3:00pm
1. Discussion with Rep. Jeff Irwin on the role of government in higher education and the role of higher education in government
2. Selection of SAGE Advocacy Issues for 2013
3. Formation of Heterogeneous Groups (for White Paper construction & Issue Monitoring)
4. Questionnaire Discussion
5. Nominations - Vice Chair

Session 5: Saturday 5:15 - 7:00pm
1. Selection of Steering Committee meeting days & times for 2013
2. Review of Officer performance July 1,2012 - December 1, 2012
3. Elections to fill vacancies
4. SAGE Recruitment & Retention Update
5. Groups assigned to work on each advocacy item
   a. Assign one campus to lead each item or sub-item
   b. Assign one campus + one officer to oversee whitepaper process
   c. Assign Heterogeneous groups (from summit) to advise and continue to monitor for future updates.
6. Future of SAGE 2: Engaging our membership

Session 6: SAGE Closing Session Sunday 10:00am - 12:00pm
1. Spill-over from previous 5 sessions
2. Small group discussion and presentation on areas of future collaboration
3. Summit Roundup
4. Review Next Steps & Suggestions for next year's summit

**Meals & Snacks:**
- Thursday Evening Snack: Bar snacks will be available at the Victor's Bar
- Friday Breakfast: Bagels, Coffee, Tea, and fruit will be provided at the first morning session
- Friday Lunch: Provided at a new U of Michigan Dining Facility
- Friday Snacks: Will be available during the afternoon and at the Michigan Stadium
- Friday Dinner: Mini-groups (2 or 3) will dine together, or on your own, in Ann Arbor
- Saturday Breakfast: Bagels, Coffee, Tea, and fruit will be provided at the first morning session. Additional breakfast food is available for purchase in the Michigan League.
- Saturday Lunch: Provided at a new U of Michigan Dining Facility
- Saturday Snacks: Will be available after lunch and during the walking tour of campus
- Saturday Dinner: Sava's (216 South State Street)
- Sunday Breakfast: Bagels, Coffee, Tea, and fruit will be provided at the first morning session.
- Sunday Lunch: Out on the town for those that have late flights (or drives) home.
SAGE Coalition Meeting Minutes

Table of Contents:
Welcome
SAGE Business Session I
   University of Michigan Budget Discussion, Assistant Vice Provost Haskins
SAGE Business Session 2
   Introductions and Attendance
   History of SAGE
   SAGE Advocacy History
   Current Issues in the Legislature and Potential Future SAGE Advocacy Issue
   Sharing of Best Practices Roundtable
SAGE Business Session 3
   Potential New SAGE Lobby Issues
   Sharing of Best Practices Case Studies
   Roundtable Discussion - Where would you like your GSA to be in a year or so?
SAGE Business Session 4
   Role Govt in Higher Ed and Higher Ed in Govt, Rep. Jeff Irwin
   Selection of SAGE 2012 Advocacy Issues
   Sharing of Best Practices in Small Groups
SAGE Business Session 5
   Additional Discussion Areas Related to Sharing of Best Practices
   Discussion of Monthly Conference Calls
   Election of New Vice-Chairperson
   Assignment of Groups for SAGE Advocacy Items
SAGE Business Session 6
   The Future of SAGE
   Coalition Meeting Round-Up and Suggestions
SAGE Chairperson Michael Benson (UMich) called the meeting to order at 9am, welcomed delegates and reviewed agenda.

Michael Bertucci (UNC) discussed SAGE social media and how to participate on Twitter and Facebook over the weekend. Many efforts were made to get SAGErs to start tweeting with hash tags.

The group recessed at 9:30am to attend a tour of the Big House.

------------------------------------------TOUR OF THE BIG HOUSE & LUNCH---------------------------------

SAGE Business Session 1

Session Start at 1:00pm

University of Michigan Budget Discussion, Assistant Vice Provost Haskins

The Group was joined by Assistant Vice Provost Lori Haskins for a discussion on the University of Michigan's finances as well as state appropriations. [A powerpoint presentation will be linked shortly]

Session Adjourned at 2:45pm

------------------------------------------BREAK------------------------------------------

SAGE Business Session 2

Session Start at 3:10pm

Introductions and Attendance
Adam Sherman - UW GPSS President
Alex Toulouse - U of M Treasurer
Suzie Borkowski- Michigan State VPEA of COGS
David Croom - UC Berkeley
Michael Bertucci - UNC Chapel Hill GPSF President
Katie Lavoie - UNC Chapel Hill GPSF Special Projects
Michael Redding - UT Austin GSA President
Lauren - UT Austin GSA Legislative Affairs Director
Chris Tom - U of M RSG Representative & Academic Affairs Committee Chair
Alberto Ortega - UC Berkeley GA Federal Director
Vanessa Cruz - U of M RSG Representative
Michael Benson - U of M President, SAGE Chairperson
History of SAGE, Michael Benson (UMich)

- Brainchild of Bradley Carpenter at UT Austin
- Interested in addressing educational policy and university issues specifically related to our peer-institutions, more specific than NAGPS
- Brought student leaders together in October 2008 from R1 public research institutions at UT Austin for a weekend and all attendees felt this was a worthwhile endeavor
- Lobbying in the Spring - Day on the Hill
  - State Day - delegates visit federal legislators from their state
  - SAGE Day - form heterogeneous groups to meet with legislators
- Membership has grown; expand based on invitation to those universities who share our core values and could help bring a new dynamic when lobbying; AAU member institutions are a metric for invitation
- Leadership and bylaws have always been dynamic with SAGE based on need; constantly reevaluated
- Young related to other organizations but name recognition is growing
- We have relationships with AAU, APLU; help us strategize how we do our work
- Melanie: What is different with NAGPS??
  - Manny: Larger body; includes all graduate programs, not just large public research universities
  - Alberto: Lots of decisions made by leadership, like lobbying topics for instance, instead of a more collaborative approach

SAGE Advocacy History, Manny Gonzalez (UT Austin)

- White Papers & Lobbying Topics!
  - Indebtedness & Taxation, Alberto (UC Berkeley)
    - Qualifications for Tuition Expenses related to taxation; American Opportunity Tax Credit
    - Desire to change language regarding the tax credit to expand the definition; could save graduate students thousands of dollars
    - Used to include protecting subsidized loans for graduate students but now is a lost battle
    - Also discusses income based repayment (IBR); Department of Ed is hoping to implement a retroactive payment for school through IBR
  - Research Funding, Manny (UT Austin)
    - Large amount of graduate students funded by grants from federal agencies like NIH, NSF, etc.
    - Advocating to maintain current level of funding to these agencies
■ encouraging funding to humanities and social science based agencies like JAVITS and GAANN
■ need these agencies to be competitive internationally in research and technologies; also creates future jobs
■ Adam: though this is a tough advocacy point to push currently; we hope to maintain a relationships with the legislators so they can come to us for opinions/information
  ○ Immigration, Adam (UW)
    ■ F1-B visa reform: allow students to come to the states to study; if they are only granted single entry visas, they can’t leave to go home once they are here regardless of situation (sick family, conference, etc.). Hoping to find a way to grant exceptions
    ■ H1-B visa reform: work visas; if they can’t be obtained, then we are educating international students and then not granting them the opportunity to stay in the states and work; losing valuable, educated workers
    ■ STEM Jobs Act: passed the House today; do we support some/all/none of it? To be discussed tomorrow
■ Though we are considerate of the humanistic nature of the issue, we keep our language very economic based to cater to the legislators
  ○ Important to know the history of what we are lobbying for so we can formulate the best angle to get our current lobbying items considered
  ○ Play the long game; may not see results immediately from lobbying each year but we are raising awareness for issues related to graduate education

Current Issues in the Legislature and Potential Future SAGE Advocacy Issue, Ellyn Perone (SAGE Advisor, UT Austin)

