Rackham Student Government
Board Meeting: May 24, 2012
Agenda

I. Call To Order

II. Approval of Agenda

III. Approval of Previous Minutes * (p. 2)

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

V. Approval of RSG Committee Chair Slate
   a. Academic Affairs Committee – Chris Tom (I)
   b. Community Outreach and Social Action Committee – Eli Eisman (I)
   c. Student Life Committee – Alex Emly (II)

VI. RSG Spring / Summer 2012 budget* (p. 15)

VII. Conflict Resolution and Academic Integrity Discussion with Graduate
     Ombudsperson Darlene Ray-Johnson (rayj@umich.edu) (p 17)

VIII. Committee Updates
   a. Academic Affairs * (p 5)
   b. Budgetary * (p 7)
   c. Community Outreach & Social Action * (p9)
   d. Legislative Affairs* (p 11)
   e. Student Life Committee *
   f. Bylaw Review Committee (p13)

IX. Representative & Executive Office Hours

X. Open Discussion

XI. 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
BOARD MEETING
5/10/12
RACKHAM GRADUATE BUILDING
2ND FLOOR WEST CONFERENCE ROOM, NORTH ALCOVE
6:30 P.M.

I. CALL TO ORDER: 6:35pm
   a. Present: Representatives: Chris Tom, Matt Waugh, Dan Trubman, Brandon Erickson, Matthew Filter, Alex Emly, Anna Belak, Bernardo Orvananos, Haven Allen, Evan Arthur, Treasurer Toulouse, Vice President Flynn, and President Benson.
   b. Absent:
   c. Excused: Representatives Vanessa Cruz, Heidi Pedini*, Eli Benchell Eisman, Andrew Crawford, and Ben Curtiss-Lusher*

* indicates that the representatives have been granted summer excusals from regular Board meetings by President Benson.

II. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA
   a. Motion by Chris, seconded by Haven. Approved unanimously.

III. APPROVAL OF THE PREVIOUS MINUTES
   a. Motion by Haven and seconded by Alex E. Approved.

IV. OFFICER REPORTS
   a. President Michael Benson. The website has been updated and now includes the functionality for all board members to have accounts and edit. Particularly, committee chairs will be allowed to make accounts and are responsible for keeping their committees page updated. Next meeting Michael will be providing the contact information for the board in the agenda. The calendar is up to date and committee chairs will be able to update events as needed.

   b. Vice President Kaitlin Flynn. Committee reports from last semester are included in the packet. These provide information about the committees from last semester including events, goals and participation.

   c. Treasurer Alex Toulouse. Alex runs through the final budget from last semester included in the budget. Various board members ask about specifics included in the budget.

V. Executive Order EO-12-02: Executive order to create the 2012 Bylaw review committee. The charge is that the bylaw review committee will review the bylaws and
present them to the board for review by August 16, 2012. The order directs the committee provide added focus on a number of RSG areas of function, including our election and financial systems.

VI. RSG LOGISTICS
   a. RSG Overview
      i. Food at board meetings: sometimes the board has voted to have food at meetings. Michael describes the idea. Motion by Matt and seconded by Haven. Chris objects. Discussion: Matt begins by saying that he feels that we are volunteers and we should give this money to the students instead of feeding the board. Chris explains that we have plenty of money in the bank and in that as a student group we are entitled to some sort of snack. Evan says that for him sitting through a long meeting might be more tolerable with food. Kaitlin mentions that from a laziness standpoint it can be a pain to be in charge of getting food and getting reimbursed. Dan says that he echoes that of his colleagues and feels that we don’t deserve to spend that much money on ourselves as a board when we constitute a small portion of the student body. Bernando says that for him, these meetings are at dinnertime and he doesn’t have time to get food before hand. Michael mentions that we can bring our own food to board meeting when we don’t have guest speakers. Haven asks for explanation on the summer budget and the funds that we would be allocating towards this issue. Michael explains that it could be up to $300, depending on allocations. Alex T helps clarify the issue. Call to question. A yes vote means yes to food, a no vote = no food. The motion to allow sponsored food at meetings is defeated by a vote of 4-6-1.
      ii. Board meeting start time: Chris moves to start on time (6:30pm) instead of ‘Michigan time’. The motion is seconded and caries.
   b. Representative & Executive office hours
      i. Representatives are required to hold an office hour at least twice/month. Michael passes around a signup sheet for office hours. A brief explanation of office hours follows.
   c. RSG Email list usage
      i. Once committees have been approved, reps will be added to the committee list-serves and then people are free to email the committee for discussion and otherwise.
   d. Committees
      i. Membership: Kaitlin included the slate of committees and motions to approve, seconded by Alex T.
         1. Dan is now going to be in Ann Arbor this summer and asks to be added to the budgetary committee.
         2. Chris asks to be removed from student life.
         3. Evan asks to be added to the student life committee.
         The amended slate is approved with one abstention.
ii. **Meeting times and locations**: Alex E is going to be creating a Doodle poll and sending it out tonight with the expectation that members will respond.

