Rackham Student Government
Board Meeting: May 10, 2012
Agenda

I. Call To Order

II. Approval of Agenda

III. Approval of Previous Minutes * (p. 6)

IV. Officer Reports
   a. Graduate Student Body President, Michael
   b. Graduate Student Body Vice President, Kaitlin
   c. Graduate Student Body Treasurer, Alex (p. 5)

V. Executive Order EO-12-02: An Executive Order to Create the 2012 Bylaw Review Committee * (p. 16)

VI. RSG Logistics
   a. RSG Overview
   b. Representative & Executive Office Hours
   c. RSG Email List Usage
   d. Committees
      i. Membership * (p. 13)
      ii. Meeting times & locations

VII. Spring/Summer (Fall) 2012 Goal Setting Workshop * (p. 2)

VIII. Conflict Resolution and Academic Integrity * (p 29)

IX. Open Discussion

X. Adjournment

* - Item included in packet
** - Item will be provided on Day of Meeting or at Meeting
*** - Item was included in a previous packet
Rackham Student Government Spring/Summer/Fall 2012
Representative Goal Worksheet

**Academic Issues**

**Student Services Issues (non academic)**

**Local Issues**

**Social Events**

**State/Federal Issues**

**RSG Internal / Bylaws**

I will work with Committee ______________ to achieve ____________________.

I will work individually to achieve ________________________________.
Academic Issues
- G SRA issues, IP ownership
- **Bill of Rights**
- GPA issue (Ford school)
- Interlibrary loan efficiency
- Dispute Resolution Board to address student issues
- Ideas for non-traditional and international grad student funding
- PhD Candidate Courses
- Building Hours
- Masters Student Study Space

Local Issues
- PILOTs
- Status of Pfizer campus (NCRC)
- Town Halls for Political Candidatees
- More Political Activism (GOTV)

State/Federal Issues
- Grant and funding availability
- Cost of tuition, State bill with tuition coverage for Michigan students
- Decreased availability of loans
- **Taxing of stipends and loans**
- Support for non-traditional grad students
- Tuition

Student Services Issues (non academic)
- Housing: Northwood issues, closing of Lawyer’s club, West quad and Baits II
- **Increasing bussing** during peak hours (or longer hours overall)
- Airport shuttle for other times of year (work with CSG)
- Peer mentoring program, emphasis on non-trad or international students

Social Events
- **Detroit Lions!!**
- Grad student formal
- Red Wings!
- Event with local leaders (City and University)
- Earth Day
- Non-Traditional Careers
The RSG Board voted to commit the following issues to its listed committees

**Academic Affairs Committee**
- GSRA issues
- IP Ownership
- GPA Scale
- Interlibrary Loan Efficiency
- General Dispute Resolution Board
- PhD Candidate Courses
- Building Hours (academic)
- Masters student study space
- Associate Dean Advisory Panels

**Student Life Committee**
- GSRA Issues
- General Dispute Resolution Board
- Non-traditional and International student funding
- Housing: Northwood crunch, closing of the Lawyer’s club, west quad, baits 2, etc.
- Increasing bussing during peak hours (City and U of M)
- Airport Shuttle (AATA or U of M)
- Registering Graduate Student Organizations

**Community Outreach and Social Action Committee**
- Earth Day
- Non-Traditional Careers
- Peer Mentoring Program, emphasis on international and non-traditional students
- Associate Dean Advisory Panels (& Assistant Dean for International Education)

**Legislative Affairs Committee**
- Payments in lieu of Taxes (PILOTs) for U of M and Ann Arbor
- Status of NCRC
- Town Halls for local political candidates
- More Political Activism
- Grant and Funding Availability
- Cost of Tuition, State bill with tuition coverage for Michigan students
- Availability of Loans (subsidized and other)
- Taxation of Stipends
- Support for non-traditional graduate students (including international students)
- Tuition and Fees

---

1 Per Approved Board Resolution F-11-001: Creating Student Advisory Panels
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Allocated</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Life</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Skating at Yost Arena</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$1,059.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pistons vs Lakers NBA Game</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$740.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling at Colonial Lanes</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$1,156.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karaoke Night at Circus Bar</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valentine's Day Event</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$182.31</td>
<td>$182.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Patrick's Day Event</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$545.00</td>
<td>$545.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March Madness Contest Prizes</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinball Pete's Event</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pistons vs Orlando NBA Game</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$535.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$4,700.00</td>
<td>$4,570.04</td>
<td>$1,052.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COSAC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Education Outreach</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washtenaw area parks cleanup</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat for Humanity Huron Valley</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
<td>$230.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$375.00</td>
<td>$230.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Affairs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall Meetings</td>
<td>$760.00</td>
<td>$746.10</td>
<td>$746.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Academic Conference Prizes</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$1,160.00</td>
<td>$1,146.10</td>
<td>$746.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budgetary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Group Funding</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td>$5,361.00</td>
<td>$4,922.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td>$5,361.00</td>
<td>$4,922.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communications</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter Trivia Prizes</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSG Banner</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$230.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legislative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAGE Federal Lobbying</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>$2,703.44</td>
<td>$2,703.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Lobbying</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council Town Hall</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$3,700.00</td>
<td>$2,703.44</td>
<td>$2,703.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elections</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elections Director</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising/Prizes</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$600.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Administration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$91.17</td>
<td>$91.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary Funds</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$91.17</td>
<td>$91.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jorge Cham Event - Water Bottles</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial Balance Winter 2012</strong></td>
<td>$25,041.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Allocated Funds</td>
<td>$17,265.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Costs</td>
<td>$14,301.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Spent</td>
<td>$9,515.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Reserve Funds</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Balance</td>
<td>$15,526.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated Final Balance</td>
<td>$10,740.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Call to Order:** 6:34pm
   
   a. Present: Representatives Lauren Knapp, Heidi Pedini, Pat Rooney, Pete McGrath, Ben Curtiss-Lusher, Dan Trubman, Alex Emily, Andrew Crawford, Eli Eisman, Haven Allen, Chris Tom, President Michael Benson, and Vice President Kaitlin Flynn.
   
   b. Absent: Representatives Tien Huei-Hsu, Nina White, Alex Toulouse, and Marisol Ramos.

2. **Approval of Agenda:** Moved by Pete and seconded by Andrew. Approved unanimously.

3. **Approval of previous minutes:**
   
   
   b. April 5, 2012: 2 changes to be made. Approved with two abstentions.

4. **Public Hearing on Resolution W-12-01:** Resolution to expand the University’s Non-Discrimination Policy. No one is here for the public hearing so Michael closes the public hearing.

5. **Officer reports**
   
   a. **President Michael Benson:** this is our last meeting of the term. The new board will take office in the beginning of May.
   
   b. **Vice President Kaitlin Flynn:** motion to extend the budget of Academic affairs by $400 to account for $50 per student presentation award winner from UM from the GAC conference. MSU will cover the cost of $450 and we will put in $50 for $500 total prize to match UM and MSU presenter awards. Motion by Kaitlin and seconded by Alex E. Approved unanimously.
   
   c. **Treasurer Alex Toulouse:** exec report included in the packet. Two motions need to be made. For the town halls, the Academic Affairs committee went over budget by $60 for the purchase of drinks. Motion by Chris to increase the budget and seconded by Alex E. Heidi objects and expresses concern over not sticking to the budget, particularly for this town hall event. Eli explains that for the last town hall we had less students and money left over. It did happen to go over in this case. Approved 12-1. Additionally a motion to extend the student life budget for $1000 for the Pistons tickets that we thought were free but ended up not having the collaboration worked out properly with Rackham. Ben asks if the bus was included here and Michael says that we did charge people $5 to take the bus. Dan mentions that we
should have a write up on this issue so board members and constituents can follow discussion and the issues of increases. Michael responds that we will note this in the minutes and try to not have this issue in the future. Heidi asks about how we can fix issues like this, particularly with events that we co-sponsor with Rackham. Alex E mentions that we do struggle with Rackham events going over budget. Heidi asks how we can (perhaps through Michael) ensure that we’re clear on financial limits and expectations with Rackham. Michael agrees and says that he will work with Rackham on this. Dan mentions that this is the second time we’ve had to go to bat for Rackham just in this meeting and suggests that perhaps we write a contract or have a mode of recourse for these issues to stop this pattern. Roll call vote. Vote is halted to continue discussion. Michael describes the situation in more detail. If we vote no, Rackham would have to foot the bill. Ben asks if we could split the difference. Michael mentions that we are splitting the difference at this point. Pat asks about the costs of the busses. Haven asks specifically about the busses being paid for by Rackham and Michael indicates that he thought the event was free. Alex E says that it won’t happen again. Chris thinks that it’s better not to spoil our relationship with Rackham co-sponsoring events. Haven says that we need to not set a precedent where Rackham can push costs on us. Heidi says that this issue speaks to the fact that we are functioning over capacity and need to stick to our budgets. Michael says that the points being made are valid and we can work on fixing our structural issues with event planning and having everything in writing going forward with Rackham. Dan agrees with Heidi and also still feels that Rackham is still having us foot the bill. Lauren asks if the written agreements are going to be in the bylaws or how we can ensure accountability with the exec board. Michael will introduce an executive order. Andrew asks how this cost came about and Michael answers that it was a surprise. Chris says that there should be some degree of flexibility in our committee budgets expected based on how our board works. We begin to go around and discuss. Michael says that he directed Alex T to allocate a portion of the budget to allot for things that might arise. Pete would like to call to question. Haven has a few points: we should be responsible and try to spend under our budget and he also supports making a motion to increase our picnic budget but stick Rackham with this budget overage. Michael does not recognize this motion at this point. Lauren asks if we could be more conservative in our initial estimate about overages. Heidi says that we should be realistic about our current expectations and estimates. Pat asks where the money would come from. Michael answers that the money could come from the communications, elections and discretionary budget. In this case, we are coming close to coming even. Alex E mentions that we usually have a lower budget during spring and summer and by taking money out of the budget now so we can do more things over the summer. Andrew says that this is a case of rubbing elbows and that we shouldn’t directly try to damage the relationship we have with Rackham. Eli would like to know the percentage increase that RSG would see if we separate for CSG. Michael explains that we would get about a
400% increase. Eli would also like to continue to work with Rackham in the future. Dan would be in favor of allowing all committee chairs to have discretionary budgets. Additionally he mentions that he doesn’t like being bullied into funding events after they happen. Ben mentions that there was a miscommunication and this is on us and it is our responsibility to cover the cost of this successful event. Chris says that there are unallocated funds that might be of use. Kaitlin mentions that generally we require committees to come to the board with budget approval requests prior to spending the money. She also mentions that Michael and Natalie are both individuals with plenty on their plates and while it did slip through the cracks, it’s not like it was intentional. Dan mentions that we shouldn’t let committees run over continually and allow the chairs of the committees to have override for inevitable costs.