● Ellyn’s Advice on Current Issues in the Legislature
  ○ What did the elections do?
    ■ billions and billions dollars spent on the election and we are at status quo; republican house, democrat senate, democrat president; still entrenched deadlock
    ■ think a deal will be made related to fiscal cliff and sequestration but will be very last minute; if no deal is made, we will go back into recession (stock market will crash); will also endanger their reelection because people know better now! When the legislators wobble, so does the stock market
    ■ Grover Norquist (From Michael Benson’s home town.) has a pledge with the legislators about not raising taxes so they will likely “kick the can” down the road (extend deadlines) to keep the pledge and not cause another economic depression
    ■ Obama has put a plan on the table but not agreed upon; feels like we are playing a game of chicken
  ○ Reauthorization of the Higher Education Act
- 1965 Higher Ed Act inconsistencies with 1986 Internal Revenue Code policies
- The legislature from 1986 have been taking precedence but it has been prevent certain tax benefits to graduate students
- Currently trying to figure out how much this would cost; trying to generate a score by the end of the lame duck period; likely sponsored by Rep. Levin
- Scheduled for 2013 but not likely to happen
- Sequestration
  - legislation written to get debt under control and reduce debt (base reductions) cut in nondiscretionary and cuts in defense; overhauling cuts is a very dangerous approach
  - congress couldn’t come up with a decision yet
  - needs to be a compromise made to take a harder look at what will actually be cut and what % to reduce debt but not weaken the entities that are funded by those dollars
  - defense has to take their share of the cuts because the non-discretionary funding covers our federal research agencies (Medicaid and social security are exempt)
  - Fiscal Cliff will have to be addressed in conjunction with sequestration
  - Research Funding Effect: Research agencies have been asked to work on contingency plans in case sequestration happens; already agencies like NSF or NIH are funding less research proposals; contingency plans may involve cutting really large programs to serve as scare tactics to prevent the cuts from actually happening; could really affect academia as some professors are required to get a large research grant for tenure
- Expanding Education Tax Credits
  - 16 taxes that address higher education; ex. American Opportunity tax credit most likely won’t make it through the year (addresses undergrad students)
  - see extended list below

The following are key provisions of the Tax Code affecting colleges and universities:

**Aid to Students**
- Lifetime Learning Credit
- Tuition Deduction – expired on December 31, 2011.
- Section 127 Employer-provided Educational Assistance – expires on December 31, 2012.
- Section 117 Qualified Scholarships
- Student Loan Interest Deduction (SLID) – certain elements expire on December 31, 2012.
• Coverdell Education Savings Accounts – *certain elements expire on December 31, 2012.*
• Section 529 Education Savings Plans
• Federal Student Loan Forgiveness Programs

**Incentives for Charitable Giving**
• Charitable Income Tax Deduction
• IRA Charitable Rollover – *expired on December 31, 2011.*

**Tax-advantaged Financing**
• Tax-exempt Bonds
• Build America Bonds – *expired on December 31, 2010.*

**Research and Development Tax Credit**
R&D Tax Credit – *expired on December 31, 2011.*

**Unrelated Business Income Tax**
Unrelated Business Income Tax (UBIT)

• Fisher vs. UT
  ○ Supreme Court case - determine the status of affirmative action.
  ○ Unsure. Hoping it’s a 4-4 vote but will be tough.
• New Income Based Repayment (IBR)
  ○ Report included in agenda packet; compares new IBR to old IBR and what it means for graduate & professional students
  ○ Concerned because the people who will be making the most money will be benefitting; could be missing the purpose of IBR
  ○ Key considerations: how much are you paying in interest and how much would you have been paying with the old IBR
  ○ removal of subsidy is a major factor
  ○ some expensive programs were marketing IBR saying they will make a lot of money when they get out anyways; not as concerned about those with high income and high debt... more concerned about students who are under a certain income level but have high debt
  ○ your debt that is forgiven is still taxable for that year; legislators are not cognizant that some students can’t manage that hit
• STEM Jobs Act
  ○ What is STEM Jobs Act? Enable visa priority for immigrant STEM students
  ○ Rep. Lamar Smith’s bill passed the House today (11/30/12)
  ○ Taken a year - only schools eligible are doctoral institutions that have a high level of research (180 Carnegie Research University)
    ■ Waiver process is available for Universities to participate in the bill
    ■ Added: if you used a paid international recruiter, you are ineligible to participate; now the provision is gone
○ Proprietary schools were added which means AAU, APLU, Big 10 schools, Georgia Tech, MIT, Stanford, UC Berkeley, UCLA, UT and TAMU couldn’t support it
  ○ Diversity visas were removed which means it won’t go anywhere
  ○ Currently dead in the Senate; demanding comprehensive immigration reform

● ACHIEVE Act
  ● Sponsored by Sens. Hutchinson, Kyl, and McCain
  ● Does not provide a path to citizenship but rather to permanent residency.
  ● Proposed amendments (out of order)
    ■ Shelia Jackson-Lee - Strike section 3 to protect diversity immigration
    ■ Shelia Jackson-Lee - Authorize congress or DHS secretary to reassign unused visas to other classes of immigrants
    ■ Schumer & Lofgren (sp) - introduced new bills using language that they like from Rep. Smith’s bill but didn’t include the parts they didn’t like.

About STEM degrees “Must have a graduate degree” (Doesn’t even need to be in a stem field.)
  ● Lofgren’s 1st amendment - replace entire bill with hers
  ● Lofgren’s 2nd amendment - replace entire bill with Schumer's bill
  ● Get the rest from Ellyn.

Sharing of Best Practices Roundtable

● Scott UCSD
  ○ Very little to speak about currently; hoping to revisit directions
  ○ Slight changes in policy for graduate student housing opportunities

● Melanie & Adam UW
  ○ Provost Advisory Committee for Students - trying to create similar committees at the college level to have more opportunities for students to engage with college deans; helps give more info how to advocate for students at the University lever
  ○ State Lobbying - trying to get new revenue; state funding is way down; having legislators more in touch with graduate educations
  ○ Endowments for GSAs
  ○ Faculty salary freeze currently for 4 years
  ○ Student fees

● Alex & Chris U of M
  ○ Secession from the undergraduate (central) student government
  ○ Conflict resolutions board; currently not one coherent path so we want to have centralized place to go
  ○ Changing GPA scale (currently a unique 9.0 system) to a more uniform 4.0 scale
  ○ Increased advocacy within Ann Arbor and state of Michigan
  ○ looking at non-discrimination policies to make sure it is inclusive of all lifestyles
  ○ Professional School Issues to be added shortly.
  ○ prop 2 was overturned and then brought to the supreme court
● Suzie - Michigan State
  ○ work with professional students and satellite campuses; trying to get them more involved with the GSA
  ○ alumni network for graduate students
  ○ pushing for a graduate resource center; don’t currently have central location for the graduate school (really investigating space utilization)

● Mike - UNC
  ○ Harassment & discrimination (student grievance committee) -- Ombuds office for faculty is now linked to students. University things it will lead to students filing cases to be heard [positive thing], SGC is student-to/on-student harassment cases
  ○ Start a state lobbying day for the springtime (February?), but looking for feedback currently
    ■ Thinking of bringing in faculty to talk about research and how it benefits the state
  ○ Student fees are REALLY BIG. No solution for the student fees, but they are in the “audit season” on how student fees are proposed
    ■ Make sure fees are utilized as how they should be
  ○ Sense of affordability; creating a graduate student-specific emergency fund. There was a bank error in their favor, collecting $25k (not $35) that was proposed but denied by referendum (though they collected it anyway). Oops.
    ■ Trying to keep it so we can encourage donations into the fund; look at the alumni base to give money to the GPSF
  ○ Residency process on how to get NC residency. Issues are speed as to how requests are granted, speed of appeal, and all sorts of mess from that.
    ■ Offered grad students to sit on the appeals committee that deals with undergrads, in order to free up spots to review grad appeals
  ○ Graduate school programming -- oh look, another fee
    ■ Do people even use it?
  ○ Transit.
  ○ Health insurance “stuff” - we are bidding for a new insurance company and need to decide coverage
  ○ continuous enrollment needs to be revised

● UT Austin - Red
  ○ Career Service for graduate students
    ■ have University wide career services office but currently favor the undergraduate students
  ○ Announcement of new medical school
    ■ voted for local tax increase that will fund a medical school
    ■ really trying to figure out what this will mean (a new influx of graduate students)
  ○ fee-based masters students (university just wants the money)
  ○ discussion of what is required for a dissertation
- Legislators are coming for session (AHH!); figuring out how to structure lobbying day
- UC - Berkeley
  - 3 chancellors in system leaving
  - Lots of new legislature; passed Prop 30 - increased income tax and sales tax to go towards education; saved a lot of cuts
  - Supermajority of democrats in the California legislature - means they can create revenue streams
  - Mental health - how are mental health problems being dealt with by grad students on campus? Specific issues relevant to our community
  - Student workspace for interviewing, meetings, collaboration - through classrooms or creation of specific spaces?
  - What is the definition of public education in the state? Old/current master plan: 3 systems of higher education → CSU college (4 yr undergrad focus), UC colleges (research focus), and community colleges → everyone has an opportunity to go to at least 1 type. New master plan?
  - New student center that is being built - BEARS initiative - how is space allocated? Grad student specific spaces?
  - System wide look at professional degree supplemental tuition
  - Used to have non-profit Berkeley Graduate Student Foundation but it was recently dissolved
  - Found several million dollars worth of student services fees!, now forcing campus to use it in projects that students can apply for
  - New position: Student advocate → helps with student grievances
  - Hoping to start an LGBTQ Advocate