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

VIII. **Conflict Resolution and Academic Integrity**
   a. The academic integrity policy was last updated in 2001 and we will be joined by Darlene Ray Johnson next week and has been tasked with updating that document. We will also be talking about conflict resolution. Michael asks that we come to the board meeting next week with examples of conflict that we can share with Darlene.

IX. **OPEN DISCUSSION**
   a. Michael says that our discussion on future ideas doesn't stop here! Email more ideas to rsg-exec@umich.edu, and committees can start working on these ideas at committee meetings next week.
   b. Dan welcomes everyone and has enjoyed his time on RSG, hopes you do as well and is excited to continue working with everyone this year. Haven inquires where EO 12-1 is - Michael clarifies about guest speakers and the process by which they come to talk to us (we want to avoid jamming everyone in at the end of the semester). Eugene is coming to the meeting next week to address IP issues because he asked to speak to the board last month, and we were not able to fit him in. Please try to sit at the end closest to where MB sits for when we have student guest speakers.
   c. Michael asks for a vote. RSG has hosted a fall welcome picnic for the last 20 years. Over the last three years, we've had between 800-2000 students each year. The total budget last year was $4500, and we are working at decreasing that amount. We need to rent the park as soon as possible, and we need $306 for the two pavilions. The last three years we have used Island Drive Park, across from the hospital, off of Maiden Lane near the Med School apartments.
      i. Haven asks if Rackham's Centennial can help cover these costs, but Michael says they're not planning on helping out with this, and we are hoping to get help from Rackham for the SAGE Fall Summit. Motion to spend $306 is approved unanimously.
   d. Chris is excited for the summer and for meetings when Michael talks less. Matthew and Anna second and third Chris' opinions, respectively. Brandon is excited to learn things. Evan fourths Chris' thoughts. Alex is excited as well. Bernardo seconds Alex. Everyone laughs.
   e. Dan is looking forward to continuing our fiduciary responsibility. Also to get more student groups to apply for funds so we can start to eliminate our reserves of excess funds. Haven seconds Dan. Alex T says we used most of our funds and is looking forward to working with everyone. Matt is looking forward to meeting everyone. Michael, as chair of Legislative Affairs, came under budget. To piggy-back off of Alex, we do try to be financially responsible and we have had to run out of money before and we don't want to do that again.

X. Motion to adjourn moved by Matt seconded by Evan.

XI. **ADJOURNMENT**
I. CALL TO ORDER 6:46 pm

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

III. AGENDA ITEM 1
    Chris was nominated to be the Chair of AAC by Kaitlin, and accepted.

IV. AGENDA ITEM 2
    Academic affairs has no budget requests for the spring or summer term.

V. AGENDA ITEM 3
    Discussion about tech transfer and IP issues. Anna suggests that IP issues be brought up during orientation, so that people know what resources are available.
    Graduate student bill of rights – hopefully finish it up this summer. Put in a Right that we are entitled to University IP ownership, and a Responsibility to be informed about University policies. Goal: get the GSBoR to the Executive Board by fall, and figure out methods of enforcement. Chris will include the conflict resolution flow chart sent by DRJ to the minutes.