6. Guest Speaker: Dr. Laura Blake Jones, Dean of Students. Laura introduces herself and her background. She oversees student affairs offices such as UHS, CAPS, multiethnic student affairs, spectrum center, greek life, and others. She also oversees critical incidence work that happen with students. Laura notes that there are a large number of graduate students on campus and is working on two issues. The first issue is intentional work on safety on campus. Her office has created the Beyond the Diag program and hiring students to work as community organizers in many neighborhoods that students live in. The other big thing that is being worked on is a strategic wellness program for students. They’re trying to implement something like MHealthy that is here for faculty. The actualization of this is taking place soon.

a. Questions from the board: Lauren asks what the student affairs response was to the tornado in Dexter. Some students in SNRE were displaced by the tornado. Laura says that in that case, they tried to help those students by checking them into a hotel that night. Additionally they sent students out to the Red Cross shelter that was set up that night. Additionally, greek life students were organized to do cleanup. Chris mentions that the CAPS emergency services are pretty great but there is little available for students for long term preventative therapeutic services beyond being rerouted to the greater Ann Arbor community. Laura answers that CAPS services are designed for short term psychotherapy and that insurance matching does take place for students who are referred out. CAPS is designed for a maximum of 10 appointments. The funding model does not allow for long term care for students who need something of this sort. A 5 year plan by the provost was added to CAPS to address the short term needs of students. Heidi mentions that one of her colleagues went to a support group within CAPS and that Heidi went to see if that group could be reinstated and there was less interest in starting one. Heidi feels that it would be great if CAPS could reinstate this group for women in graduate school. Laura responds that certainly members of CAPS are capable and she will look into it. Heidi asks also about the support group that SAPAC organizes and asks if it is organized during the summer terms as well. Michael informs Laura about current issues that the board is working on, including the Graduate Student Bill of
Rights. Pete asks if there’s anything RSG can do to help Laura communicate resources from her office to graduate students. Kaitlin offers to put information into the newsletter for Laura. Alex E. says that we’ve been increasing the events we’ve been having but we don’t have have a connection with MSA as much so if Laura wants to, it would be great if she could communicate directly with us. Michael explains that MSA doesn’t particularly serve out constituents very well and that we’re interested in separating from the University Council in order to bring our student’s issues to the forefront of the minds of the administrators. Laura says that if there is a way to do this but also preserve some sort of overarching connection in order to not completely fragment the students. Michael mentions that Berkeley has a model that allows for this type of governance. Alex E says that we are here for different reasons and for instance it would be great if we could fund our student groups at a higher level for graduate student issues that MSA wouldn’t normally fund. Eli mentions that he thinks there is a limit to what our student government can provide for students to get out into the community and volunteer with our current budget limitations. Eli explains his interest in working with WISD and use our graduate student populace to work with the community. Laura asks if we’ve been collaborating with the Ginsberg center at all and Eli responds yes and we also have collaborators at the school of Education. Again, Eli highlights the issue of being limited by what we can offer students in terms of budget and resources. Heidi also mentions that we have been doing fundraising for these projects as well. Michael wraps up by mentioning some of the things the board is working on and how this will affect all students. Laura mentions that there are limited funds available through her office at the student affairs.

7. Executive Order W-12-02: codifying community input at RSG board meetings: Michael describes that this policy was put in place by previous RSG president Tiffany Tsang and Michael is modifying it slightly for the order to allow for members of the community beyond students to address our board. The order is in effect immediately with no board members overriding.

8. Board Resolution W-12-01: Resolution to expand the university’s non-discrimination policy. Michael asks for a motion that if ‘marital status’ is required by state law we would replace it back into the policy. Moved by Chris and seconded by Ben. Heidi asks if it would default back to the motion that we had discussed previously. Haven asks if we can go beyond what the state or federal law requires and in this case it would have to be an addition to the policy in this case. Haven would also like to divide the question. Dan suggests that we take out the possibly problematic language and hold off on approving this until the issue is clarified. Michael mentions that we can still take action on it after we vote on it. Discussion continues and we clarify again. Dan and Chris recall their motions. Michael asks for a motion to direct Michael to withhold his approval or rejection until this issue is resolved. Haven suggests perhaps bringing this to the board in the fall. Pete makes a motion to table this motion for 2 months because he feels like it’s taking too long. Chris says that the resolution was read and vetted by a lawyer. Heidi says that we as a board should approach a lawyer through the University. Michael has approached
the University legal council on behalf of the board. By a vote of 0-4-8 the motion to table for 2 months fails. Haven makes a motion to divide the question to vote on striking marital status and adding relationship status, and the second part would be to add sexual expression to the policy and the third part would be to vote on the resolve clauses. Second by Heidi. Approved with one opposed and two abstentions. Dan makes a motion to include both marital status and relationship status in the policy for various reasons as discussed last and this week and also to ensure that we will likely be in accordance with state policy. This is seconded by Chris. Haven comments that relationship status has more power than marital status and that we should combine the policies. Pat says that the whole point of including it is to ensure the state’s mandates will be followed. Chris says that he’d rather have this pass with both clauses than not at all. Ben clarifies that we would be putting marital status under the umbrella of relationship status. Heidi says that we shouldn’t forego legal advice as a board. Michael explains the rest of the process for putting this resolution through. Haven asks if we were to veto the motion how would the board override and the answer is a 2/3 majority. Heidi mentions that we shouldn’t push this through without hearing what the lawyers have to say. Dan mentions that if his motion passes we won’t have to worry about this issue. Chris says that this wouldn’t come into University policy until after legal review. On Dan’s motion: by a vote of 7-3-2 the motion carries. Michael determines that this is a non-substantive amendment. Pursuing to Haven’s motion, we will vote on the first issue of insertion of relationship status, then sexual expression, then the clauses. Roll call vote. Inserting relationship status, the vote carries with one abstention. The next vote, inserting sexual expression—Haven asks for clarification, Michael asks for a straw poll to continue debating and the motion fails. The vote on sexual expression is tied 5-5-2 and fails. Resolved clauses roll call vote. 10-0-2. Final vote on passage of the entire resolution.  

**Roll call vote. 9-1-2 the resolution is approved.** Chris votes no with rights and mentions that his main intention for putting forth this resolution was the sexual expression piece.

9. **Graduate Student Bill of Rights and Responsibilities:** the bill of rights is by no means complete but Michael asks for a motion to approve the basics of the bill of rights. Haven motions to add the new discrimination policy into the new GSBOR. Seconded by Ben. Approved with one abstention. Motion to endorse this as amended moved by Pete and seconded by Alex E. Approved with one abstention.

10. **Open Discussion:** Kaitlin comments that the psychological clinic has a lot of resources for mental health and students on campus and it’s in East Hall. Chris asks about the graduate student formal. Ben thanks Chris for his hard work on the motion. Dan says that he has had a good time on the board and has really enjoyed working with all of us and learned a lot. Eli mentions that he is also supportive of Chris’s hard work. Andrew makes some points about Chris’s resolution on the sexual expression and relationship status piece. Andrew says that he also enjoyed the board and has some issues regarding the lack of groups for white men on campus. Alex E clarifies some updates about the student formal. This is Pat’s last meeting and his only regret is that he wasn’t able to get involved more. Heidi comments to Andrew that she works with WISE and they are not allowed to turn away men. Also she says that sexual expression has seemed like an inflammatory
term to her constituents so that's why she voted against it. Lauren says that she is interested in getting together and discussing some of the budget issues we discussed tonight. Haven asks about division specific email lists. Michael says they’re coming soon. Haven says that he doesn’t feel that $8 student fees are very high. Finally Haven says that some of his constituents were concerned that there might not be an actual problem and by adding this into the clause. Pete moves to adjourn which is not recognized by Michael. Michael gives wrap up comments. Michael mentions how far the board has come since he joined and encourages further participation. Finally, Michael notes that the Rackham exec board has voted to lift the ban on continuous enrollment and that the RSG Board will take the issue up in the spring and summer months.

11. Adjourned at 9:26pm.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Uniqname</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Election</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eli</td>
<td>Eisman</td>
<td>eleisman</td>
<td>Chemical Biology</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>ctchem</td>
<td>Chemical Biology</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauren</td>
<td>Knapp</td>
<td>knlauren</td>
<td>SNRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Waugh</td>
<td>mwaugh</td>
<td>Chemical Biology</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandra</td>
<td>Emly</td>
<td>aemly</td>
<td>Chemical Biology</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon</td>
<td>Erickson</td>
<td>bmse</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td>awags</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Crawford</td>
<td>mccarten</td>
<td>Chemical Biology</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>Alvey</td>
<td>pedini</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>Belak</td>
<td>aabelak</td>
<td>Materials Science</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernando</td>
<td>Orvananos</td>
<td>orvanano</td>
<td>Material Science</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evan</td>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td>evanarth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Winter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haven</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>haven</td>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Curtiss-Lusher</td>
<td>benlush</td>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Trubman</td>
<td>dtrubman</td>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanessa</td>
<td>Cruz</td>
<td>vcj</td>
<td>Education &amp; Political Science</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Filter</td>
<td>mfilter</td>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>McGrath</td>
<td>pcmcg</td>
<td>Urban Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Winter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Benson</td>
<td>mbenson</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Winter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexis</td>
<td>Toulouse</td>
<td>atlouse</td>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Applied Physics</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaitlin</td>
<td>Flynn</td>
<td>kjflyn</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Microbiology/Immunology</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Winter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rackham Student Government Spring/Summer 2012
Representative Committee Slate

**Academic Affairs**
1. Eli Benchell Eisman (I)
2. Chris Tom (I)
3. Anna Belak (II)
4. Pete McGrath (IV)
5. Andrew Crawford (II)
6. Haven Allen (III)
Michael Benson
Kaitlin Flynn
Alex Toulouse