Visitor: Jill, VP of Advancement

Session Adjourned at 6:10pm
SAGE Fall Coalition Meeting -- SATURDAY 12/1/12

SAGE Business Session 3

Session Start at 9:40 am

Potential New SAGE Lobby Issues, Manny Gonzalez (UT Austin)

- Sequester and Fiscal cliff are relevant perhaps a new bullet point in our white paper on taxation and indebtedness? (or in the intro?)
  - Ellyn: Work with campus vp for research and other appropriate people to formulate (in a short period) what the impact will be on graduate students on our campus(es) if there will be an 8.2% across the board cut (to research spending). Provide details and quantify how many students will either lose funding (their job), etc. If your campus has a high number of NSF, NASA funding, quantify by agency. Also, the sooner the better. Once done, reach out to members of congress (before the January session) as everyone expects a grand deal so time is of the essence. (How will this impact the next generation of scientists)
  - At UW, were sending a specific letter (hopefully next week) which we constructed with our DC staff. A lot of what Ellyn described is probably already available so Ellyn’s idea really shouldn’t be too hard to implement. Also, we’re working with our undergrads to do this jointly.
  - Student financial aid will also be impacted (Ellyn) if we go into a sequester.
  - The members of congress (112th) should be back in district a few times between now and the end of the year.
  - There was also a briefing by AAAS that came out about a week ago. (American Association for the Advancement of Science)
  - On social sciences, we need to address them. Social sciences are under attack in Congress. Every year there is an effort to prohibit NSF from funding social sciences which only make up 5% of their funding budget. The main issue is faculty poorly name their research projects (E.g. psych effect of posters in your dorm room. ---- Useless research per a member of congress but what they don’t see is the actual work rather than the title.) AAU is working to combat the “bad title” issue by highlighting research with unusual names. (e.g. sex habits of the screw worm -- eradication screw worms in cattle which saved billions of dollars)
  - Every hard science change has a social science component to get the American people to buy into it.

- Tuition Equality
  - Give in-state tuition to students that graduated high school in your state. UCLA and Co schools have done this. At the graduate level, mainly for masters students.
  - For Graduate Students at UCLA, it’s pretty easy to get in-state tuition if you’re a domestic student. However the same isn’t true for undocumented students.
  - David Croom: This seems more like a state issue.
Ellyn: There is a federal dialogue on this. During the presidential election, the Texas gov made a bit of an “oops” when he said that if you “don’t believe in this, you don’t have a heart.”

States are investing a great deal of funds in people that ultimately can’t stay, due to the visa system. This is the piece that Congress can address as states can’t create visas. (It’s broader than STEM.)

The Green Card is the stumbling block here which is a federal issue.

- Online Education Initiative
  - Michigan is involved in Coursera. Currently no graduate student impact, but that could change.
  - Adam: Currently, the focus has been on increasing access for undergrads. There are two courses that are up and running that I’m aware of that are graduate level. One impact on graduate students would be the need to increase the number of TA-ships to help administer the course. The more this moves away from the “MOOCS” (Massive open online courses).
  - Ellyn: Under the Smith bill that just passed the house, to get a new E1-B visa, all course work must be done in the united states but it CAN be done online. (Allow an international student in the STEM field to have up to 50% of their course work take place online or over distance learning.)
  - At UW, the administration has budgeted funds for additional TAs to teach a proposed undergraduate degree completion program. These positions would be funded by tuition associated with this program (tuition would be measurably less than for residential students - students who attend classes on campus).
  - Legislators think that online learning is cheaper. Not so. However, that could and likely will change in 5 - 10 years. Currently the costs are higher than traditional teaching.
  - A number of universities might choose to have fewer faculty which would reduce instructional quality and would have the added effect of decreasing the number of researchers available to mentor graduate students.
  - Also, the retirement of the baby boomer generation. The pipeline to replace the tenure track faculty doesn’t exist to the level it needs to. As a result there are more lecturers and non-tenure track faculty positions to fill the gap.
  - Econ at UCLA: To students, most undergrads don’t see a difference between lecturers and tenure track faculty. However, if you look at research output, seminars, etc. lecturers aren’t a resource for graduate students.
  - This will likely become an issue first at smaller universities before it hits the larger ones.
  - We need to be careful. We shouldn’t try to block online progress but rather should try to frame our position as a control issue, e.g. put the safeguards in place to ensure quality for both undergraduate and graduate students.
  - Do we need to rethink the current idea that “teachers are researchers”
  - Berkeley and UT are going to Edex which is completely different (a different model entirely) from Coursera which offers non-credit classes. (Engage with institutions to make sure we know what they’re doing!)
UW held a panel discussion on the future of online higher education at its 6th Annual Higher Education Summit. This will be posted online soon. If anyone is interested in this, please contact Adam Sherman gpsspres@uw.edu.

**Sharing of Best Practices Case Studies, Alberto (UC Berkeley)**

- Federal Director at the University
  - How many people know that they have a federal director at their University?
  - One big benefit of SAGE (the first sharing of best practices); helping us understand the dialogue on federal issues that are already going on at our University and how they relate to the discussions at our peer-institutions

- SAGE is a Wiki
  - we all bring in information that is affecting our University and a repository for this information
  - questionnaire helps to draw out this knowledge and bring back new information that will benefit your GSA and campus
  - How many of you know about the way other campuses are structured?
    - incredible diversity in how student govts represent their student body
    - how we work with undergraduates and other student organizations
  - helps to get the best out of our resources

- Your best practice should be my best practice
  - using comparisons to peer institutions garnered through SAGE enables you to get more done at your University as a student leader

**Roundtable Discussion - Where would you like your GSA to be in a year or so? (inside and outside the University)**

- UW
  - better representing our constituents as a GPSS
  - building some sort of “memory” in GPSS; turnover every year
  - give more responsibility to Senators since they may stay around year to year
  - depend less on the 4 officers that currently make most decisions
  - improving financial independence and stability; currently almost 100% of funding is contingent on asking another body for the funds; not leaving funding to the discretion of the fee committee

- UC Berkeley
  - see UW; high turnover in GSA, poor institutional memory and seems to start from scratch every year
  - people who have lead in the past are not seen as resources by the current leadership
  - we have representation on all major university committees; but it is critical that when we place people in committees, they need to report back to the executive board and other GSA members
  - how can we bring in more money for graduate students; endowments funding the graduate student assembly and the GA officers; could even create new, funded positions and endowments for each of them
- University of Michigan
  - Transitions and improving institutional memory
  - Everyone is volunteer so it is sometimes hard to get people involved; also they don’t always hang around and keep student government a priority (not as hardcore as Michael)
  - Separate but equal representation (vs. UGs)
    - How much separation is good (quazi-separation vs. full)
    - Relying on the RSG for graduate student issues
- UCLA
  - institutional memory to withstand crisis; when someone leaves or fails at their job, have the means to transfer knowledge and have the infrastructure for a new person to jump right in
  - increasing communication to graduate students as a GSA
  - gaining financial stability; saving the graduate writing center
  - cost of housing for graduate students; currently some housing options are 60% of a graduate students monthly TA stipend
- UT Austin
  - transition amongst assembly members; also not every seat filled
  - increase fund raising effort (currently funded by “not student fees”); want to create an endowment as well
  - getting fair share of resources and attention relative to undergraduates, especially with the population difference
  - already feel like they are having better collaboration with their other student govt bodies
- UNC
  - GPSF is the first resource for graduate students
  - infrastructure of GPSF is solid enough to help address any student concern
- Michigan State
  - visibility of GSA to the graduate population
  - reaching out to satellite campuses; they are also taxed to pay into the student government so they need to be aware of programs that are available to them
  - further ways to support research for student
  - having a place on campus specifically for graduate students; going to need a big donor so should start working with advancement
  - similarly, want to enhance alumni relations; plenty of pride from undergraduate alumni but not from graduate school alumni

Session Adjourned at 11:45am

Session Start @ 1:00pm

- More about Rep. Irwin
  - Started as County Board of Commissioners, Chair of the Board
  - 2010 State Rep and just won a 2nd term
  - Education is a top priority; helps the individual and helps the community

- Michigan currently governed statewide by Republicans even though the federal representatives for Michigan are democratic; lots of cut for higher ed (15% one year)
- if any other cuts are going to happen to Michigan, they will likely happen in 2013