VI. AGENDA ITEM 4

VII. OPEN DISCUSSION

VIII. ADJOURNMENT: 7:13 pm
Resolution steps

Student seeks informal mediation from S/C Resolution Officer

Resolved

S/C Resolution Officer organizes formal dispute resolution process under school/college procedures

MOU

No agreement: Dean requests Rackham's Dispute Resolution Process

Student asks Rackham Resolution Officer for reconsideration

RRO and Resolution Board asks school/college to reconvene mediation

RRO and Resolution Board sustains MOU

MOU

Rackham Dean determination of resolution

MOU = Memo of Understanding
RRO = Rackham Resolution Officer
I. CALL TO ORDER May 15, 2012

II. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS
a. Present: Alex Emly, Kaitlin Flynn, Michael Benson, Daniel Trubman, Matthew Filter, Brandon Smith, Alexis Toulouse
b. Absent (excused): Vanessa Cruz
c. Absent (unexcused): Lauren Knapp

III. FUNDING REQUEST:
   a. Organization Name: Association of Multicultural Scientists (AMS)
   b. Event name: AMS Annual Invited Speaker
   c. Event date(s): June 5-6th, 2012
   d. Event location: MedSci I M3330
   e. Requesting: $600

IV. DISCUSSION:
   a. Alex T: Please find attached the first funding request of the Spring/Summer. As usual, please review the request and respond to rsg-budget@umich.edu with your response in the next 5 days, by Sunday 5/20 at the latest. As a reminder, in your response feel free to express your thoughts but please make sure to clearly either: 1) Make a motion to allocate funds for specific items in the budget or 2) Vote in favor of a motion made by someone else. As the chair, I can't make motions and will usually let others respond first, but I will say that given how specific this talk appears to be, I don't think we should consider fully funding it. I will note on this request that they have not answered questions 6 or 10, which would be useful in judging the level of interest for this kind of talk. I have emailed the contact and will let you know if I hear anything. If you have not yet done so, it may also be helpful to review the current funding guidelines in Article VIII of the bylaws (http://rsg.umich.edu/wp-content/uploads/RSG-Bylaw-Amended-April-5-2012.pdf).
   b. Alex E: I agree with Alex that I don't think we should fund the whole $600. Seeing as how their request is asking for food, it seems a little odd that they neglected to answer the question about food.... They say that the event is open to the entire student body in Q2, but then in Q3 say it's open to programs in the biomedical sciences. They're also only planning on advertising to PiBS programs, so that drastically cuts down the potential audience. If they don't respond back to Alex (which I'm a pretty firm believer that if you don't have the time to proofread the form the first time around, then we aren't obligated to give the time for you to respond back to us), then we can go off of their answered "average attendance at meetings/similar events" (top of pg 2) of 20, I think $100 should be the tops we fund for 20 people. I also don't think that this event includes "several departments" by having faculty meet with this visiting professor (Q3) or one faculty member's student having lunch with this visiting prof. All things said, I motion to fund $100 of this seminar, the only limitation being that they can not spend it on the very limited student/visiting prof lunch (end part of Q3)
   c. Dan: I'm not prepared to vote to give them a dollar until they answer questions 6 and 10, in some ways the most important questions for this application. Consider that a no vote on all motions until we hear back from them.
d. Kaitlin: I'm going to abstain from discussion as this is a group I am a part of.

e. Matt: I'd second Dan and Alex's comments. This is a very sloppily constructed, incomplete application. It's also unclear to me how many students they expect to attend -- and if 20 is our working number based off of their membership, $600 sure seems like way too much as they already are getting $100 for "seminar food" from CMB. And they keep going back to citing "one-on-one" meetings between respective Michigan faculty and the visiting scholar -- which makes me question how many PhD or masters students will really be involved here. I'd support funding of $100 for the speaker's travel/lodging portion, but only after they complete the full application so we can fully and appropriately consider their request.

f. Alex T: Thank you all for your responses. I apologize for not asking them to complete the application before sending it out, but I'll make sure to do that in the future. I've attached their updated application with responses to questions 6 and 10. Please look it over and respond with any updated motions and votes. I'd still like to complete this discussion by Sunday if possible.

g. Alex E: My previous comments stand. All the money for food is for a small group of people which I'm not comfortable spending 10 grad students' Rackham fee for one person to eat dinner at Sava's and another 7 students' fees for lunch. That being said, they are expecting ~60-70 grad students at the seminar, which is a more reasonable number, however, I think $100 is still fine since they're not advertising to the whole student body, say it's only open to those in the biological sciences, and everything except for the actual talk is extremely limited. My motion still stands for funding $100 of the event to do with whatsoever they please except not for providing the Potbelly's/Sava's dinner.

h. Alex T: I agree that funding the lunch/dinner may not be the best use of our funds. I do think this appears to be an active student group, that I am in favor of supporting. I would also note that the biomedical sciences has a relatively large graduate student base. To be consistent with our previous funding requests, I would be comfortable funding in the $200 region.