**Student Life**
1. Christopher Tom (I)
2. Alex Emly (II)
3. Matt Waugh (I)
4. Anna Wagner (II)
5. Bernando Orvananos (II)
6. Heidi Alvey (II)
Kaitlin Flynn
Alex Toulouse

**Budgetary**
Alex Toulouse (Chair)
1. Brandon Erickson (II)
2. Lauren Knapp (I)
3. Vanessa Cruz (III)
4. Matthew Filter (III)
5. Alex Emly (II)
Michael Benson
Kaitlin Flynn

**Community Outreach and Social Action**
1. Eli Benchell Eisman (I)
2. Vanessa Cruz (III)
3. Alex Emly (II)
4. Peter McGrath (IV)
5. Andrew Crawford (II)
Michael Benson
Kaitlin Flynn
Alex Toulouse

**Legislative Affairs**
Michael Benson (Chair)
1. Lauren Knapp (I)
2. Chris Tom (I)
3. Anna Belak (II)
4. Brandon Erickson (II)
5. Matthew Filter (III)
6. Ben Curtiss-Lusher (III)
7. Daniel Trubman (III)
Kaitlin Flynn
Alex Toulouse
AN EXECUTIVE ORDER CODIFYING COMMUNITY INPUT AT RSG BOARD MEETINGS

WHEREAS, The Rackham Student Government (RSG) Board has allowed members of the University of Michigan community to address its Board at the beginning of its weekly meetings subject to availability as specified by the chair; AND

WHEREAS, The RSG President serves as the chair of the Board and as Chief Executive Officer of the graduate student body; AND

WHEREAS, The RSG Bylaws do not specify a procedure for members of the University community to request to be added to the Board’s agenda; AND

WHEREAS, President Tsang instituted the process that has been followed without renewal since the Winter 2009 semester”; NOW THEREFORE I, MICHAEL L. BENSON, AS THE DULY ELECTED PRESIDENT OF THE RACKHAM STUDENT GOVERNMENT AND BY THE POWER VESTED IN ME BY THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STUDENT BODY OF THE ANN ARBOR CAMPUS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN AND THE BYLAWS OF THE RACKHAM STUDENT GOVERNMENT DO HEREBY ORDER THE FOLLOWING:

Section 1. That this order may be referenced as the RSG BOARD COMMUNITY INPUT PROCEUDRES.

Section 2. Any member of the University of Michigan is welcome to address the RSG Board at a regularly scheduled meetings provided that:

A. The requesting individual or group emails the RSG President (rsg-president@umich.edu) by 5 PM at least 2 days preceding the meeting time asking to be slotted.

B. The student or student group emails a hard copy of any handouts AND a brief summary of what they are going to speak about with their request. The RSG President will forward this to the Board for review prior to the meeting.
C. The student or student group will be limited to 5-minutes speaking and up to a 5-minute Question and Answer period with members of the RSG Board asking the student or student group questions.

D. The requesting individual or group requesting to address the Board will adhere to the rules of decorum as specified by the President during his/her/their time before the Board.

Section 3. Presidential Slotting of requests to address the Board. The President will consider the state of the RSG Board’s agenda as well as the time constraints of any invited speakers, in determining when to slate individuals or groups that meet the criteria specified in section 2 of this order. Should an agenda be full, the President will work with the requesting party to find a slot at a future RSG Board meeting.

Section 4. Term. This order shall remain in effect until such time as the RSG Board adopts an amendment to its bylaws that directly addresses community input at its meetings or until superseded by a future executive order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

______________________________
Michael L. Benson
President, Rackham Student Government
AN EXECUTIVE ORDER CREATING THE RSG 2012 BYLAW REVIEW COMMITTEE

2 WHEREAS, The Rackham Student Government (RSG) Board has traditionally reviewed and amended its bylaws annually during the spring and summer months; AND

4 WHEREAS, The RSG Vice President serves as the chief operating officer of the graduate student body as well as the parliamentarian of the RSG Board; AND

6 WHEREAS, Article 1, section D of the RSG bylaws (BYLAWS) defines the process by which the Board may amend its operating procedures and bylaws; AND

WHEREAS, Article 4, section A, subsection 1i explicitly grants the president the power to “create, charge, and oversee Ad-Hoc committees for special projects and interests”; NOW THEREFORE I, MICHAEL L. BENSON, AS THE DULY ELECTED PRESIDENT OF THE RACKHAM STUDENT GOVERNMENT AND BY THE POWER VESTED IN ME BY THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STUDENT BODY OF THE ANN ARBOR CAMPUS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN AND THE BYLAWS OF THE RACKHAM STUDENT GOVERNMENT DO HEREBY ORDER THE FOLLOWING:

Section 1. That a bylaw review committee (BRC) be created, effective immediately.

Section 2. That the BRC’s composition, leadership, charge, and operating procedure shall comply with the RSG bylaws as well as section 3 of this order.

Section 3. BYLAW REVIEW COMMITTEE

A. Composition. The BRC shall be composed of a minimum of no less than four (4) members of the RSG Board, including the Vice President who shall serve as the chair of this committee. Any member of the Board may join the BRC and shall have voting rights, subject to the conditions outlined in subsection C.

B. Quorum. A quorum shall exist when half plus one of the committee members are present as determined by the chair.
C. Voting Rights. All members of the Rackham student body are eligible to vote on this committee. Voting rights may be obtained and retained at any point in time, following the committee’s formation by:

1) Notifying the chair of their intent to serve on the committee.

2) Attending a minimum of 60% of the committee meetings and discussions.

After meeting both requirements listed above, a member of the student body shall have voting rights on the BRC. Maintenance of voting rights shall be pursuant on continued compliance with the requirements listed above.

D. Committee Operations. The BRC shall meet bi-weekly. Votes to approve recommendations and to send a final recommendation package to the Board must be taken in person with a quorum present. Committee discussions may take place electronically so as to allow for maximum participation including representatives and students at-large that are not in the Ann Arbor area.

E. Charge. The BRC shall review all aspects of the RSG bylaws and will, by August 16, 2011 present to the Board a set of recommended amendments. The committee’s review should focus on RSG’s interactions with the student body, including but not limited to RSG’s financial structure, RSG’s elections and apportionment systems, RSG’s external communications strategy, the RSG Board’s composition, and RSG’s use of the Constitution of the Student Body of the Ann Arbor Campus of the University of Michigan.

F. Reports. The BRC will submit regular reports to the Board on its progress and will seek feedback from the same. The Vice President is tasked with ensuring regular input on the BRC’s activities is gathered from the Board.

G. Modification. The committee may, by a simple majority vote recommend an extension of its timeline or an expansion of its charge to the President. An amendment to this order shall not be necessary to affect either such change as a memorandum from the president to the chair shall suffice. Further, the Board may, by a simple majority vote extend the timeline for the BRC up to the end of the 2012 calendar year. Any motion to extend the timeline of the board must include a new dissolution date.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

____________________________________
Michael L. Benson
President, Rackham Student Government
University of Michigan Rackham Student Government

End of Semester Committee Report

Committee Name: Academic Affairs Committee

Date: 4/20/12

Committee Chair/Co-chairs: Chris Tom and Tien-Huei Hsu

Names of committee members:
Chris Tom, Tien-Huei Hsu, Eli Benchell Eisman, Michael Benson, Kaitlyn Flynn, Andrew Crawford

What events or projects did this committee host or complete this semester?
We completed the Town Hall/Lunch with the Deans, the Graduate Academic Conference at MSU. Additionally, we got the Graduate Student Bill of Rights and Resolution W-01-12 out of committee and to the Board, set up a meeting between GEO-SAGU.

What events or projects are currently in progress for the committee? Status of each outstanding item?
Academic Advisory Panels for the Assistant Deans (waiting for summer), the Conflict Resolution Board (waiting until summer), a flowchart/handout for conflict resolution (working on the rough copy).

Did the committee stick to its budget? Why/why not?
We went over the budget for the town hall due to the increased attendance and registration! Also, I believe the bus to MSU wasn’t included in our budget initially, so we went over that.

Approximately how many graduate students did the committee’s events impact/recruit/sponsor?
Town Halls: 60+
MSU-GAC: ~60 (UMich students)

Did the committee accomplish its goals for this semester? Why/why not?
We didn’t move everything off our plate, but we accomplished most of the goals we set out to, as well as dealing with issues and student requests as they came up.

What are the committee’s goals for the next semester? Next year?
This summer’s focus will primarily be conflict resolution, with the hope to have something in place for when the new class arrives. We will also help implement the GSBoR.
University of Michigan Rackham Student Government

End of Semester Committee Report

Committee Name: Budgetary Committee (BC)

Date: 4/21/12

Committee Chair/Co-chairs: Alexis Toulouse

Names of committee members: Marisol Ramos, Patrick Rooney, Eli Eisman, Lauren Knapp, Dan Trubman, Michael Benson, Kaitlin Flynn, Alex Toulouse

What events or projects did this committee host or complete this semester?

The BC reviewed 13 funding requests this semester. Meetings were held electronically for requests under $700, and a number of meetings were held with groups submitting requests for larger amounts, from which recommendations were made to the full board to vote on.

What events or projects are currently in progress for the committee? Status of each outstanding item?

There is a discussion in progress on how best to update the budgetary committee’s role as well as the funding process and guidelines. This will eventually be taken on by the Bylaw Review Committee.

Did the committee stick to its budget? Why/why not?

The BC did stick to its budget. It allocated $5361 of its $6000 budget. It also reimbursed $1332 of funds that were allocated for 4 events in the Fall 2011 semester. To date it has reimbursed a total of $4922.47 this term.

Approximately how many graduate students did the committee’s events impact/recruit/sponsor?

Without accounting for double counting, the events involved approximately 1000 Rackham students.

Did the committee accomplish its goals for this semester? Why/why not?

The committee did accomplish its goals, by allocating most of its funding to student groups.

What are the committee’s goals for the next semester? Next year?

The goal will remain to spend all of the funds allocated to student groups each term.
University of Michigan Rackham Student Government
End of Semester Committee Report

Committee Name: Community Outreach and Social Action (COSAC)

Date: 19, April 2012

Committee Chair/Co-chairs: Eli Benchell Eisman

Names of committee members: Heidi Alvey, Michael Benson Alex Emly, Kaitlin Flynn Tien-Huei Hsu, Pete McGrath, Marisol Ramos, Nina White

What events or projects did this committee host or complete this semester? This semester saw the participation and execution of three major events. Working with the Ross School of Business Social Outreach Group, COSAC brought 28 graduate students to plant trees with Greening of Detroit in this year’s Detroit Partnership DP Day. COSAC also planned and hosted a graduate student bar night at Rick’s American Café raising $540 in support of our upcoming Habitat for Humanity Huron Valley build day.