Questions:
- Budgets; what are the budget & revenue sources currently for Michigan
  - $45 billion budget, $7 billion general fund (used to be $8 billion)
  - solve $1 billion deficit with shared sacrifice; proposal was to cut tax revenue by $1.8 billion for businesses (WHAT?!) Revenues were actually coming in from sales tax
  - Sales tax in Michigan 6%; guaranteed for school aid fund but just for K-12; so when sales were low from 2000 to 2010, school where hurting; but in 2010, people began to start spending money & sales tax brought the revenue back
  - but governor changed definition for what the sales tax revenue could be used for and lost revenues from K-12 1.3% to 1.1% in addition to leveling out higher ed funding → end of the day, cut $1.5 million from education to cut taxes for business

- What is the mix?
  - 64 republicans to 46 democrats in House and 26 to 12 in the Senate
  - we have a 3 term limit in House and 2 in the Senate (too short) and are full time

- Conceal/Carry?
  - What is it? you are allowed to have a concealed handgun with license but not on Universities
  - Currently an effort to eliminate gun-free zones like the University except for courts; not sure when it will be addressed
  - Rep Irwin is trying to add an open carry clause that he thinks would get Republicans to vote it down

- Bills overhauling K-12 Education
  - 2 ships
    - expanding educational achievement authority (for districts that severely under-perform, the state can take them over.) state-wide authority to run those schools; it is being proposed that the EAA will be able to take over the lowest 5% of schools every year and any school buildings that aren't being used must be sold to a charter school → major concerns because they would negatively impact school
    - change how school finance happens

- What can higher ed do to convince legislators to see our side?
- be politically active, knock on doors of people that sit on the other side of the issue as you
- recognizes difficulty of turnover at University for student leaders
- letters, emails, phone calls - easy to do, easy to ignore
- work with people at University to get individuals that can relate to the legislators to get together and have a short conversation; personal contact means everything
- get on the legislators communication list
- “turn up the heat”; go to their coffee hours, letters to the editors, Op-ed
- Get a database! generate lists of registered voters, petitions they have signed, etc. so you can identify students who can best lobby to specific legislators; if you can get address (even zip code) you can get this information
  - Value of research to state and economy
    - **good idea: host research conference within the Capitol building-- happening in WA and NC
    - going to work with some legislators and some not; important to target legislators that it may have an impact
    - Rep Irwin doesn’t feel like this is currently missing in Michigan
  - Unionization of Graduate Students
    - University fought unionization in 1980s of graduate research employees and it didn’t happen
    - 2009, 2010 graduate research assistants tried again and University supported it
    - legislature rushed to pass a law that graduate students are not considered University employees before the decision on instating the Union could be made; immediate effect for law was motioned and passed even when there was no counting of votes for immediate effect; now sits in Michigan court
  - What are your tools for taxation and raising revenues?
    - income, property, sales tax are major (gas tax for transportation); sales tax is mostly for education; income and property tax go to general fund
    - federal dollars to state are bound in varying degrees
    - recent 1.5% increase to higher ed was tagged a lot of “performance criteria” that were and were not related to performance so they could control changes at the Universities
  - What powers that University has independent of the state govt
    - constitutional autonomy granted to the University but state govt still provides them the money; use budget to push the University in particular directions
  - Privatization of the University
    - As state decreases support and tuition goes up, it as if large public institutions are becoming private → very concerned about how this would
decrease accessibility and affordability for young, bright Michigan residents

○ What is the state’s role in supporting graduate students?
  ■ Michigan funding for medical education; fought to protect this funding so that when students are in the residency process, the govt pays for part of the costs for these students
  ■ state would like if federal government would maintain major responsibility (because they can print money)
  ■ New idea: state loan program → borrow money from the state for your education but if you work in state after, state takes on some of your tax burden for you

Selection of SAGE 2012 Advocacy Issues, Michael Benson (UMich)

Historically, we’ve decided to limit ourselves to 3 - 4 main issues. Both for the sake of time (meetings are often 15 minutes or less) and focus.

We’ve focused on indebtedness and taxation, research funding, and immigration reform.

These issues have been renewed and updated annually

Flynn: always in support of research funding
Benson: motion to maintain the same 3 areas of focus and simply adjust each area as we see fit (since all new topics seems to fit under these areas)

Ellyn: make sure to have a score for taxation issues

David UCLA: visa reform should still be included in the immigration issues

(Ellyn, Manny, Michael reviewed SAGE DOH - see above; presentation of issues may vary on SAGE Day and State Day; example Dream Act)

Bertucci (UNC) seconds Benson’s (Michigan’s) motion. [VOTE] Motion passes unanimously

The 3 current SAGE lobby items will be kept as they are:
  Taxation & Indebtedness
  Research Funding
  Immigration

Manny: Which tax provisions should we address? the ~14 coming up are too many

Ellyn: decide based on ones that are most related to higher education and graduate students
Benson: Let’s go through suggestions for additions to the white papers discussed yesterday (see above)

Adam: How much of tuition equality is a federal issue?

Ellyn: really is a state issue

Benson: well there is the federal governance over policy regarding green cards

Benson: How about online education?

Michael Redding: Really to be address at the University level.

Benson: Can we have a show of hands to see who would like to strongly monitor the changes in online education but not include it as a SAGE white paper issue?

Coalition votes to not include online education as a major white paper issue

Manny: READ UP ON THE WHITE PAPERS! Only when we can revise them in an educated manner is if we know what we have advocated for in the past. Also, we will not revise the white papers in DC

Sharing of Best Practices in Small Groups, Michael Bertucci (UNC)

SAGE coalition split into 3 heterogeneous groups (based on interest) for 3 different sessions of discussion

20 min sessions, note taker assigned for each

Session A

● Grad/UG relations, benefits of graduate student association independence
  ● Lobbying at the state level
  ● Building an alumni network

Grad/UG relations, benefits of graduate student association independence

· UTA has three student governments. 1) student government—UG and Grad for student academic affairs but mainly just focus on student fairs 2) college councils which is only academic affairs 3) graduate academic and student affairs. All three are co-equal and all co-sponsored by dean of students. All have financial advisor and secretary (support staff is equal) lot of negotiation between who gets what area i.e. career services. Nice because independent and don’t report to anyone. Budget is totally separate but run by the student fee committee and doesn’t officially connect to them. Spun out in 1994 so have been independent since.

· UM every college has its own council (with exceptions). So a lot of small student governments. Then there is the central student government. Then there is a graduate
government that reaches all graduate students. The university considers them separate but not. They want quazi-separation but currently graduate students are under the overarching central student government but the graduate students are able to limit the amount they get involved.

- UCLA has one group. All student government is a part of ASUCLA. They run stores, undergrad and grad student government. Separate from UCLA so money comes from ASUCLA and student fees. Don't answer to administration so have a lot of financial independence. Pay university to run elections. ASUCLA is paying for support staff (mixed with the student governments). They are still collaborative with the university and deans. Separate organization is a liability shield for the university. They appoint the members of ASUCLA so can control that too.

- UNC

We currently exist under one larger umbrella; the GPSF President is directly underneath the Student Body President in the chain of command. The student body president also is the only student with a seat on the Board of Trustees. We have a pretty good rapport with the undergrads but are very concerned about their thoughts being undergrad-centric (even though they technically represent us too)

- Issue
  - UCLA—the legislated body. They are set to approve things and it is very bureaucratic and they don't get follow up or get results. UTA has similar issue. Kind of get people to replace the legislative branch who worked underneath it so already know what's going on and can help
  - What helps: financial separation so you don't have to fight with undergrads about that but make sure it is very clear who covers what

Lobbying at the State Level

Who currently does state lobbying? UW, U Michigan, (not UCLA), UT, UNC (sort of)

UNC: just a couple reps usually go, want a bigger.

Mich: usually just Michael (& MSU)

UT: "Invest in Texas" for UT Austin (platform: affordable, competitive, safe)

  UT: 3 lobby days: UT Austin, UT System, all state Universities.

UW: works with undergrads on yearly lobby day; also a separate lobby day with other state universities.

Bertucci question: what do you do at lobby day? Is it through relations with legislators or more research-driven?

Lauren (UT) - letter writing drives (with draft letters). Set up meetings for students, based on where they live. Also meetings with committee staff. Often do a rally at the front of the Capitol with a podium, speeches, etc.

U MLch: Michael testifies at committee hearings.

Lauren: They do the same thing. Have the legislative calendar, fit in students at the right places.
UW: Summer/fall: start meeting with legislators, research policy. Winter: propose any legislation. UW lobby day, also statewide lobby day. Also attend committee hearings.

UNC: Dean is connected to legislators. Want to demonstrate research benefits to legislators - e.g. tick jacket - shows how UNC research created a product that helps construction workers. How do other schools get students to attend? At UNC, the "science fair" aspect helps. (Dean organizes the poster session/science fair.)