i. Brandon: I agree that the lunch/dinner seems a bit over the top, given that it would be a small number of students. I think a maximum of $200 would be reasonable to help them out with speaker costs or if they want to supplement the seminar food since those are available to the plurality of potentially interested students.

j. Michael: Ideally, I would support funding up to $300 which would be limited only to speaker travel and lodging. However, as there isn't support for more than $200 from the committee, I will happily cast my vote for $200 which will be restricted to travel and lodging costs.

k. Dan: So are there now 2 motions on the floor?

l. Alex E: Apparently. To make it slightly less of a logistical mess, I'm rescinding my motion to fund $100, and seconding Michael's motion to fund $200 since that amount seems to be what we've funded for these types of things in the past, and consistency is nice.

V. VOTE:
   a. $200: Brandon, Michael, Alex E, Alex T
   b. $100: Matt
   c. $0: Dan
   d. Abstentions: Kaitlin

VI. The committee votes to fund $200 for AMS’s event given the above mentioned stipulations.

VII. ADJOURNMENT: May 23, 2012
I. **CALL TO ORDER** 6:52 pm

II. **ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS**
   a. Present: Eli Eisman, Michael Benson, Evan Arthur, Andrew Crawford, Alex Emly
   b. Absent (excused): Heidi Alvey, Pete McGrath, Vanessa Cruz
   c. Absent (unexcused): none

III. **ELECTION OF CHAIR**
   Eli nominates Alex and Eli as Co-chairs, however Michael suggests that since Alex will be pseudo-co-chair of the committees, maybe we should have another official co-chair. After discussion, Eli is elected chair.

IV. **PRIOR EVENTS**
   Habitat was awesome, slightly over budget for the event, however still stayed under overall budget. 22 people were at the event over two 4-hour shifts. Awesomeness all around. The attendees were surveyed after the event, and the afternoon shift went to Corner Brewery. Lots of support for a beach cleanup and cleanup in Dexter. Everyone seemed to have loads of fun. Already discussing plans for the next Habitat event. Looking at dates for September (trying to get 2 a year)

V. **FUTURE EVENTS / BUDGET**
   **Huron River Watershed Council (HRWC) Kayak building / park cleanup**
   - $0 since Island Park is so close people can carpool/bike.
   - $150 for food for a social night immediately following
   **Food Gatherers Donation** - combine it with Fuller Pool, only allow people who donate cans to get in free
   **Church of Messiah Combined Event**
   **Next Detroit Neighborhood Initiative (501C3):** Take unused property that’s overgrown and disheveled areas and clean it up and make it prettier
   **Parks Cleanup**
   Eli is talking to A2 Parks and Rec to have an event at beginning and end of fall, as well as the summer
   - Budget : $150 for passenger van
   **Beach Cleanup:**
   $10 to “rent” picnic table, want to limit to one bus (60 people) ~$600
   **Greening of Detroit:** Work with the Ross Outreach Program. GoD has tree plantings every Saturday in the fall
- **Washtenaw School District**: Poetry workshops or creative writing. Eli ran it by the people at Habitat and they quite liked the idea - especially the social sciences.

VI. **RANDOM TIDBITS OF INFORMATION**
Renting passenger vans from Enterprise isn’t that expensive
Getaway Trails is much cheaper than Indian Trails

VII. **OPEN DISCUSSION**
Evan’s project this semester is looking into subsidizing (offering some type of benefit) flight travel for individuals (so the University’s discounted rate).
Andrew says we have a different dynamic than Legislative Affairs
We want to have a semester banquet to thank people for what they did

VIII. **ACTION ITEMS:**
- **Eli** needs to contact Beverly of Food Gatherers
- **Alex** is going to call Getaway Trails (usually cheaper than Indian Trails) for a bus for a day for the beach cleanup

IX. **ADJOURNMENT**: 7:26 PM
All,

I’ve heard from a number of you that you won’t be able to attend tonight’s meeting of the legislative affairs committee. As we don’t have anything that must be done this week I would like to cancel our meeting. In lieu of our meeting, I would ask that each of us do the following by the dates listed:

1. Please review the packet that I have attached to this email. This packets that were provided by the Graduate Student Assembly at UC Berkeley as a part of last year’s SAGE Fall Summit. We will be hosting the fall summit this year. In addition to the standard SAGE meeting (which principally focuses on the sharing of best practices and planning for the spring visit to Washington, DC), we will also be continuing the SAGE tradition of hosting a policy forum on the Friday of the summit. Our theme for the forum is quite broad, the future of education in America with a focus on graduate and professional education. Ideally, we will host 3 panel discussions on a variety of topics that center around this theme. BEFORE THE NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING, please think about what topics you would like a panel of experts to discuss that involve this theme. (These packets are not included in this document)

2. I will be appointing a new State government liaison as well as a new Local government liaison. These individuals will be responsible for helping our committee to stay on top of developments at these two governmental levels that could affect the graduate student body. If you are interested in serving in one of these positions, please let me know and we can talk in more detail about what the positions entail.

3. We will be electing a vice-chair for our committee at the next meeting as well. Please consider running for this important position. The Vice Chair will help me manage the committee’s activities. If you’d like more information about this position and my expectations for the spring/summer, please let me know.

4. Please review the attached documents about the sequester. It is likely that the SAGE Coalition will be passing a resolution on this topic in the coming month and I would like the RSG Board to do the same. I would like our committee to draft the resolution for RSG and for as many of our members to sponsor the resolution (Again, only if you support the resolution.) As a note, there are some pretty big potential cuts being proposed to research funding and other sources of financial aid.

5. Please respond to this email if you would like our committee to request a budget for the spring/summer. As it stands now, I am unaware of any events that we might host before September that would require funds. (As a note, the fora for the lease-signing-ordinance will be
taking place in the Fall.) IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO REQUEST FUNDS FOR OUR COMMITTEE, PLEASE EMAIL ME ASAP (By Saturday at 5pm at the latest.)

Please don't hesitate to email me if you have any questions, concerns, or comments.

Warm regards,

-Michael
RACKHAM STUDENT GOVERNMENT
STUDENT LIFE COMMITTEE
DATE
7:30 PM, AMER’S 312 S. STATE ST.

I. CALL TO ORDER 7:41 pm

II. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS
   a. Present: Alex Emly, Alex Toulouse, Michael Benson, Evan Arthur, Matt Waugh
   b. Absent (excused): Anna Wagner
   c. Absent (unexcused):

III. COMBINED RACKHAM EVENTS
    Execs are meeting with Natalie next week to determine budgets
    Order of Priorities for Rackham Events:
    a. Tigers (~$500-$800 June 2) : Top
    b. Lions (FALL)
    c. Ice Cream Social (late June $500) : Gallup Park → Matt points out concern that it’s kinda far away. Do we want to maybe move to Argo? Michael is providing background information: Summer Ice Cream Social used to be a summer barbeque, and then when they ran out of money, it became a dessert thing. This is more Rackham’s event, not really ours… We need to keep the options of things to do. We could look into renting a Blue Bus for a special run from Rackham to the park. Top
    d. Fall Picnic ($2000) Yes (obv)
    e. Beach Cleanup (July 21) - Is going to happen no matter what
    f. Cedar Pointe - to nix or not to nix. Nix.

IV. OTHER EVENTS
    Michigan Argentine Tango Club : Event Tues July 10 at the Union
    “Explore Ann Arbor” Hump Day Happy Hour : Off Wednesdays of the board meetings. 7-9 PM Places we like: Blue Tractor, Jolly Pumpkin’s Patio, South U, ABC, Brown Jug…
    Advertise to student body and have a graduate student t-shirt. Late summer. Everyone likes the idea
    Fuller Pool Event : It’s been going on forever. Longer than Benson has been around. We used to provide ice cream as well. Want to do one in July and August. 1st 100 who come in and bring two cans get in free. $600 for budget. Michael is talking to Fuller Pool for a potential discount.
    Nature walk in the Arb
    Event with med students?