What events or projects are currently in progress for the committee? Status of each outstanding item?

In the short term, COSAC has been in contact with our DP Day hosts, Greening of Detroit, for a regularly scheduled (i.e. semesterly) event. Continuing in the trend of environmental stewardship, Alex Emly has been working diligently on a co-SLC/COSAC beach clean up event for the summer, likely in July.

Additional events include a Humane Society work day, though dates and work details may make planning such an event unattractive to students. Coordinating a monthly work day at Food Gatherers or with The Shelter Association are also ongoing.

Did the committee stick to its budget? Why/why not?

COSAC’s budget was $450 for the semester, allocated equally for 3 events. None of those specific events took place (the budget for FS11 was mistakenly resubmitted), and thus none of those funds were disbursed. The upcoming H4H build day, not in this budget, will cost approximately $100 for food for the participants.

Approximately how many graduate students did the committee’s events impact/recruit/sponsor?

Earlier events saw moderate participation, with numbers in the low teens. The bar night and H4H build day have generated considerably more interest at 106 and 31 participants, respectively, and from across all four Rackham divisions.
Did the committee accomplish its goals for this semester? Why/why not?

An enthusiastic YES! This past year was a pilot for generating a volunteer presence within RSG. We reached our goals of two major events and adoption of COSAC as a permanent committee.

What are the committee’s goals for the next semester? Next year?

Monthly volunteer events, scheduled two-four months in advance, for approximately 25-50 students. Working with the SLC, we envision an incentivize program to encourage more participation. An example of such a collaboration would be a COSAC event in the afternoon (A2 Parks and Rec Huron River Clean Up), followed by dinner (pizza) for the participants paid for by RSG at a location (Dominick’s) that has previously been designated for an SLC event. In this scenario, the COSAC event would run from 12p-5p with dinner from 5p-7p, followed by the SLC event from 7p-close.
University of Michigan Rackham Student Government
End of Semester Committee Report

Committee Name: Elections Committee (EC)

Date: 4/21/12

Committee Chair/Co-chairs: Alexis Toulouse

Names of committee members:

What events or projects did this committee host or complete this semester?
The EC ran a campus wide online election for RSG representatives and executives as well as an email based advertising campaign for the elections.

What events or projects are currently in progress for the committee? Status of each outstanding item?
There is a discussion in progress on how best to update the election committee’s role as well as the election process and guidelines. This will eventually be taken on by the Bylaw Review Committee.

Did the committee stick to its budget? Why/why not?
The EC was under budget, spending no money, because an outside elections director was not hired and no prizes were given out.

Approximately how many graduate students did the committee’s events impact/recruit/sponsor?
The entire student body received emails and was eligible to vote. Of the approximately 8000 Rackham students, 478 voted in the President/Vice-President election and 582 in the divisional elections.

Did the committee accomplish its goals for this semester? Why/why not?
The committee did accomplish its goals in that the elections took place with a President/Vice-President being elected as well as number of new representatives.

What are the committee’s goals for the next semester? Next year?
The goals will be to increase voter turnout with better advertised elections and hopefully a new elections timeline will be drafted and followed accordingly.
University of Michigan Rackham Student Government

End of Semester Committee Report

Committee Name: Legislative Affairs Committee

Date: May 9, 2012

Committee Chair/Co-chairs: Michael Benson, Chairman

Names of committee members: Representatives: Haven Allen, Chris Tom, Ben Curtiss-Lusher, Lauren Knapp, Andrew Crawford, and Student At Large Christine Andres (vice-chair).

What events or projects did this committee host or complete this semester?

The committee mainly focused its efforts at the federal and local levels this past semester, culminating in our sending a five member delegation to Washington, DC for the SAGE spring conference and Days on the Hill. Additionally, the committee has been involved in planning a set of fora for both graduate and undergraduate students relating to the City of Ann Arbor’s lease signing ordinance and the tenant bill of rights. The committee has also stayed abreast of activities in Lansing, including the passage of a bill designed to restrict Graduate Student Research Assistants from forming a union. President Benson attended hearings on this matter and testified on behalf of the student body.

What events or projects are currently in progress for the committee? Status of each outstanding item?

Local level

- Lease Signing Ordinance – Forums will take place in the fall. Ongoing discussions with City Councilmember Jane Lumm regarding our direction on this initiative.
- Tenants bill of rights – Initiating discussions on how to modify.
- Fire Safety – Ongoing discussion about improving fire prevention services to the University
- Public Safety – Ongoing discussions with the Student Safety Work Group and the City on this topic.
- Meet and Greet – On hold until the Fall
- Candidates’ Forum – On hold until the Spring/Summer (in time for the August Primary)

State Level

- MSU – Wayne State – Michigan Joint lobbying: On hold
- Graduate Students testifying before the legislature: Ongoing. Will happen more in the coming fall semester.

**Federal Level**

- Support the SAGE coalition – ongoing
- Host the SAGE Fall Summit – Preparations are underway
- Host CFPB Town Hall – On hold until the Fall

**Did the committee stick to its budget? Why/why not?**

Yes, we were even under budget. The committee did not have the person-power to host the meet-and-greet with city and University officials this past semester which saved us money. In addition, travel costs associated with travel to/from the state capitol were mitigated by ride-sharing. As such, while the committee spent nearly $6,000 overall, the majority of that was spent on the federal level and includes a $3,000 grant from the graduate school to assist in sending a delegation to Washington, DC.

**Approximately how many graduate students did the committee’s events impact/recruit/sponsor?**

Over 200,000 nationwide as well as all Rackham students and all professional students at the University of Michigan.

**Did the committee accomplish its goals for this semester? Why/why not?**

The committee accomplished its goals at the federal level in that it researched a number of initiatives and bills and worked with the SAGE coalition to formulate their white papers. At all levels, there are on-going projects and activities that will serve the student body going forward, including hosting the SAGE fall summit in the Fall semester.

**What are the committee’s goals for the next semester? Next year?**

The committee’s goals are the same as for the previous year, with the exception that we will also be hosting the SAGE Fall Summit in October and possibly a Big Ten graduate student leaders gathering the following Winter.
University of Michigan Rackham Student Government

End of Semester Committee Report

Committee Name: Student Life Committee

Date: April 16, 2012

Committee Chair/Co-chairs: Alex Emly (Chair), Anna Wagner (Vice-Chair)

Names of committee members: Patrick Rooney, Heidi Alvey, Pete McGrath, Chris Tom

Italicized items denote co-sponsorship with Rackham

What events or projects did this committee host or complete this semester?

January: Red Wings Game (no cost for us, we just sold tickets through Rackham)
Karoake Night at Circus

February: Valentine’s Day Bar Night
Ice Skating at Yost Arena

March: COSAC combined Rick’s Fundraiser
St Patrick’s Day Bar Night with TShirt giveaway, Bowling

April: Pistons games

What events or projects are currently in progress for the committee? Status of each outstanding item?

Bar Night for the end of the semester
Tango Lesson with the Michigan Argentine Tango Club
Beach Cleanup combined with COSAC

Summer Ice Cream Social
Summer Cedar Point
Fall Picnic
Summer Tigers Game

Did the committee stick to its budget? Why/why not?
Kinda – We had unexpected costs from miscommunication with Rackham. We had to pay for Pistons tickets we thought were paid for last semester, and we had to pay for transportation to Detroit for another Pistons game which we also did not know until after the fact. For the planned events, we were within budget or under 10% over budget.

**Approximately how many graduate students did the committee’s events impact/recruit/sponsor?**

Karaoke: ???

Ice Skating: 500

Bowling: ??? Probably that many...

St Patrick’s Day Bar Night: 400

Valentine's Day Bar Night: 200

Free Piston's Game : 250

Rick’s COSAC Combined Event : 100

**Did the committee accomplish its goals for this semester? Why/why not?**

Almost – we wanted to have two events a month, and we just fell short in April, mainly due to the semester ending halfway in the month since classes end on the 17th. Most every committee member helped plan an event in some way, which was also a goal.

**What are the committee’s goals for the next semester? Next year?**

Find more family-friendly cheap events, since these tend to cost the most. Create a more balanced budget. Continue to plan two events per month.
A RESOLUTION CREATING STUDENT ADVISORY COMMITTEES FOR THE RACKHAM ASSOCIATE DEANS

WHEREAS, The Rackham Student Government (RSG) serves as the conduit between the graduate student body and the university at large, including the Horace H. Rackham School of Graduate Students; AND

WHEREAS, RSG recently hosted a set of four lunches with the deans for the student body; AND

WHEREAS, It became apparent during these lunches that regular contact between Rackham’s associate deans for programs and initiatives and students in their divisions would be mutually beneficial; AND

WHEREAS, RSG appoints graduate students to a number of school and university wide committees and workgroup; AND

WHEREAS, The associate deans for programs and initiatives have each voiced support for the creation of a student advisory panel; NOW ON BEHALF OF THE STUDENT BODY OF THE HORACE H. RACKHAM GRADUATE SCHOOL, BE IT

RESOLVED, That a student advisory committee for the associate dean be created for each of the Rackham Graduate School’s four associate deans; AND BE IT FURTHER

RESOLVED, That each associate dean shall serve as the chairperson of his or her advisory committee; AND BE IT FURTHER

RESOLVED, That each committee shall meet at least once in the Fall semester and once in the Winter semester, at times and locations determined by the chair; AND BE IT FURTHER

RESOLVED, That the membership of the advisory boards shall be appointed by the RSG Board for a term of one year; AND BE IT FURTHER

RESOLVED, That the chair of each committee may appoint additional members to the committee for a specified term; AND BE IT FURTHER
RESOLVED, That the size of each committee will be determined by the chair and communicated to the RSG Board on an annual basis; AND BE IT FURTHER

RESOLVED, That vacancies will be filled by the RSG Board under the advice of appropriate advisory committee’s chair; AND BE IT FINALLY

RESOLVED, That the chair of each advisory committee or their designee will transmit to board a report of his or her committee’s discussion on or before the last day of the fall and winter terms.