UT: Since there have been gigantic cuts, that gets people active. Student governments at undergrad level are super excited about this. Kind of a prestigious thing - people want to be part of "Invest in Texas" - political science students. Also, student organization coordinators contact all the individual student organizations - helps get info out there, word of mouth. (Way easier to get the undergrads.)

U-Mich: Trying to secede from undergrads, so some challenges now.

UNC: How do you address graduate student issues when you combine with undergrads?

UT: Platform is infused with things that grad students care about, general enough so that grad students are a part of it. Graduate side is a little diluted, but platform still encompasses grad student issues. A lot of grad students are upset because stipends have been cut.

UW: Grad student voice can get diluted by undergrads, but it’s definitely worth working with them because of all their people & enthusiasm.

U Mich: Do you all lobby upper-level administrators? they might have sway.

UT: We work closely with state & federal relations people. They’re out there also lobbying.

UW: Delicate at UW - students don’t always have same positions or priorities as the school administration.

U Mich: unionization issue - should have been a vote. University could have taken a stronger stance.

Building an Alumni Network
Suzie, Adam, Phil, Alberto, Alex

- What do we mean by Alumni network:
  - Grad student leaders or at the university?
- Adam: GPSS has good relationship with alumni association and sit on board of trustees and develop ideas. Prior to this year, nothing specific toward graduate students partnering with GPSS. Went through all records of former members of GPSS with administration to identify GPSS alumni, 182 people.
  - What trying to achieve:
Potential Donor Base
- Institutional Memory greater than in archives
- Professional/Social Networking
  - New union building and invited alumni back to see new offices etc. About 20 people came out. Also planning home for the holidays events.
  - Featured alumni page on website. One alumnus elected to state legislature. Plan to do that once a month until end of term.
  - Working with graduate school advancement department on developing alumni relations in hopes of future donations. Can't just go ask them for money, need to develop long term relationships. Possibly develop a committee of alumni telling them how to reach out to alumni and make list of people to reach out e.g. wealthy alumni.
  - Creating database going forward for all members.
- Alberto: Main alumni associations are individual to schools. Central one focusses mainly on undergraduates. Potentially talk to advancement office, which may have a list of alumni and which programs they were in. Have a few active former
- Tags in alumni lists:
  - UW has tags for students e.g. this person was associated with GPSS. By also giving them information about people in GPSS to help them with tagging so mutual interest
  - Michigan state's advancement office does not tag people in the list of alumni.
  - Tagging people can be important tool.
- MSU: Have created LinkedIn group for former executives. Planning to open it up to reps as well. Relatively new initiative. Hoping to use for exchange/networking program between students and alumni.
- UW’s effort has been led by Adam and one of his assistant.
- Michigan: Has a strong alumni network but through RSG we have not begun developing any specific graduate alumni network. Would like to start developing a database of former members.
- Endowment: UW working with advancement officer to identify people and developing strategic plan with what they need. Putting together testimonials of students and developing a packet to send to alumni.

Session B
- Student fees & fee structure
- Conflict resolution/Non-discrimination
- Graduate student spaces

Student fees & Fee Structure
Issues:
- UW students have imposed fees on themselves to get access to transportation, new buildings etc. Then unionized contracts stopped the increase in student fees. Since students imposed fees on themselves and not the college, there is a lawsuit that this was illegal. It could end that the non-union students will have increase fees
§ UM student unions are different. Student fees aren’t getting the increases they need. When students vote to impose a fee, the regions aren’t allowing it

§ UTA students don’t see the breakdown of fees that they pay as part of tuition/to be a part of the school. Don’t know that it is the student fees—flat rate tuition

§ UCLA students are fully funded depending on the department

§ UM and UW have optional fees (like sports) so if you choose not to pay them then you can’t partake

§ UNC

§ UW is trying to make their student fees transparent so that you can see where every dollar is going

○ Does anyone account for inflation with student fees?

§ As an undergrad yes, but none of the schools here have

§ UTA has to put a dollar amount of the amount that is going to increase so can’t say the percentage that goes with inflation. The student services have a group that states the amount of student fees that are collected

§ UW historically have none but could. They just choose to put a dollar amount has a committee to set those fees and say what they need. Then they are approved by a board

§ UNC doesn’t peg it to tuition but will account and say we need to increase by a certain percent that is then voted on. The vote has to go through two of three groups for approval to allow this

§ UM has health insurance paid for the graduate students but for the undergrads it is not and there is a different source for that. There are three fees for the graduate students that go into the student fees

- UW: some links to good background information of fees at UW:
  - UW Student Fee Links:
    - http://depts.washington.edu/safcom/
    - http://techfee.washington.edu/
    - http://f2.washington.edu/fm/sfs/tuition/components

Relevant Washington State Laws:

- RCW 28B.15.610 - U-PASS fee was instituted under this authority
- RCW 28B.15.051 - Our Tech Fee was instituted under this authority
- RCW 28B.15.045 - Authority for our Services and Activities Fee

Conflict resolution/Non-discrimination
U-Mich, UT, UNC, Berkeley, UW

U-Mich: Conflict resolution is a bureaucratic thing. Academic things - like students & advisor conflicts. Do have an Ombudsman, don’t have binding power, can’t enforce things. Academic affairs committee: major push is to figure out how to do Conflict resolution - how to make an effective solution with teeth. don’t want Deans or admin. to enforce it, but want to go through office of institutional equity - to handle harassment, discrimination issues. If you’re being worked to death, there’s no clear process. If it’s a violation of state or federal law (e.g. title 9), there’s a clear process. U-Mich also trying to make all issues of student expulsion feed through this new process (except academic dishonesty) - make this a necessary checkpoint. Usually would be a conflict that could be worked out. just passed a student bill of rights.
Berkeley: Has a system wide student bill of rights, but no enforcement. Next step: each campus takes back to their own student government, approve it, work with administration to implement it. Got stuck when taking the bill of rights to the administrations, meeting resistance.

San Diego: got watered down product. Berkeley had the best receptions from admin. Alberto was working on with the President. Being told that the components are already in rules at the campus. Difficult to find: what is the process for resolving a grievance? Where do you go? Now have a Graduate Advocate -paid position, $5k/year - helps students how to navigate system, confidential, funded by students.

UW:

UNC: Important for schools to decide how to sift through the claims, address differently based on University policy. UNC has a harassment and non-discrimination policy that is linked together - goes through a particular office. If something falls under that category, there’s a clear process. UNC has linked the Ombuds office to the Title 9 coordinator - if there’s reasonable evidence of a case, will handle it. If not, goes to Student Grievance committee, which will decide. Title 9 - coordinates.

U Mich: Try to put other types of conflicts (e.g. student and advisor) through existing processes that handle things like harassment - gives the power to solve the issue and give the grad student more equal footing with the advisor.

Examples of issues: 1.) a woman was fired from a department, perhaps because of involvement with GEO - department didn’t follow the proper process. 2.) Student whose advisor stole intellectual property from him. He changed labs, is suing the University. Gross violations are the exception, but may indicate many smaller issues out there.

Berkeley: What should the advisor-student relationship be? What is expected of you? Professors from different departments have different ideas.

UT: People don’t know about the Ombuds. UT has one Ombuds each for faculty, staff, and students. Able to solve 1,000 cases/year. People don’t know that resource is there.

U Mich: Have a student Ombuds.

**Follow-Up:** Mich will send out bill of rights & info on the new conflict resolution process they are working for to the SAGE list-serv.

*Graduate Student Spaces*

Alex, Dani, Suzie

- MSU: Office for consul of graduate students in student services building. No place for graduate students to host events or study. Trying to get an empty building that would need to be refurbished to create central space for graduate students on campus.
  - Plan is still being developed but coming up with ideas for this. Hoping to raise money and talk to people about getting this building.
- UCLA: GSA has a space for graduate students to use. Like a large common area with some offices for GSA nearby where they hold office hours. Space is in Kirchoff hall which houses all student governments.
  - Departments have their own study lounges and graduate specific spaces.
  - GSA has a theater where they show films
- Michigan: Rackham has a great building but it’s primarily an administrative building. The hours and spaces are not conducive to being a space that graduate students can utilize.
  - Raising funds to pay for these spaces would be an option but at least at Michigan the Reagents haven’t been willing to raise fees.
  - UCLA has had success in advertising early and widely to students about referenda
- UCLA has had some success in securing space for graduate students largely because of their student fees.