V. REGISTERING STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS
    We want the grad and professional students combined together.
    We need to incentivize student groups registering under us:
Once we have money, we can give everyone a “stipend”
Publicize their events
What about combined grad student / undergrad groups? Let them choose who they want to register with
Rolling admission since grad student groups are pretty dynamic
We want to mimic Ross’ organization
We’re hiring someone to redesign website
Adding listservs for extra information about specific events
Steps to Success: See how other groups register with SOAS

VI. **GRAD STUDENT SURVEY**
Student Life is really broad, so we want to ask a lot of questions. We want to get the current state of life for graduate students

VII. **ACTION ITEMS**
   - **Michael** is calling Bab’s for a bar night on Thursday May 31
   - First happy hour June 13, 7-9PM: **Bernardo** is calling a bar to set this
   - Registering Student Orgs: Watch the video on studentorgs.umich.edu
   - Consensus is that we should let orgs register whenever they want, that way they can apply for funding as soon as they register
   - Look at survey questions from past and focus on “student experience” questions: extracurricular questions as well as GSRA/GSI/GSSA
   - State of rec sports facilities, UHS is submitting a few questions as well

VIII. **ELECTION OF CHAIR**: Michael nominates Alex E, everyone approves

IX. **FUTURE MEETINGS**
Future meetings will be at Espresso Royale on Wednesdays at 7:30

X. **ADJOURNMENT**: 8:32 pm
<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>Bab’s Bar Night</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigers Game (Rackham Co-Sponsored)</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Cream Social (Rackham Co-Sponsored)</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy Hour Events - Food</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuller Pool Days</td>
<td>$650.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arboretum Nature Walk</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Picnic</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$3,600.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COSAC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRWC Island Drive Park Cleanup - Food</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach Cleanup - Bus Rental</td>
<td>$700.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Parks and Rec - Van</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Affairs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budgetary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Group Funding</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communications</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website Upgrade</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$300.00</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>Total</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elections</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$0.00</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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary Funds</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Anticipated Initial Balance** | $10,700.00 |
| **Total Allocated Funds**      | $8,200.00  |
| **Total Costs**                | $0.00      |
| **Total Spent**                | $0.00      |
| **Required Reserve Funds**     | $2,500.00  |
| **Unallocated Funds**          | $2,500.00  |
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

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

**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

**Student Life**
1. Alex Emly (II)
2. Matt Waugh (I)
3. Anna Wagner (II)
4. Bernardo Orvananos (II)
5. Heidi Alvey (II)
6. Evan Arthur (II)
Michael Benson
Kaitlin Flynn
Alex Toulouse

**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
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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 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 un-informed 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 to 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 any 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 lists.

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 i, 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 consultation with others, whether there are sufficient grounds for the appeal. If the Associate Dean determines that the content of the appeal does not provide sufficient grounds for the case to be revisited, all decisions will stand and there shall be no further opportunity for appeal within the University. If the Associate Dean determines that there are sufficient grounds for the appeal, the Resolution Officer will select an Appeals Committee to review the case and make recommendations to the Dean.

Composition and Function of the Appeals Committee
The Appeals Committee shall be composed of two faculty members and one graduate student drawn at random from the Rackham Appeals Panel but not to include the members of the Rackham Integrity Board that heard the case previously. In addition, the same rules for disqualification from serving on the Appeals Committee will be followed as those provided in Section III.C.4.

The Appeals Committee shall evaluate the allegations outlined in the appeal and be given access to the case file. The Appeals Committee shall communicate in writing to the Dean of the Graduate School both its recommendations and its rationale for having reached those recommendations. The Appeals Committee can recommend 1) that the decision and the sanctions should stand, 2) that the sanctions be revised and in what ways, or 3) that the case should be reheard.

Decision and Communication
Thereafter, the Dean of the Graduate School, in conjunction with the Dean of the school or college in which the student is enrolled, may decide to 1) let all aspects of the original decision stand, 2) alter the earlier decision and/or sanctions, or 3) conclude that the grounds for appeal warrant a rehearing of the case.

The Deans will prepare a joint letter to the respondent outlining their decision and revisions to the sanctions, if any, Based on their 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.

9. Case File Maintenance
Rackham shall maintain the case file for at least six years after the student’s final term of enrollment, as part of the student’s educational record.

10. Deadline Extensions
In exceptional circumstances, time deadlines in the policy and procedure may be extended at the discretion of the Dean or the Resolution Officer.
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 participant(s)**: 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 or 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 manuscripts 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.mnich.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/standards/humandeclarations.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 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 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 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.