AUTHORS

Tien-Huei Tsu
Representative, Division 1
Chair, Academic Affairs Committee

Eli Benchell Eisman
Representative, Division 1

ATTEST

By Signing below, I certify the this resolution was dispatched by the RSG Board under the rules as prescribed in section IX of the bylaws and that the vote count appearing at the top of this resolution is accurate.

Joshua Bow
Vice President, Rackham Student Government

PRESIDENTIAL ACTION

I, Michael Benson, President of the Rackham Student Body, do hereby approve / veto this resolution on this the _______ day of _____, 2011.

Michael L. Benson
President, Rackham Student Government
Appendix B

Policy Statement on Academic and Professional Integrity and Procedures for Investigating Allegations of Academic and Professional Misconduct

Approved by the Rackham Executive Board
March 7, 2001
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This policy statement has been written to affirm and clarify the general obligation of all Rackham students to maintain high standards of academic and professional integrity. It defines some of the serious offenses of academic misconduct and outlines, in general terms, the standards to which Rackham students are held relative to professional conduct.

I. Policy Statement on Academic and Professional Integrity

The Roles and Responsibilities of Graduate Students
A clear sense of academic honesty and responsibility is fundamental to our scholarly community. To that end, the University of Michigan expects its students to demonstrate honesty and integrity in all their academic activities. However, students pursuing graduate education are being educated not only in a substantive field of inquiry but also in a profession. Although there are many common values, specific standards required of professionals vary by discipline, and this policy document has been written with respect for those differences.

As professionals in training, graduate students assume various roles, depending on the academic program. These include the roles of scholar, researcher, teacher, supervisor of employees, representative to the public of (the University, the discipline and/or the profession), and professional colleague and even the role of provider of services to clients. Therefore, students are responsible for maintaining high standards of conduct while engaged in coursework, research, dissertation or thesis preparation, and other activities related to academics and their profession. Because students take on multiple roles in multiple settings, some types of conduct are both academic and professional in nature—hence, the inclusive nature of this policy.

Graduate training, like future professional life, includes demands that might tempt some students to violate integrity standards. There are pressures on graduate students to achieve high grades, obtain financial support, meet research or publication deadlines, gain recognition from the scholarly community, and secure employment. Although faculty members can help students to maintain academic integrity despite these pressures, each student has final responsibility for maintaining integrity in his or her individual conduct.

Finally, conduct that violates the ethical or legal standards of the University community or of one's program or field of specialization may result in serious consequences, including immediate
disciplinary action and future professional disrepute. In support of the Graduate School’s commitment to maintain high standards of integrity, this policy makes provisions for bringing forward and hearing cases of academic and professional misconduct.

The Role of the Graduate Faculty and Others in the University Community

The graduate faculty are accountable for maintaining high standards of academic and professional integrity and for serving as models in this regard. Many of the same policies and codes of conduct that apply to students also apply to faculty (see section II.B.2 below).

Since each of the roles played by a graduate student carries with it some measure of public trust, the awarding of a graduate degree confers on its recipients some assurance of the individual’s suitability to bear that trust. Therefore, faculty and administrators associated with students’ education, both at the unit and central levels of the University, must hold students accountable according to these standards. Toward this end and taking into account the pressures on students that may lead to misconduct, faculty members are responsible for educating and mentoring students on matters of integrity and for monitoring students’ actions in this regard. Attention to matters of integrity should be given in both courses and research settings. Such guidance is particularly important for students as they assume independent roles as course assistants or begin to conduct their own original work. Traits that should be fostered are those that are common to all scholarship and also those that are unique to a particular discipline.

II. Forms of Academic and Professional Misconduct

A. Forms of Academic Misconduct

Offenses against the standards of academic integrity include the following. More detailed information about these offenses is available in Addendum A of this document.

1. Cheating
2. Plagiarism and other misappropriation of the work of another
3. Falsification of data
4. Improperly obtaining or representing laboratory or field data
5. Dishonesty in publication
6. Publication or attempted publication of collaborative work without the permission of the other participants
7. Abuse of confidentiality
8. Misuse of computer facilities
9. Misuse of human subjects
10. Misuse of vertebrate animals
11. Illegally or carelessly obtaining or using dangerous substances, or providing such substances to others
12. Falsification or unauthorized modification of an academic record
13. Obstruction of the academic activities of another
14. Other forms of academic misconduct that are commonly accepted within the scientific community
15. Aiding or abetting academic misconduct
16. Attempted academic misconduct

B. Forms of Professional Misconduct

Professional misconduct is behavior that is inconsistent with ethical standards in any of the professional roles for which the student is being trained that is not covered by policies governing academic integrity. This may include the student’s performance in the role of researcher or scholar, teacher or mentor, supervisor, service-provider or colleague. Of particular note in this regard are behaviors that make the workplace hostile for colleagues, supervisors or subordinates. Graduate students are expected to adhere to ethical standards in a variety of work settings (e.g., offices, classrooms, and laboratories) within the explicit standards set by University policies. Being physically or verbally threatening, disruptive, abusive or hostile can make the workplace so unsafe or unpleasant that others cannot do their work. However, graduate education must take place in an environment in which free expression, free inquiry, intellectual honesty, and respect for the rights and dignity of others can be expected. Ethical standards of conduct should help ensure, not compromise, these features of the University environment.

Sources of the norms or standards to which graduate students can be held accountable (and charged under this policy if they fail to adhere to them) are as follows:

1. **State and Federal Laws**: Graduate students, like all members of the University community, are expected to abide by all State and Federal laws.

2. **Relevant University-Wide Policy Statements**: Graduate students are responsible for being familiar with and are held accountable to the formal norms or standards that are identified in University-wide policy statements and that apply to them, including the following. Please note that with the exception of the two policies that are specific to students (the final two policies on the list below), these standards apply to faculty as well as to graduate students.

   * the Sexual Harassment Policy for Faculty and Staff (Office of Human Resources and Affirmative Action);
• the Regents' Bylaw on Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action;

• the Policy Statement on the Integrity of Scholarship and Procedures for Investigating Allegations of Misconduct in the Pursuit of Scholarship and Research, which applies to all instructional faculties and others in the institution as specified in the document;

• the Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities; and

• the Student Policy on Alcohol and Other Drugs

The text of these policies can be found on the Rackham website on-line version of The Guide to Campus and Community for Graduate and Professional Students at http://www.rackham.umich.edu/StudentInfo/Publications/rounding/contents.html (see University Policies Affecting Students). See also the Office of the Vice President for Research's site on policies and research responsibility: http://www.research.umich.edu/research/policies/policies.html#UM.

3. Discipline-Specific Professional Standards of Conduct or Codes of Ethics: Graduate students are expected to meet professional standards of conduct associated with their own disciplines and/or professions as articulated in formal codes of ethics. Such formal codes can include but are not limited to codes of professional conduct or statements on professional behavior that have been adopted by the student's department, program, school or college, as well as codes of ethics published by professional associations. Departments and graduate students share responsibility in this regard. Departments should make such policies available to their graduate students, and, in turn, students should take the initiative to familiarize themselves with such codes of conduct or ethics.

4. Additional Forms of Professional Misconduct: In addition, graduate students can be held accountable for the following professionally relevant behaviors, which may or may not be identified as violations in other formal codes of conduct relevant to the student. With respect to the following behaviors, the appropriate academic leadership (e.g., dean or department chair), in consultation with department faculty, serves as the authority for whether a specific student behavior warrants review under this policy.

a. Misrepresentation of one's credentials or status, or failure to correct others' inaccuracies or misrepresentation of one's credentials. This includes professional experience, paid or unpaid, including positions held, and relevant timeframes and dates (e.g., the timeframe in which a professional position was held, or the date on which a degree was earned).

b. Unethical consulting activity, including misrepresentation of one's status, credentials, or level of expertise to secure a consulting assignment; and knowingly taking on a consulting assignment without the necessary knowledge or expertise. (Consultation should only be provided by individuals who have demonstrated knowledge, expertise, and competence related to the consultation. To avoid problems in this regard, graduate students are strongly encouraged to seek the advice of their faculty advisors or other appropriate members of the faculty before taking on a consulting assignment.)

c. Unethical professional practice based on conflict of interest. This includes engaging in unethical professional behaviors to promote, benefit or protect one's self, family, friends, or business colleagues; and exploiting personal knowledge about an individual (e.g., personal life as well as political and religious views).

d. Deliberate failure to protect confidential records, in accordance with relevant professional standards.

e. Abuse of the peer review process. This includes the following: 1) simultaneous submission of a manuscript to more than one journal without approval from the respective editors, 2) submission of previously published material without clarifying the extent of the previously published material to the editor, 3) submitting a manuscript without the permission/agreement of all authors, 4) judging a peer's work on other than professional grounds, 5) judging a peer's work unfairly or in an uninformed way, 6) serving as a peer reviewer despite conflict of interest (e.g., having a personal relationship with the author) or otherwise being knowingly unable to judge the merits of scholarly work without prejudice, and 7) trying to unduly influence a colleague's review of one's own work.

f. Other fraudulent behavior. This includes actions, taken individually or with other people, that the appropriate dean believes to call into question the student's ability to ethically and competently join the profession. Specific examples include knowingly providing false information in one's professional role, embezzling funds, and misusing department or school resources.

g. Aiding or abetting professional misconduct. Aiding or abetting any individual in the violation of any of the categories of professional misconduct outlined above shall itself be considered misconduct.

h. Attempted professional misconduct. An attempt to commit professional misconduct may be treated as seriously as the completed act.

Other violations of State or Federal laws or University policies, brought to the attention of the Graduate School that are not explicitly mentioned in the policies and standards of conduct mentioned above but which appear to merit review under this policy will be evaluated on a case by case basis.
III. Procedures for Reporting and Investigating Allegations of Academic and Professional Misconduct by Graduate Students

A. Basic Guidelines for Handling Allegations of Academic and Professional Misconduct

1. To Whom These Procedures Apply
These procedures are applicable anytime a person in any of the following categories is accused of misconduct: currently enrolled in a Rackham program, previously enrolled in a Rackham program, currently enrolled in a Rackham course, previously enrolled in a Rackham course, or completed a degree from a Rackham program. In addition, this policy shall remain applicable to formerly enrolled students with respect to incidents that occurred when the person was a student.