Session C
- Communication to constituents and future leadership
- Student health (mental health)
- Career services

*Communication to constituents and future leadership*

1. How do you communicate with your students, do you have a list-serv and if so how frequently do you use it
   a. Berkeley – we can send as many emails as we want but each one costs $60. Also a four day lag between submitting the proposed language and it going out. IT could change the language but they don’t. We also communicate through our delegates. One person in each program (more per each 100 enrolled). We send them emails to forward. There are also ______ that send out local information. Some divisions (Within programs) don’t have a representative, but most do. Divisions can request a representative from the graduate assembly. (representation affects $ from the GA too) **Generally send 1 email per month ($60)**

Every delegates meeting we have a question sheet that we send around on information that they want. (It’s also how we take attendance) An example of a question was “do you care about housing” or “do you like the food we’re serving?” Usually when we are trying to achieve something, we can show the delegates

b. UW – We don’t represent proportionally. We have senators that are by program. WE don’t have to pay or wait to email our students. It goes through our registrar and while they do have to approve the email it just goes out. We email about 1x per month. We try to have fancy emails and make the emails cover a number of topics. We have 150 senators total, 2 per department. We have a list-serv for our senators. Some emails get forwarded and others are for the senators themselves. Also, trying to get communication to come in as well as to go out. We have a comment box at our meetings. (example, have quieter snacks at meetings.)

c. MSU – We can’t email all of the graduate students at once. Not sure why. We could probably go through the registrar. We rely on our representatives. We have a bi-monthly newsletter (2x month) and we also email the departmental secretaries. We do Facebook events too. We have about 500 people liking COGS on Facebook. We also work with our medical and
law liaisons to get the information out to those constituencies as well. No one is really in charge of PR.

- UCLA – $200 / email charge. We use Facebook, our GSA website, or student affairs officers. We have a list of SAOs are department staff members and they help us get the information out too.
- UNC – we email 2x per month. Bullet points like reminders and what not. No charge to email. If something comes up we tell our senate and the senators either forward the email or we ask department staff to do so.
- Michigan – We don’t pay to email and we can send emails without the consent or review of the university. We send regular emails, usually averaging one a week. We send bi-weekly newsletters which contain student government specific information as well as …

2. Relationships with others

- MSU – seed money for programs to host a pizza party and to elect a representative ($50)
- Michigan –
- UNC – We created a position known as the outreach coordinator whose responsibility is to visit/contact each of the academic departments to raise awareness about GPSF and find out how we can help them better
- UCLA –
- Berkeley –
- UW –

**Student Health (Mental Health)**

Mich: CAPS counseling center for graduate students; crises based individual services → free visits are only for critical need; message chairs and video games → make it a place to relax (no questions!)

UT: counseling center that you can go to, group sessions for graduate students to air their grievances; feels there is a shortage counselors and mental health help is just not strong in Texas

Policies for mental health:

Mich: medical leave for students not paid when you are gone; to not take leave of absence, have to just work it out with your advisor; need to consider relationship between disability policy and mental health

Programming for mental health:

Mich, UT, UNC - not too much planned by GSA but there are stress management sessions & other events run by the Counseling & Wellness Centers

UT - social workers often run programs for interested students

How much do students have to pay for regular sessions?
Mich: co-pay! graduate student insurance covers mental health
UNC: regular sessions cost out of pocket for student (~$50)
UT: also have to pay for regular sessions

Mich: union really helps get most out of health insurance
UT: fee health insurance for state employees & TA/RA are state employees

Career Services
Adam, Alex, David, Phil, Michael R

- Texas: UT has no career services in the graduate school, and each college has their own. New campus wide career center filled with undergraduates. Grad students have access but not tailored to them. It’s in the undergraduate services building. Tuition goes to career services but cannot really use them
- UW: Similar, campus wide career center almost exclusively used by undergraduates. Focus of their efforts geared to undergrads. Including mock interview, resume development.
  - Linking academic advising with career advising is a new initiative. Idea: developing a skill set through your classes and need to learn how to market yourself.
  - Professional schools have their own individual career people. Engineering also has strong career services. Social sciences and those looking at academic careers have less services.
  - Graduate school has something called core programs putting on series of events/seminars geared towards career development.
- Michigan: Pharmacology has an alumni steering committee that has been asked to help give advice in career development. Academic departments they seem to do well, but
  - Also seeing movement
- UW: engineering has plenty of job offers because lack of degrees for companies in the state.
- UCLA: Has a central career office with segment dedicated to graduate students. Departments can have dedicated people in this office. Many departments you cannot talk to your advisor about private sector jobs. Sense that if you say you’re looking outside of academia there is negative response from faculty that you don’t say this until just prior to graduation. Some programs have job offers without too much difficulty but humanities it’s more difficult
- Texas: Versatile PhD software which provides training and support for PhD students should market themselves if they want to go into industry. Outsourcing career services effectively.
- How to group graduate students in one career services
  - Texas: Idea to propose graduate student career council with students, advisors, and people in industry where students can go.
  - UW: Core programs advising: graduate school puts on seminars and events. Committee is meant to interface with students to determine how best to meet the students’ needs.
- UCLA: Grad student welfare committee setup with career services subcommittee with director of career services and students. Find that they really need departments on board. Requiring one of the admins in each department to provide career services with some resources or interact with them.
- UW: Increased effort in the future to integrate career advising into curriculum.

Session Adjourned at 4:35pm

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

SAGE Business Session 5

Session Start at 5:20pm

**Additional Discussion Areas Related to Sharing of Best Practices, Michael Bertucci (UNC)**

Alberto - Does anyone have an LGBT liaison or similar?
Adam - WE put a community seat in our senate but it isn’t a board structure or anything. Not a paid position. (They represent LGBT interests rather than a department)

Bertucci - We have 18 cabinet members, one of which advises on LGBTQ issues. They also work with our center (?) to ____. Cabinet meetings are 1x per month and also one committee meeting bi-weekly or monthly which leads to 3-4h per month. Not paid.

David (UCLA) - We have an LGTB oversight committee. We have 3 representatives, its campus wide. The committee includes faculty and undergrads and oversees the LGTB center. The GSA president also sits on the council for diversity and inclusion. This committee includes the chancellor and other high level administrators.

Alberto - We have a similar organization to UCLA with respect to campus committees and student representation on it. The position we are trying to create will be an addition to a branch of our student government called “Projects”. Projects are services provided for graduate students and have been made permanent branches of the organization. They are led by graduate students who are hired (there is a formal job posting and interview process) to be the “NAME OF PROJECT Project Coordinator”. There are currently 8:

- **Graduate Minority Student Project**
- **Graduate Women’s Project**
- **Graduate Support Services Project**
- **Graduate Student Parent Advocacy**
- **Graduate Minority Outreach, Recruitment, and Retention**
- **Women of Color Initiative**
- **The Berkeley Graduate**
- **Graduate Social Club**

They do anything from putting large social events (200-1000 people) by the Graduate Social Club to Conferences for Graduate Women, Women of Color, and Minority Student Retention. The positions are paid from $2,000- $9,000. We’re looking to add a similar position specific for LGBTQ.

Michael - Fill me in later. I’m tired.
Michael (UT-A) - At the school or department level there are LGBTQ groups. There is a new group, OUTgrads which is student body wide. They’re looking for support from the GSA and not sure how that will work out.

Michael - Benefits and Perils of separate student governments?
Michael (UT-A) - drawback would be competition for airtime. Three independent student governments and only so much political capital. So if multiple folks are focusing on something, things get done, otherwise, less likely.
Adam - It depends on the student leadership each year. GPSS used to be a part of ASUW and split ~ 35 years ago. I’ve heard that at that time there was almost no communication between the two as GPSS was trying to establish itself as its own thing. I have a very good relationship with the ASUW president. Melanie coordinates with their office of govt. relations. It works really well if everyone is on the same page. Technically, ASUW represents all students, including graduate students. However, whenever a graduate student issue comes up, no one talks about it, it automatically goes to GPSS. GPSS is specifically mentioned in University guidelines (?). We work together so we come in with a united voice. Sometimes we focus on graduate issues and sometimes we focus on undergraduate issues. (This is basically UT’s system too) We also don’t have the issue with Airtime like UT does.

Katie - Transitions - What do people do?
Bertucci - Sometimes the documentation (a folder, wiki, etc.) is enough, but …. We’re starting to pick people. The only position elected is president. all the rest are appointed so you can see a year down the road. We’re starting to get those people ready. And we’re really going to be working on that come January. Elections in April and exec board appointed a few weeks later. Serve from May - May.

Michael - President and VP elected together in March and serve May - May. Treasurer is appointed by the pres. in December and serves from Jan - Dec. Also, our representatives are elected in two shifts, half in December to serve the calendar year and half in March to serve May - May.