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 imposing by Rackham in consultation with the appropriate School or College.

n. **Expulsion.** Permanent dismissal from the program, which will be 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.
Sequestration: What it Means and How it Could Affect Federal Research Funding

Why are we talking about sequestration?
The Budget Control Act of 2011 (PL 112-25) was enacted last August. It brought to a conclusion the 2011 debt ceiling crisis, which threatened to put the US in sovereign default. As enacted, the Budget Control Act (BCA):

- Established caps on defense and non-defense discretionary spending through 2021;
- Established a procedure to increase the debt limit by $400 billion initially and procedures that would allow the limit to be raised further in two additional steps, for a cumulative increase of between $2.1 trillion and $2.4 trillion;
- Created a Congressional Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction to propose further deficit reduction, with a stated goal of achieving at least $1.5 trillion in budgetary savings over 10 years; and
- Established automatic procedures (sequestration) for reducing spending by as much as $1.2 trillion if the Joint Select Committee fails to make recommendations, and/or Congress fails to enact legislation, that would achieve such savings.

As you all now know, the Joint Select Committee failed to reach an agreement on deficit reduction just before Thanksgiving last year. Therefore, as required under BCA, an automatic sequestration of $1.2 trillion will begin on January 2, 2013, and will continue in subsequent years through FY21. The BCA does not lay out any specific program funding cuts but does require cuts among large categories of spending.

How is Federal Government spending divided?
(1) Mandatory or entitlement programs, such as Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid and certain other programs – including but not limited to food stamps, federal civilian and military retirement benefits, veterans' disability benefits and unemployment insurance – that are not controlled by the annual appropriations or budget process. Mandatory programs account for more than 60 percent of federal spending, and the cost of these programs is expected to rise dramatically in the coming years as more people become eligible for benefits.

(2) Discretionary programs must have their funding renewed each year by Congress in order to continue operating. The annual budget process, including the 12 annual appropriations bills, determines the discretionary funding necessary to administer most government agencies and programs. Almost all defense spending is discretionary, as are the budgets for basic research, K-12 education, workforce training, housing, and many others. Altogether, discretionary programs make up about one-third of all federal spending.

How does the BCA treat mandatory programs?
The BCA requires cuts to mandatory spending amounting to approximately 29 percent of the overall $1.2 trillion in total reductions. Of this, 16 percent of savings will be due to lower debt service and 13 percent will come from an automatic sequestration of mandatory spending for FY13-FY21. Several mandatory programs, and portions of programs, are exempt from the sequestration process, including Social Security benefits and Medicaid. There also is a 2 percent limit on cuts to Medicare.

How does the BCA treat discretionary programs?
The BCA limits discretionary spending by establishing specific spending caps for FY12-FY21. Typically, Congress establishes these spending caps each year through a Budget Resolution, but the BCA overrides this effort and establishes the spending caps through FY21. The Congressional appropriations committees will maintain jurisdiction over funding levels for specific programs, projects, and activities but they may not exceed the caps established in the BCA.
Here’s how it will all work:

- Approximately $109 billion will be sequestered from discretionary programs in FY13, half from Defense accounts and half from non-Defense accounts.

- The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates that sequestration will likely reduce security/Defense discretionary funding by 10 percent and non-security discretionary funding by 7.8 percent in FY13 (as compared to enacted FY12 levels).

- The caps on spending for FY14-FY21, after the initial FY13 sequestration cuts, will achieve the balance of the savings – resulting in declining reductions (below the previously projected spending levels) of 8.5 percent for security programs and 5.5 percent for non-security programs by the time we reach FY21.

- If Congress adheres to the spending caps for the entire 10 year period, it will appropriate about $825 billion less than if it appropriated the same level of resources, adjusted for inflation, as in FY11.

**How are discretionary programs likely to be affected?**

Though the estimate of sequestration cuts to non-security discretionary programs in FY13 will be 7.8 percent, this does not mean that all programs will be treated equally. The BCA included sequestration exemptions for several programs, accounts, and activities within discretionary spending. This could mean that some programs may suffer significantly higher cuts, while others are left untouched or even increased.

- Under the BCA, the White House Office of Management and Budget (OMB) is tasked with calculating the sequestration and annual spending cap targets. Therefore, OMB will have some responsibility in interpreting which programs and portions of programs are exempt from sequestration – unless Congress intervenes.

- Since sequestration is not scheduled to begin until January 2013, Congress may still pass legislation to adjust sequestration levels or redefine sequestration categories or exemptions. At this point, we do not know if or how Congress will intervene in the sequestration process.

- Members of Congress strongly supportive of defense spending have announced plans to protect the Pentagon’s budget from the nearly $500 billion in estimated cuts over the FY13-21 window. However, President Obama has announced he will veto any legislation that unilaterally prevents defense cuts.