Rackham is also willing to make these procedures available to academic units in the University that administer graduate programs outside the Rackham Graduate School. Such programs may make standing arrangements for all such charges to be handled through Rackham’s procedures, or may request use of the Rackham procedures on a case-by-case basis.

2. Timeliness and Confidentiality
Every effort will be made to proceed through each step of the grievance procedure and the process as a whole in a timely fashion. If the procedure must take place during the spring and/or summer months, this time frame may need to be extended, at the discretion of the Rackham Resolution Officer. Great care will be taken to handle allegations of misconduct confidentially, providing information only to those with a need to know consistent with their official responsibilities.

3. Deciding Which Procedures to Use
For any given case of alleged misconduct, more than one University procedure for handling such allegations may be applicable. Should the question arise as to which set of procedures is most appropriate, the University shall decide, in consultation with the Office of the Vice President and General Counsel and appropriate University faculty and staff.

Any academic unit at the University may develop procedures for formally investigating cases of academic misconduct that appear to be serious in nature. To ensure that such procedures incorporate due process and follow certain guidelines, they should be developed with appropriate guidance such as that available from the Rackham Resolution Officer and in consultation with the Office of the Vice President and General Counsel.

4. Reporting Allegations
Members of the University community as well as persons outside the University may report allegations of academic or professional misconduct by graduate students by contacting the Rackham Resolution Officer. Regardless of their source, allegations should be submitted in writing, whether by the source of the allegations or a third party, as soon as possible after the discovery of the alleged misconduct.

Likewise, any administrative or judicial body within the University that receives allegations of misconduct covered by this policy should bring them to the attention of the Rackham Resolution Officer. If the alleged misconduct occurred within a laboratory, library, computer facility, or other research unit, the head of the unit should notify the Rackham Resolution Officer, who will consult with the Office of the Vice President and General Counsel to determine which procedures will be used.

B. Procedures for Reporting and Investigating Allegations of Academic or Professional Misconduct in the Academic Units

With respect to maintaining high standards of conduct, it is important for students to feel accountable first and foremost to the faculty members from whom they take classes and under whom they do research. It is equally important for those faculty members to monitor student behavior in this regard and to take action if they observe alleged misconduct. Therefore, the position of the Rackham Graduate School is that misconduct allegations should be handled at the unit level wherever appropriate, particularly in instances of alleged misconduct for which informal intervention is likely to be sufficient.

Any such faculty member, however, may face a conflict of interest between his or her commitment to upholding high standards of integrity and his or her desire to have the student succeed. For this reason, in all cases of alleged misconduct the faculty member must consult with his or her department chair or program director, who may in turn wish to consult with the Dean of the student’s school or college. Any of these parties may consult with the Office of the Vice President and General Counsel.

Where there is agreement in the academic unit that the most appropriate course of action is to meet informally with the student to call the alleged misconduct to his or her attention and provide an opportunity to respond, the person in the unit who plans to handle the meeting should consult first with the Rackham Resolution Officer. This should be done to ensure that several important steps are followed to ensure due process.

If the offense is deemed to be minor or unintended, the faculty member should take informal remedial steps with the student to correct the infraction and avoid its recurrence. In such instances, no official response is required and no record need be kept.

If, on the other hand, the student admits to having knowingly committed a violation of this policy, the faculty member should do one of the following.

- Decide on commensurate sanctions, in conjunction with his or her department chair or program director (see Addendum B of this document for guidelines for issuing sanctions). The student should be notified of these sanctions in writing and a copy of this communication should be sent to the Rackham Resolution Officer for record keeping. The letter should also inform the student of his or her right to
file an appeal of the decision with the Rackham Resolution Officer.

- OR. Refer the case to Rackham Resolution Officer for a formal hearing or, if formal procedures exist in the department or program, to the appropriate person there.

C. Procedures for Reporting and Investigating Allegations of Academic or Professional Misconduct in the Rackham Graduate School

1. Choosing the Appropriate Venue for Review

   When an allegation of misconduct is forwarded to the Rackham Resolution Officer, the following guidelines will be followed.

   a. If the charge involves behavior covered under the University's Policy Statement on the Integrity of Scholarship and Procedures for Investigating Allegations of Misconduct in the Pursuit of Scholarship and Research, the Resolution Officer shall refer it to the Office of the Vice President for Research (OVPR). (This document is available from the Office of the Vice President for Research and can also be found on their website at the following URL: http://www.research.umich.edu/research/policies/policies.html#UM.)

   If OVPR determines that its own policy is most appropriate, the allegation will be reviewed under OVPR procedures. Once the inquiry has been completed, the Rackham Resolution Officer will review it to determine whether additional charges, if any, should be filed under the Rackham procedures. If, on the other hand, OVPR determines that the Rackham Policy and Procedures for Academic and Professional Integrity are most appropriate, the case will be referred to Rackham's Resolution Officer for handling.

   b. If the complaint involves behavior that is most appropriately handled under the Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities and/or by the police, the Resolution Officer will make the appropriate referral.

   c. If neither the OVPR-administered policy nor the Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities are relevant, the Rackham Resolution Officer will consult with appropriate persons in the academic unit in which the student is enrolled to decide on the best course of action.

   d. If it is determined that the allegations should be handled by Rackham, the Rackham Resolution Officer shall undertake an initial in-

   quiry to evaluate the seriousness of the allegation and to determine whether a formal hearing is warranted. If the allegation involves the use of data, the Resolution Officer shall consult with the General Counsel's Office, as appropriate, to determine if suspect data should be sequestered.

   An inquiry consists of information gathering and initial fact-finding, based on contacts with appropriate University officials and others in the University. It is intended to separate serious allegations from frivolous, unjustified, or clearly mistaken allegations, and allegations that are based on insufficient evidence/information. Every effort will be made throughout to protect the confidentiality of the accused and the reporting witness.

   The Resolution Officer will prepare a written report that describes the evidence reviewed, summaries of the relevant interviews, and the conclusions of the inquiry as to whether there is sufficient evidence to warrant a formal hearing or take any further action. The Dean of the Graduate School, in consultation with the Office of the Vice President and General Counsel and others, will decide whether, based on the report, the student should be formally charged under this policy.

   If the inquiry concludes that a hearing is warranted, the student shall be given an opportunity to comment on the report in writing, which will become part of the report. In addition, the reporting witness may review and comment in writing on any portion of the report directly related to the testimony or other evidence brought forward by the reporting witness. If the Dean finds the evidence to be insufficient to warrant a formal hearing, the Dean or his or her designee will inform all persons who were involved in the initial inquiry to whom the name of the student was disclosed.

   e. If a hearing by a Rackham Integrity Board is decided to be most appropriate, the Resolution Officer shall formally charge the respondent with misconduct and refer the case to a Rackham Integrity Board. Guidelines and procedures for formal charges of misconduct are outlined in sections 2 through 8 below.
2. Rights of Graduate Students Charged with Academic or Professional Misconduct Under the Rackham Policy Statement on Academic and Professional Integrity

A student who has been charged with academic or professional misconduct, hereafter referred to as the respondent:

shall be presumed innocent until the allegations are found to be accurate based upon a preponderance of evidence;

shall be provided with the following items:

- written notification of the charges against them;

- an opportunity to provide a written response to the charges, which will be due within two weeks of the date on which the student receives the notification (if the student does not file a written reply to the charges, this shall not be construed as an acknowledgment of the alleged misconduct);

- a copy of the Rackham Resolution Officer’s written report based on the initial inquiry, where applicable (see item 1.c. above), or a summary of the evidence on which the charges are based;

- any written evidence that has been submitted; and

- a copy of this policy;

has a right to meet with the Resolution Officer;

shall be given notice of the date and location of the hearing(s) and a statement of the general format within which the hearing shall be conducted;

may bring an advisor to the hearing, who may be an attorney (the advisor may advise the student but may not participate directly in the hearing);

shall have an opportunity, within the parameters of the hearing guidelines, to respond fully to the charges by doing any or all of the following:

a. presenting testimony and evidence,

b. bringing witnesses,

c. questioning any or all witnesses, including the reporting witness

d. reviewing additional evidence provided during the hearing, and

e. responding to statements made during the hearing;

may choose to acknowledge the accuracy of charges against them. (In such instances, a Rackham Integrity Board will be convened in accordance with the procedures outlined below to evaluate the seriousness of the misconduct and recommend relevant corrective actions and/or sanctions. In this case the deliberation of the Board will focus not on whether the conduct occurred but on its degree of seriousness and therefore which sanction(s) the Integrity Board deems to be most appropriate.)

The Rackham Resolution Officer will ensure that the file includes written evidence that the materials mentioned above were delivered to the student.

3. Function of Rackham Integrity Boards

When a case is referred to a Rackham Integrity Board, the Board’s task is to gather information about the case and, after considering all the facts and circumstances, to decide whether misconduct occurred and submit their findings to the Dean of the Graduate School. If the Board finds the allegations to be accurate, they will also recommend sanctions.

Following the hearing, the Board will deliberate in closed session to reach their findings. The Board will make every effort to reach consensus in regard to their recommendations. Otherwise, a majority vote is sufficient.

The Chair of the Board is responsible for assuring an orderly and expeditious proceeding. In that capacity, he or she has the right to discourage and exclude unduly repetitious or irrelevant evidence and testimony, to exclude any person who disrupts a hearing or fails to adhere to hearing guidelines, and to discontinue a later time a hearing that has become disorderly.

4. Composition of Rackham Integrity Boards

Rackham Integrity Boards shall consist of two faculty members and one graduate student.

Faculty Members

Depending on the nature of the allegations, one of the two faculty members may be selected who has expertise relevant to the nature of the allegations. The Dean of the Rackham Graduate School will make this selection in consultation with leadership of the appropriate academic unit. However, the following people should generally not serve in such a capacity: the student’s employer or advisor, any member of the student’s doctoral dissertation committee, or any faculty member involved closely with the student’s training. The Resolution Officer will select a second faculty member at random from the Rackham Appeals Panel.

Otherwise, the Resolution Officer will select two faculty members at random from the Rackham Appeals Panel. If enough members to complete the Board cannot be appointed from the Appeals Panel, the Dean of the Graduate School may appoint additional members to the panel.
Graduate Student
The Resolution Officer will select a graduate student from the Rackham Appeals Panel at random. A student who is enrolled in the same program as the student who has been charged with a policy violation may not serve in this capacity. Therefore, if such a student is selected, the Rackham Resolution Officer will randomly select an alternate.