Michael (UT-A) Manny is going to be around forever and is going to battle Michael to be the new Alberto. (and Alberto himself)

Discussion of Monthly Conference Calls, Michael Benson (Mich)
- Option 1: 2nd Sunday of the Month @ 6pm EST
- Option 2: 2nd Sunday of the Month @ 7pm EST → PASSES
Expect 1st phone call on January 13th. Michael will email reminders out (and so too will Google calendar)

Election of New Vice-Chairperson
- Katie (UNC) → new Vice-Chairperson
- Lauren (UT Austin)
Assignment of Groups for SAGE Advocacy Items, Michael Benson (UMich)

- Indebtedness & Taxation (Political Director - Manny and Berkeley - Alberto)
- Research Funding (UNC - Michael)
- Immigration (Michigan - Alex)

Session Adjourned at 7:00pm
SAGE Fall Coalition Meeting -- SUNDAY 12/2/12

SAGE Business Session 6

Session Start at 10:30 am

The Future of SAGE, Michael Benson (UMich)

- Engaging our members
  - A lot of the work has been doing the limited few. How do we engage people in the coalition but also those on campus at our schools
  - UW has two groups a state and federal funding committees. They get more people engaged because more people are involved in writing letters to the legislators. Also the people have been reached out to before there is an issue so then when something comes up you already have someone who wants to be involved
  - Knowing the white paper issues and caring about the subject so you know the background before you start writing and also engage more people
  - UM has been recruiting a group to focus on local, state, and federal. Have 10+ now and while they don’t take all suggestions they get people involved and caring and ideas are at least being discussed
  - Would it make sense to add a members only section to the web page?
    - orientation for the fall summit
    - resources before day on the hill
  - Make it so others can get involved (on the web page but also on all the discussions mentioned) and make changes so more people are involved and not relying on one person
  - Benson is worried about timely completion of tasks--just be aware and nimble with changes
  - For advocacy stuff we get more people involved but then for communication it’s only a few people so getting people involved in all aspects not just the policy
  - Need to delegate so there isn’t a horrible transition so that the group prevails
  - Once we know who all the new officers are we can get people involved and try to help them have a good segway but we won’t know till summer and attendance on the conference calls is traditionally low then
    - Maybe stage the training so it happens at different times so people start getting involved as soon as possible
    - If you can kind of tell who is taking over, bring them to DOH or have them do the calls with everyone so they start to get involved and know the information
  - Create a ‘Welcome to SAGE’ that includes a brief history and the purpose of everything is. Small things to start to get things involved
  - Presidents round table--get the presidents of the schools together and talk about their schools and GSAs
○ Add to the history of SAGE on the website because it stops early 2010--Manny offers to help since he knows the history  
○ For the new people, what do you wish you received/known before coming here  
  ■ Ellyn starts halfway through assuming we know the legislation already but knowing the legislation and what might be referenced. Maybe list all those things beforehand so we can look it up before we come  
  ■ Mention what the acronyms are when first referencing it  
  ■ For DOH we all have different backgrounds on politics so introducing for how it all works before we go in (before we go into DOH)  
  ■ Oriented to how this group works and how things operate  
    ● Maybe longer introductions so we know what everyone's strengths are  
    ● Submit bios before coming  
  ■ Smaller groups for talking to get connected or video calls  
  ■ Continuity within organizations so people who are taking over in the organization at a single school gets introduced to SAGE  
  ■ For the new members who are highly motivated to continue in SAGE, help them figure out an appropriate role in the organization both now and then over the next 2 or 3 years  
  ■ A list of basics you should know that you can look up online but still the key points that will be referenced  
  ■ Consider having a person who orients and makes the new people feel involved  
    ● Doesn’t want to become one person’s job to connect people and wants to make sure everyone still feels equally involved and trying to make everyone feel welcome  
  ■ Older souls need to be aware of cliques that are happening especially at the fall submit  
  ■ Maybe be able to stop people and say “I don’t know what’s going on, can you explain this”  
  ■ Maybe talk to your campus’ version of Ellyn. We all have them and they will be very helpful and help overcome discipline specific issues  
  ■ Make it known it is okay to stop and ask question because most people will have questions and often they will overlap. Know going into it who feels comfortable and know who needs a little extra help with what to say and what to cover  
  ○ Have the meetings earlier in the year again because people don’t get fully involved till this summit  
    ■ Concern is that it’s partly the campus and when that can happen and they can handle the group coming and hotel room

**Coalition Meeting Round-Up and Suggestions, Michael Benson (UMich)**  
- Thank you for coming out. List favorite (f), least (l), and what to do different (d)
- Benson: (f) Lori coming in was really helpful and eye-opening, sharing of best practices. (l) attendance; sad that a lot of people couldn’t come and weren’t represented (d)
- Ryan: (f) Jeff Irwin was great to talk to someone in congress and have a perspective of what conversations might be like for DOH. (l) the league and issues with losing time like internet or locked doors. (d) nothing to note
- Alberto: (f) sharing of best practices with Bertucci. (l) more time for best practices and talk about the questionnaire (d) figure out what we are trying to achieve during this conference but have more on sharing of best practices and being able to focus
- Manny: (f) the guest speakers, it was great to hear everything and know that everyone has a similar situation. Also the sharing of best practices that should be a bigger (equal) component. (l) agenda—gets frustrated when things are broken into segments. (d) move the summit earlier in the year, October, because people are more engaged once they have attended this and feel connected
- David: (f) sharing best practices. (l) meetings went on for too long so the focus is lost. (d) having breaks and keeping things on time and moving
- Dani: (f) state representative (l) the meeting being in December because they lost the whole term
- Alex UW: (f) shared best practices, having the people you want come talk to us instead of a summit because we could ask those questions in regards to our own situations, increase social time. (l) not in October
- Alex UM: (f) Jeff Irwin (l) goes so quickly (d) minutes are too long for the sharing of best practices
- Melanie: (f) small groups and sharing of best practices, guest speakers, social media. (l) don’t like things split apart (d) more small groups
- Bertucci: (f) best practices, the dancing (l) not getting to the questionnaire. not knowing how everyone’s GSA is set up and what is good and bad about the set-up (d) agenda sent out earlier so people can look at what will be discussed and staying on time (did much better this time)
- Katie: (f) Ellyn, even if I didn’t understand everything she was saying, she was really candid and was a great resource (l) The split up nature of the agenda (d) Make sure we stay on time

- Jumping around the agenda was intentional to try and keep people on task and keep people focused and interested. Will try to get a compromise to the setup of the meetings going forward
- Going to start talking about the questionnaires on conference calls so we still learn the information since it will be helpful
  - Ideally wanted to get the information back before and the people at UM would make the comparison of everything. Melanie will help put that together
- Alumni—formalize an alumni group
  - One exists; created, formalized and has chair. Alex tentatively will take over
  - Good contact list will help and people who are alumni stay more connected
○ You don’t get removed from the listserv until you take yourself off or ask to be
removed so alumni still have access with all the information

● How are we going to do retention?
  ○ Pester the groups until they give us an answer as to whether or not they want
to stay involved
  ○ Want this to be their decision and interest to join so they are contributing
members

Session Adjourned at 11:55am
POLITICAL CAREER

- Established policy leading to the reorganization of the City Bureaucracy resulting in savings to the City of over $10 million per year.
- Championed the Parks and Greenbelt Initiative to forever save open space and farmland.
- Issued the Mayors Green Energy Challenge calling for the City Government to use 30% renewable energy by 2010 and the city as a whole to use 20% renewable energy by 2015.
- Championed the Percentage for Art Program to provide consistent funding for public art to beautify the city for decades to come.
- Founded the Washtenaw Metro Alliance for planning and cooperation with neighboring communities.
- Founded the Clean Communities Program to clean up and protect our neighborhoods.
- Pushed through the non-motorized initiative to move Ann Arbor to the forefront in cycling and pedestrian infrastructure.
- Protected and expanded human services funding.
- Promoted the building of new affordable housing for those who need it most.
- Keeps open office hours every week for residents to sit down and talk with the mayor.
- Initiated new effort to plan for Ann Arbor’s future.
- Re-established infrastructure repair, replacement and improvements as a priority in Ann Arbor.
- Founded the Annual Mayor’s Green Fair on Main Street.
- Ann Arbor City Council: 1999-2000. Major initiatives: Passage of Ban on Mercury Thermometers. Sponsored a resolution for a reduction in the millage that was approved by City Council.