- If Congress approves a budget resolution this spring (typically done annually to set the spending levels for the appropriations process), it is likely that it will be the vehicle for changes to the sequestration process. Indeed, House Republicans have already announced plans to use the budget resolution to modify sequestration with an alternative fiscal fix.

- Should OMB retain control over defining and calculating the sequestration categories, the President’s FY13 budget request to Congress, to be released February 13th, will provide a good indication of which programs are likely to suffer most heavily under sequestration and which programs OMB is most likely to protect.

- It is safe to assume that under the current scenario, NIH, NSF and other research grant-making agencies will receive at least a 7.8 percent reduction in funding for FY13.
• While it is unlikely that these cuts will result in reductions to existing grants, it is highly probable that renewals could be canceled and future awards drastically reduced.

• In addition, research centers enjoying multi-year funding could experience cuts or eliminations.

• While much is still unknown, the UW should prepare for at least proportional cuts of 8 percent for NIH- and NSF-supported research and 10 percent to Defense-supported research to its federal portfolio. Other research areas may not fare as well; planning for a 10 percent or more reduction is recommended.

Does the BCA solve our nation’s debt issues?
No. The BCA only slows the growth of our nation’s debt but does not bring the federal budget into balance. The only way to solve our debt crisis is to deal with mandatory programs and revenues (taxes), the two most politically difficult issues to reach consensus on in a deeply partisan Congress. Until they agree to tackle those big issues – almost certainly NOT before the November elections – we will continue to see additional attacks on discretionary programs.

The following chart shows how our nation’s debt will grow with and without sequestration applied. As you can see, the BCA merely makes a dent in slowing the rate of growth of our debt.

What happens now?
It is unclear how Congress may attempt to change the BCA and how sequestration is applied. There has already been plenty of discussion about protecting Defense funding. If Congress does succeed in protecting Defense funding, it will likely come at the expense of greater cuts to basic research. It is also possible that Members of Congress will continue to push for further reductions to tackle the on-going budget deficit. In fact, the House Republicans will very likely submit
a budget resolution in the spring that sets FY13 spending levels BELOW the caps established in the BCA. We have to wait and see if the Senate democrats or President Obama agrees with these additional cuts during a tough election year.

Regardless, this issue will be front and center throughout the year and leading up to the November elections. Do not, however, expect Congress to approve much if any legislation to modify sequestration. Any real legislative action will likely take place after the elections during a lame duck session. Until then, the Office of Federal Relations, along with our counterparts at the other research universities around the country, will be working hard to educate Members of Congress and agency officials about the work that we do and why we are a good investment to help revitalize the economy.

**What can you do?**

Now is the time to communicate regularly with the Federal Relations staff. Many of you will be asked by your national associations and professional societies to engage with Congressional offices on specific funding and policy issues related to your field and potential cuts. Please keep us in the loop on these requests as we can help guide you to the most appropriate office and assist you in tailoring your message for the maximum impact. We are also currently collecting information on the results of federal grants funding – whether it be in promising new research; preparing future scientists, engineers, doctors, or teachers; or in collecting and disseminating large data sets to help guide public policy. We are looking for positive stories that we can share with Member of Congress and the Administration that demonstrate our effective use of federal grant dollars.

You can also stay informed by reading the Federal Relations blog at [http://www.washington.edu/federalrelations/](http://www.washington.edu/federalrelations/). We will continue to post budget related information on our blog throughout the year. Additionally, this is the place where we try to alert campus to other important legislative issues as well as large federal grant opportunities.

We are also looking forward to seeing many of you in DC as you attend national conferences and annual meetings. Please do let us know when you will be in DC so that we can help you think about meetings with Members of Congress, their staff, and Administration officials that might further the UW agenda through your good work. This year is shaping up to be a challenging and anxiety-filled year for those who rely on federal research dollars, and the Federal Relations team looks forward to working with you to deliver your message in the most effective way possible.

**Who can you contact for more information?**

**Office of Federal Relations**

Christy Gullion  
*Director*  
cgullion@uw.edu  
202-624-1424

Sarah Martin Castro  
*Associate Director*  
smcastro@uw.edu  
202-624-1426

Bri Fields  
*Assistant to the Director*  
bcfields@uw.edu  
202-624-1420