Any member may ask to be excused due to conflict of interest. In addition, a member may disqualify himself or herself, or be challenged for cause by the reporting witness or the respondent. Grounds for disqualification include involvement in the case (as a party or witness) or any other substantial reason that would prevent the member from being impartial. A member shall be disqualified upon motion of either party unless the Board votes to retain the member. A member is not permitted to vote in connection with his or her own disqualification, but may make a statement. A vote to retain shall require a simple majority to pass. In the event of disqualification, the Rackham Resolution Officer shall randomly select another member from the Rackham Appeals Panel.

If the need to substitute a Committee member arises (e.g., due to scheduling conflicts), the Resolution Officer shall oversee the selection of a substitute, following the same procedures. After the members of the Board have been selected, the Dean shall select one of them to serve as Chair. The Resolution Officer will instruct all members in this policy and its implementation. Advice may also be provided by the Office of the Vice President and General Counsel.

5. Guidelines for Rackham Integrity Board Hearings
a. Department, Program, or School/College Participation
The primary department or program in which the student is enrolled, in conjunction with the Dean of the School or College or his or her designee, has the option of selecting a faculty member to attend the hearing but is not required to do so. This individual could be the reporting witness, if he or she chooses to participate in this way; a department Chair or program Director; a School or College faculty administrator, or any other member of the faculty deemed appropriate. In this document, this person shall hereafter be referred to as the department representative.

This individual may bring an advisor to the hearing, who may be an attorney but who may not participate directly in the hearing. He or she will also be given the opportunity to 1) introduce evidence, 2) make an opening statement, 3) give a response to the respondent's opening statement, 4) call witnesses, 5) question the respondent and all witnesses, and 6) make a final statement when there is no further testimony or evidence to be presented.

b. Attendance
The only persons allowed to attend hearings in their entirety are as follows: the Board members; the respondent (and one advisor); the program representative, where applicable (and one advisor); the Resolution Officer, and other individuals whose presence has been requested by the Board. Witnesses shall be present at the hearing only during their testimony or when being questioned.

c. Failure of Accused Student to Appear
If an accused student fails to appear at a hearing after proper notice, the hearing may proceed without the student's participation. The Chair may make exceptions if the student can establish, in advance of the hearing and to the satisfaction of the Resolution Officer, that there are circumstances beyond his or her control that make an appearance impossible or unusually burdensome.

If the student withdraws from the University while the allegations are under review, the University reserves the right to go forward with the hearing without the student's participation. If the University decides to suspend the hearing process, the student must resolve the case before returning to the University.

d. Introduction of Evidence
Prior to the hearing, each party should provide any additional documents he or she wishes to present as evidence by a deadline to be determined by the Board. This information will be provided to the opposing party, the Board, and the Resolution Officer. At the discretion of the Board, documents may be provided for the first time at the hearing. No evidence will be heard or shared in the absence of any of the following: the respondent (except in cases where the student has failed to appear—see above); the department representative, where applicable; and the full membership of the Board.

e. Role of the Rackham Resolution Officer
The Rackham Resolution Officer will be asked to report on his or her initial inquiry, if one was undertaken, and will serve as a resource to the Board and to all involved parties.

f. Witnesses
The respondent; the department representative, where applicable; and the members of the Board will have an opportunity to present information and to call individuals before the Board to provide relevant testimony or evidence, hereafter referred to as witnesses. Witnesses can be asked to provide information that is relevant to the particular case itself as well as information that is relevant to the context of the allegations (e.g., information from individuals who are knowledgeable about standards for professionally relevant conduct.
within the field of the student's training). Prior to the hearing, each party must provide a list of witnesses they wish to appear. The Board retains the right to decide which witnesses to call and the order of witnesses. The Board may, in its discretion, permit or call witnesses not on the witness list.

In cases of alleged professional misconduct that took place while the student was carrying out his or her duties as an employee of the University, the Board may call as witnesses appropriate staff members in the Office of Human Resources and Affirmative Action. The respondent, the department representative, where applicable; and the members of the Board will be given the opportunity to question all witnesses.

Since the purpose of the hearing is for the Board to gather information, the function of a witness at the hearing is to testify about the facts of the situation as she or he perceives them. Agreeing to appear on a party's witness list does not, by itself, denote advocacy for that party. Witnesses may wish to make an opening statement but need not do so and will otherwise be asked to answer questions. No participant in a hearing is required to make a self-incriminating statement, including witnesses.

Generally, witnesses will appear in the presence of all in attendance at the hearing. However, there may be instances when the Board believes that an important witness should be heard outside the presence of the respondent and also, in some cases, his or her advisor, because a confrontation between the parties may be painful or dangerous for one or more of the parties. The Board may exercise this option at its discretion. If possible, a link shall be established, via video or audio hook-up, to allow the respondent to view and hear the testimony. At the very least, the substance of the information received from that witness must be disclosed to the respondent when the hearing is reconvened.

g. Record of the Hearing

All formal proceedings that are part of the hearing will be tape-recorded except the Board's deliberations. The recording will be kept on file as part of the student's educational record until six years after the respondent graduates from the School or College or until six years after his or her last registration. Failure to produce or preserve an audible tape will not be grounds for setting aside any determinations of the Board.

The Resolution Officer will keep a written record of the hearings with regard to attendance, date(s), location(s), and other basic information. The Board's report to the Dean (see below) will serve as the written record of the Board's recommendations to the Dean.

6. Reports of Findings and Recommendations

The Board will submit a report that includes the following:

a. The group's decision as to whether the student engaged in misconduct,

b. A summary of the findings of fact and how those facts contributed to the group's decision,

c. The recommended sanctions, if any, and

d. The rationale for the selection of those sanctions with respect to their being appropriate to the case.

The following list of sanctions or types of sanctions that can be used as a resource by the Board when allegations against a student are found to be accurate. It is not intended to be all-inclusive. Multiple sanctions can be applied in a single case of misconduct. Sanctions 1, m, n, and o may be recommended by an academic unit but can only be imposed by Rackham in consultation with the appropriate School or College. For more detail, see Addendum B of this document, "Guidelines for Issuing Sanctions."

a. Restitution

b. Educational project

c. Service

d. Corrective action appropriate to the domain

e. Oral warning or reprimand

f. Formal reprimand

g. Grade change

h. Course repeat

i. Disciplinary probation

j. Restriction from employment at the University by way of recommendation to or in consultation with the Office of Human Resources and Affirmative Action

k. Restriction from particular activities, services, or locations

l. Withholding a degree

m. Suspension

n. Expulsion

o. Rescinding a degree
The Board also has the option of including minority opinions in the report, but they should be identified clearly as such. At the time the report is provided to the Dean of the Graduate School, copies of the report, either in its entirety or only the portions of it that are relevant to them, will also be sent to the reporting witness, the respondent, and the Rackham Resolution Officer. As noted previously, the report and recommendations are advisory in nature.

7. Final Decisions
After receiving the report, the Dean of the Graduate School will transmit the recommendations to the Dean of the School or College in which the student is enrolled. At the discretion of either Dean, the recommendations will also be provided to the head of the student’s department or program.

In a timely manner, the two deans involved in any particular case will decide jointly on corrective and/or educational sanctions, and/or actions. They will prepare a joint letter to the respondent outlining their decision and sanctions, if any. Based on their legitimate need to know consistent with their official responsibilities, copies of the letter or parts thereof will be provided to the department representative, where applicable; the Office of the Vice President and General Counsel; the Resolution Officer; and to other offices and parties at the University.

The Dean of the Graduate School may excuse himself or herself from the process due to involvement in the case (as a party or witness) or any other substantial reason that would prevent the Dean from being impartial. In this event, the Senior Associate Dean will serve in his or her stead.

8. Appeals
Grounds for an Appeal
The respondent may appeal the case on one or more of the following grounds: 1) there were violations of procedure that seriously compromised the proceeding, 2) the evidence clearly does not support the findings, 3) the sanctions are excessive relative to the violation, or 4) there is significant new evidence not reasonably available at the time of the hearing.

Filing an Appeal
The respondent must file the appeal in writing with the Resolution Officer within fifteen business days following receipt of the decision by the Deans. Requests for exceptions to this deadline must be made within fifteen business days and will be considered by the Dean on a case-by-case basis. The appeal should include a statement of the grounds for appeal and the supporting facts.

After an appeal has been filed, the Dean of the Graduate School will forward it to the Senior Associate Dean or another of the Associate Deans in the Graduate School to review the content of the appeal and to determine, in consulta

Appendix B: Academic and Professional Integrity and Procedures
Descriptions of Academic Misconduct
(Addendum A)

The following offenses are listed in the Rackham Graduate School's Policy Statement on Academic and Professional Integrity. This document provides detailed information in this regard.

Forms of Academic Misconduct

Offenses against the standards of academic integrity include the following.

1. **Cheating:** Cheating is the attempt to gain an improper advantage in an academic evaluation. Among the forms this kind of dishonesty can take are: obtaining a copy of an examination before it is officially available or learning an examination question before it is officially available; having a substitute take an examination; copying another person's answer to an examination question; consulting an unauthorized source during an examination; or changing a score or a record of an examination result.

   It is also improper to submit the work one has done for one class or project to a second class or as a second project without getting the informed permission of the second instructor. Acceptance of one piece of work that is submitted for two classes must be arranged beforehand.

2. **Plagiarism and other misappropriation of the work of another:** Plagiarism is the representation of another person's ideas or writing as one's own. The most obvious form of this kind of dishonesty is the presentation of all or part of another person's published work as something one has written. Perhaps less-obvious but no less dishonest are, without proper acknowledgment of the source, the adoption of a part of another's writing into one's own discussion, the paraphrasing of another's writing, or the presentation of another's ideas as one's own. In different forms, these all constitute a theft of someone else's work. This is not to say that students should not use the work of others; scholarship and research are, after all, communal activities. To avoid plagiarism all one has to do is fully and properly acknowledge the source of the work presented. To reduce the likelihood of being accused of plagiarism, students must follow the citation styles relevant to the discipline or the journals in which they will publish.

   It is also a violation of integrity to represent another's artistic or technical work or creation as one's own. Just as there are standards to which one must adhere in the preparation and publication of written works, there are standards to which one must adhere in the creation and presentation of music, drawings, designs, and other artistic and technical works. Students who work in these areas must become thoroughly familiar with the relevant standards.