BOARDS, COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS

- Appointed to the Michigan Climate Action Council by Governor Granholm, (2007-present)
- Board of Directors Huron River Watershed Council, (1998-present, currently an alternate member of the board.)
• Downtown Development Authority, (2002 – present)
• Chair of the Board of Directors Recycle Ann Arbor (1989 – 1990)
• Chair: Urban Core Mayor’s of Michigan. (2004-05)
• Member: The Wolfpack of the National Wildlife Federation

AWARDS

• Environmental Leadership Award for 2008, Michigan League of Conservation Voters
• Elected Local Official of the Year, Michigan Parks Association, 2004
• Conservation Leadership Award, Greater Detroit Audubon Society, 2004
• Preservationist of the Year, Washtenaw Land Trust, 2003

RECENT PRESENTATIONS

• Local Government Initiatives: National Summit - Coping with Climate Change - University of Michigan School of Natural Resources May 8-10, 2007
• The Emerald Ash Borer Challenge: Continental Dialogue on Non-native Forest Insects and Diseases – Atlanta Georgia, Jan, 23 & 24 2007

EDUCATION

• B.S. Political Science, Eastern Michigan University, Magna Cum Laude
• Ann Arbor Pioneer High School
La Fuerza: The Influence of Latinos in American Culture & Politics

The Legacy of Cesar Chavez and the Evolution of Martin Luther King’s Dream

MLK 2013 Kickoff Event
January 16, 2013
4pm – 7:00pm

“Over the past 50 years, Dr. King’s dream has evolved as others shared in it. The narrative of the speech shifted from “I Have A Dream” to “We Have A Dream,” as individuals and organizations worked to bring fruition to his vision. The goals of the 1963 March on Washington have evolved to include demands for health care for all and for equal rights for gays and lesbians. Though Dr. King’s speech centered on the African American population, it is now echoed by Native Americans, Latinos, Asian Americans, the poor, the disabled and all groups that are systematically excluded from the American Dream. The dream has evolved from equality to equity, from representation to valuing diversity, from tolerance to appreciation and from the right to vote to governing as the head of state.”

Join us as Christine Chavez, granddaughter of Cesar Chavez and political rights activist talks with a panel of experts about the changing demographics of American Politics and Culture and how the growing Latino population is helping to shape the evolution of Dr. Martin Luther King’s Dream.

**Tentative Agenda**

4pm-4:45 pm - Keynote Speech by Christine Chavez
4:45pm – 5:30pm - Panel Discussion w/ Christine Chavez and Panelists
5:30pm – 6:00pm – Question & Answer Session
6:00pm – 7:00pm – Reception

**Christine Chavez, Civil Rights Activist**

Christine Chavez has made a lifetime commitment to public service, civil rights and the labor movement. Born in Delano, California, Christine Chavez was surrounded by the farm worker movement. For years, she worked with the United Farm Workers Union, the organization her grandfather Cesar Chavez helped to co-found 40 years ago.

For eight years, Christine Chavez served as the UFW’s Political Director. While there, her responsibilities included raising public awareness to protect the civil rights of farm workers and the larger immigrant community. Every year, Christine oversees the annual Cesar Chavez Walk where over 10,000 people gather to honor the legacy of the great labor leader. She is responsible for mobilizing schools, colleges, unions, churches and community groups.

Recently, Christine Chavez joined Rev. Al Sharpton to announce the formation of the Latino and African American Leadership Alliance. Troubled by the escalating violence between Latinos and African Americans, Chavez worked with the Reverend to organize a march to correspond with the Watts riots of 40 years ago. The Alliance will also sponsor community forums, outreach to schools and enlist the help of policymakers to further this important cause. Christine’s work is based on the values passed down to her from her grandfather: the fight for civil rights, social justice and labor equality.

For More Information on Christine Chavez:
Panelist 1: Anthony D. Perez, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Sociology
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

A sociologist and a social demographer, Dr. Perez’ research interests range from race, ethnicity, and immigration to public policy, social stratification, and mobility. He is the co-author of numerous manuscripts on racial construction and categorization, as well as racial and ethnic identity among the indigenous people of the United States. Dr. Perez graduated cum laude in 2011 with a B.A. in Sociology from University of Notre Dame and continued his education at the University of Michigan where he received a M.A. in Sociology in 2006 and a joint Ph.D. in Public Policy and Sociology in 2006. He was a Post-doctoral Research Associate between 2006 and 2009 at the Center for Studies in Demography and Ecology and Department of Sociology at the University of Washington. Since then, Dr. Perez has been a research fellow and assistant professor of sociology at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Panelist 2: Rogelio Saenz, Ph.D.
Dean of the College of Public Policy
University of Texas @ San Antonio

A sociologist and social demographer, Dr. Saenz is the author of numerous publications related to Latinos, demography, race and ethnic relations, immigration and inequality. He is a co-editor of the 2008 book "Latinas/os in the United States: Changing the Face of America."

Saenz grew up in the Rio Grande Valley in Mercedes, Texas, and earned a bachelor's degree in social work and sociology from Pan American University (now UT Pan American). He earned masters and doctoral degrees in sociology from Iowa State University. He joined Texas A&M in 1986 as an assistant professor in the sociology and rural sociology departments; he was promoted to associate professor in 1991 and full professor in 1996. He served as head of the Department of Sociology from 1997 to 2005. In 2007, Saenz was appointed Carsey Policy Fellow at the University of New Hampshire Carsey Institute, and in 2008, he was appointed College of Liberal Arts Cornerstone Faculty Fellow at Texas A&M.
### Graduate Grading Systems for the University of Michigan's 20 Peer Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution (Graduate School)</th>
<th>Mark and Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University (Internal Only)</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University – FAS</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University – Kennedy</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton (recommended)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford University (Internal Only)</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Chicago</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Berkeley</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, San Francisco</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia (Internal Only)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington (0.1 grades may be awarded between those listed here.)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina</td>
<td>High Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale University</td>
<td>High Pass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Professional Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution (Graduate School)</th>
<th>Mark and Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern – Law</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Chicago – Business</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compiled by the Rackham Student Government, 12/1/12
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of N</th>
<th>High Pass</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Low Pass</th>
<th>Fail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yale University</td>
<td>High Pass</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Low Pass</td>
<td>Fail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Northwestern   | 4.33 | 4    | 3.67    | 3.33 | 3    | 2.67 |
| The University | 4.33 | 4    | 3.67    | 3.33 | 3    | 2.67 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Poll "RSG End of Term Dinner"

[Cookie Policy](http://doodle.com/sxtqmviertbqgm7qe)

### December 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Thu 13</th>
<th>Fri 14</th>
<th>Tue 18</th>
<th>Wed 19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:00 PM</td>
<td>7:00 PM</td>
<td>8:00 PM</td>
<td>9:00 PM</td>
<td>6:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pete</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt W</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Emly</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Benson</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>(OK)</td>
<td>(OK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaitlin Flynn REAL</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>(OK)</td>
<td>(OK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haven</td>
<td></td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 7</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex T</td>
<td>(OK)</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Gutierrez</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>(OK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Filter</td>
<td></td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Count

- 3:1:7
- 4:0:7
- 5:0:6
- 4:2:5
- 4:3:3
- 5:2:3
- 6:1:4
- 5:0:4
- 6:0:4
- 5:1:5
- 7:1:3
- 8:0:3
- 8:0:3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wed 19 PM</th>
<th>Thu 20 PM</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt W</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Emly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Benson</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>(OK)</td>
<td>(OK)</td>
<td>(OK)</td>
<td>(OK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaitlin Flynn</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haven</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 7</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex T</td>
<td></td>
<td>(OK)</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td></td>
<td>(OK)</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>(OK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gutierrez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Filter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://doodle.com/sxtqmvietbqgm7qe
Whereas, the University of Michigan Residence Halls Association (hereinafter RHA) is the student government in the residence halls at the University of Michigan, and;

Whereas, all power under RHA’s constitution is derived directly from non-residence staff students living in university residence halls, hereby known as residents, and;

Whereas, University of Michigan unions such as the Union, the League, and Pierpont Commons provide residents with on-campus study spaces, meeting areas, and alternative community centers, and;

Whereas, for example, the Union in particular serves as an iconic monument to the University of Michigan as a whole and the interior quality should reflect the prestige of the exterior, and;

Whereas, University of Michigan recreational facilities such as the North Campus Recreation Building, the Central Campus Recreation Building, and the Intramural Sports Building provide stress relief and overall wellness for residents and students alike, and;

Whereas, the former stated buildings are in need of improvements in order to best serve future University students and residents, and;

Whereas, the University of Michigan has historically led the country’s colleges and universities in innovations of public spaces with the Union as the third union in the country in 1919 and the IM building as the first recreation only building in 1921, and;

Whereas, Building a Better Michigan is creating a campus-wide campaign to improve these facilities and bring Michigan back to being the Leaders and Best in Campus Recreational and Academic Spaces.

Therefore be it resolved that, Building a Better Michigan is an organization that will directly affect current and future residents of university housing by improving their daily lives on campus, and;

Therefore be it finally resolved that, the Residence Halls Association supports Building a Better Michigan in its endeavors to improve campus life for students and residents alike.

As approved by the Assembly;
And witnessed by the Chair.

Chair

31-0-1

Vote

11/15/12

Date