3. **Falsification of data:** This is the dishonest reporting of investigative results. The most obvious form is the outright fabrication of data, but other examples include improper revision of data, deceptive selective reporting of data to support a particular notion, or the deceptive omission of conflicting data.

4. **Improperly obtaining or representing laboratory or field data:** Many activities in graduate school involve the collecting, analyzing, interpreting, and publishing of data obtained in the scientific laboratory or in the field. The opportunities to deviate from accepted behavior might be more numerous in research, and the temptation greater than in the classroom environment, because often research activities are supervised less closely. Forms of improper research practices include fabrication or falsification of data, taking or using the experimental data of others without either permission or due acknowledgment (misappropriation of data), misrepresentation of data or the methods used to collect or analyze them, the deceptive selective reporting of data to support a particular notion or hypothesis, or the deceptive omission of conflicting data. Furthermore, all researchers have a responsibility to refrain from practices that may unfairly inhibit the research of others now or later.

5. **Dishonesty in publication:** In most instances the objective of scholarly research is the dissemination of information, usually in the form of a written and published work. Indeed, in many disciplines career advancement is often based largely on the number and quality of an individual's publications. It is a violation of academic integrity to publish knowingly information that will mislead or deceive readers. This includes falsification or fabrication of data; failure to give full and proper credit to collaborators, including, when appropriate, joint authorship; and the act of listing as authors persons who have not contributed to the work. Plagiarism is also considered a form of dishonesty in publication.

6. **Publication or attempted publication of collaborative work without the permission of the other participants:** Written work that is the result of efforts undertaken under the supervision of or collaboratively with one or more faculty members or students should not be presented orally in a formal setting (e.g., at a conference) or submitted for publication without the permission of the other participant(s). If one or more of the collaborators cannot be reached or fails to respond within a reasonable amount of time to requests for permission, written evidence of such attempts should be kept.

7. **Abuse of confidentiality:** During graduate training a student may be asked to assist in the evaluation of confidential grant proposals, awarded applications, or manuscript that will be or may have been submitted for review and possible funding or publication. Likewise, a graduate student may work on projects for which a public or private sponsor expects or requires confidentiality. It's inappropriate to release the ideas or data of others that were given with the expectation that they would be confidential.
8. Misuse of computer facilities: Access to information belonging to someone else can sometimes be obtained through a central computing facility despite the fact that much of the information stored in such facilities is usually confidential. Unless one is explicitly authorized to do so, it is improper to obtain a password assigned to another or to copy or modify a data file or program belonging to someone else. Proper authorization to conduct these activities means being granted permission either by the owner or originator of that material or by a member of the faculty, a unit head, a project director, or a member of the computing center staff. Similarly, one should not violate the integrity of a computer system, whether of general or limited access, in order to harass another user or operator or to damage software or hardware. It is also improper to engage in any activity that evades the appropriate monetary charges for access to or use of the computer, infringes on copyright protection, or is of frivolous use. (See the Proper Use Policy, Standard Practice Guide 601.7, and the Guidelines for Implementing the Proper Use Policy, located at the following URL: http://www.snicr.edu/~policies/)

9. Misuse of human subjects: Human beings are used as research subjects in many ways. They may be respondents to questionnaires or interviews, participants in behavioral studies, or the subjects of medical research. In any of these instances, when a human subject is a participant in a graduate project, approval for such a project must be obtained in advance from the Human Subjects Review Committee and maintained in good standing through periodic mandatory review. Once approval has been granted, it is unacceptable to deviate significantly from the approved protocol without again obtaining Committee approval. It is also improper to violate the confidentiality of a human subject without his or her approval. (See Chapter 9 on Doctoral Degrees in the Rackham Graduate Student Handbook, «Use of Human Subjects in Doctoral Research.» URL: http://www.rackham.umich.edu/StudyInfo/handbook/content1.html)

10. Misuse of vertebrate animals: Controlled and humane use of vertebrate animals is often an essential part of research and training. Government and University guidelines apply to the procurement of vertebrate animals, their care and housing before and after actual experimentation, and the humane treatment procedures that shall be followed during any experiment. As in the case with human subjects, if a study involves the use of vertebrate animals on campus, the project must have prior review and approval. The University of Michigan's Unit for Laboratory Animal Medicine (ULAM) conducts these reviews, and its approval must be granted before animal procurement begins. Usually a request for such review is initiated by the faculty project director, but a student participating in actual animal procurement or in instructional or experimental use should be familiar with and comply with the ULAM guidelines.

11. Illegally or carelessly obtaining or using dangerous substances, or providing such substances to others: Graduate students in chemical or biomedical disciplines frequently work with drugs, solvents, or other biologically active substances (radioisotopes, pathogens, or other biohazards). The possession, use, or distribution of some of these is regulated by State or Federal law and monitored by the Vice President for Research or Occupational Safety and Environmental Health, whereas the proper and safe use of others may be guided only by acquired knowledge and common sense. Intentional disregard of guidelines that apply to these substances can be justification for levying a charge of ethical misconduct.

12. Falsification or unauthorized modification of an academic record: It is a violation of academic integrity to falsify, fabricate, or in any other way modify a student transcript, grade, letter of recommendation, or related document, whether it pertains to you or another individual. Falsification or unauthorized modification of any other official document, including an examination, is also a violation.

13. Obstruction of the academic activities of another: It is a violation of academic integrity to interfere with the scholarly research of another individual. Such interference includes harassment and unauthorized tampering with experimental data, with a human or animal subject, with a written document or other creation (e.g., a sculpture or an architectural model), with a chemical used for scientific study, or with any other object of study.

14. Other forms of academic misconduct: Other practices that seriously deviate from those that are commonly accepted within the scientific community, and material failure to comply with legal requirements governing research may also constitute actionable misconduct.

15. Aiding or abetting academic misconduct: Aiding or abetting any individual in the violation of any of the categories of misconduct outlined above shall itself be considered misconduct.

16. Attempted academic misconduct: An attempt to commit academic misconduct may be treated as seriously as the completed act.

Guidelines for Issuing Sanctions (Addendum B)

Some cases of alleged academic or professionally relevant misconduct are handled at the unit level. Other cases are referred to a Rackham Integrity Board. The decision about where allegations should be heard depends in part on the severity of the allegations and therefore on the sanctions that are likely to be selected if the allegations are found to be accurate. In addition,
the following list of sanctions may serve as a resource during unit reviews of misconduct allegations.

The following sanctions can be selected to achieve one or more aims: correct or compensate for the student's actions, educate the student, and/or discipline the student. Corrective actions, educational activities and/or sanctions against a student should be proportionate and relevant to the misconduct. They should also be fair not only to the person who has filed the allegation, but also to the student who has been charged with misconduct, to the other members of the University community, and to the professional community to which the student aspires to belong.

Consistent with the educational mission of the Graduate School, educational activities that might remedy a student's faulty understanding or knowledge should be recommended, wherever they are appropriate. These might include formal or informal coursework, tutorials, counseling, preparation of written products, public service or other activities. Wherever appropriate, sanctions should also be recommended that might correct the specific negative outcomes of misconduct. These might include actions such as restoration or replacement of property or belongings, or corrections of fact or impression.

The following list of sanctions or types of sanctions can be used as a resource when allegations against a student are found to be accurate. It is not intended to be all-inclusive. In addition, multiple sanctions can be applied in a single case of misconduct. Sanctions l, m, n, and o may be recommended by an academic unit but can only be imposed by Rackham in consultation with the appropriate School or College.

a. **Restitution.** Compensation for loss, damage, or injury paid to the appropriate party in the form of service, money, or material replacement.

b. **Educational project.** This could include the completion of a class, workshop, or project to help the student understand why his or her behavior was inappropriate.

c. **Service.** Performance of one or more tasks designed to benefit the community and help the student understand why her or his behavior was inappropriate.

d. **Corrective action.** This could include such things as requiring retraction of research or writing, or notification to publishers of improper research or authorship credit.

e. **Oral warning or reprimand.** An oral reprimand to the student that he/she has violated the policy and that future violations will be dealt with more severely.

f. **Formal reprimand.** A written reprimand to the student that he/she has violated the policy and any future violations will be dealt with more severely. This sanction may or may not include placement of the written reprimand in the student's file(s) at Rackham and/or in the administrative offices of the student's department, program, school, or college.

g. **Grade change.** This could include assigning a grade record of No Report or Incomplete for a course or project, or assigning a lower or failing grade. Such a sanction could only be issued with the support of the course instructor, who would assign the grade or request the grade change.

h. **Course repeat.** Requiring that a course be repeated. In cases of more serious violations, more punitive sanctions such as the following may be recommended. Because they are more severe in nature than the sanctions listed above, the following sanctions can be imposed only after a Rackham Integrity Board has formally reviewed a case (see Section F). Such a Board can select from the entire list of sanctions, not just those that follow. However, only the Dean of the Graduate School has the authority under this policy to impose sanctions l, m, n, and o.

i. **Disciplinary probation.** Designating a period of time during which the student will not be in good standing with the University. Probation is noted on the student's transcript. The terms of the probation may involve restrictions of student privileges and/or set behavioral expectations. Consequences may also be spelled out if the student fails to meet the terms. Only the Dean of a school or college can request disciplinary probation. Such requests must be submitted to the University Registrar, who alone has authority to assign disciplinary probation.

j. **Restriction from employment at the University.** Prohibition or limitation on University employment.

k. **Restriction from particular activities, services, or locations.**

l. **Withholding a degree.** Withholding a Rackham Graduate School degree (e.g., until the student has met all the sanctions) This can only be imposed by Rackham in consultation with the appropriate School or College.

m. **Suspension.** Temporary removal of a student from the program for a specified or unspecified period, which will be noted on the transcript. This normally includes placing an academic hold on the student's record for the duration of the suspension. It can also include stipulated conditions for re-admission to graduate work. This can only be imposed by Rackham in consultation with the appropriate School or College.

n. **Expulsion.** Permanent dismissal from the program, which will be so noted on the transcript. This can only be imposed by Rackham in consultation with the appropriate School or College.

o. **Rescinding a degree.** Rescinding a Rackham Graduate School degree. This can only be imposed by Rackham in consultation with the appropriate School or College.