Rackham Student Government
Board Meeting: April 12, 2012
Agenda

I. Call To Order
II. Approval of Agenda
III. Approval of Previous Minutes
   a. March 29, 2012* (p 2)
   b. April 5, 2012* (p 6)
IV. Public Hearing on Resolution W-12-01: Resolution to Expand the University’s Non-Discrimination Policy
V. Officer Reports
   a. Graduate Student Body President, Michael
   b. Graduate Student Body Vice President, Kaitlin
   c. Graduate Student Body Treasurer, Alex (p 11)
VI. Guest Speaker / Discussion: Dr. Laura Blake Jones, Dean of Students
VII. Executive Order W-12-02: CODIFYING COMMUNITY INPUT AT RSG BOARD MEETINGS* (p 14)
VIII. Board Resolution W-12-01: Resolution to Expand the University’s Non-Discrimination Policy * – second reading (p 17)
IX. Graduate Student Bill of Rights and Responsibilities* (p 23)
X. Committee Announcements
   a. Winter Goal Review *(p 21)
   b. Spring/Summer Goal Discussion
XI. Open Discussion
XII. Adjournment

* - Item included in packet
** - Item will be provided on Day of Meeting or at Meeting
*** - Item was included in a previous packet
RACKHAM STUDENT GOVERNMENT
BOARD MEETING
March 29, 2012
RACKHAM GRADUATE BUILDING
2ND FLOOR WEST CONFERENCE ROOM, NORTH ALCOVE
6:30 P.M.

Attendance: Eli Benchell Eisman, Chris Tom, Anna Wagner, Haven Allen, Ben Curtiss-Lusher, Daniel Trubman, Kaitlin Flynn, Alex Toulouse, Michael Benson

Absent (excused): Tien Huei-Hsu, Lauren Knapp, Alex Emly, Andrew Crawford, Patrick Rooney, Nina White, Marisol Ramos, Pete McGrath

1. Call to order: 6:40pm
2. Approval of the Agenda: Motion by Heidi, seconded by Haven. Motion by Dan seconded by Haven to move the guest speaker to section IV. Motion by Chris and seconded by Alex T to postpone the public hearing for the sexual practices resolution. Heidi objects to moving it. Kaitlin clarifies that publicizing this would perhaps increase turnout. Michael clarifies that this item has returned to the agenda because we postponed it only for one week so that is why it’s on the agenda again. Haven asks if we are supposed to have a 2nd reading prior to the public hearing and Michael indicates that we will likely vote on it. 6-1-3 the reading is postponed. Heidi moves to add a discussion of the sexual practices resolution to the end of the meeting and seconded by Ben. Approved with one abstention.
3. Approval of previous minutes: the minutes are provided in raw format and Michael asks that we not approve them at this time. Additionally, the election results are raw and Michael asks that we do not distribute them until the results are confirmed.
4. Jill McDonough, Director of Development and Alumni Relations- Guest speaker. Jill is working hard on the Rackham Centennial events. These events have been very successful this year. These include career roundtables, the research conference, the Jorge Cham event and more—the turnout for all of these events has been very high. Their next event is with Jonathan Cole who will be discussing the future of graduate education. Another upcoming event will involve alumni gatherings in Taipei and Seoul. In October, a number of Rackham Centennial lectures will take place. In November, a donor recognition luncheon will occur. Jill would love to get any ideas or thoughts for a closing event in November, something in line with the fun opening event for students. Michael brings up perhaps hosting a graduate student formal or formal affair for students and faculty (?). Heidi also seconds that and suggests a play, art exhibit or concert. Eli suggests highlighting top researchers who have received Rackham predoctoral fellowship. Michael mentions including and highlighting Master’s students. Kaitlin suggests a concert, perhaps with NoMo or another jazz/funk local band. Jill asks if we have RSG committees working on the semiformal. Jill will follow up with Alex T and Alex E. Jill’s email is jillmcd@umich.edu and she welcomes suggestions. Michael also mentions that UM will be hosting the SAGE fall conference. Heidi suggests putting the event on the Rackham building terraces. Haven asks Jill if there would be alumni pushback on
changing the GPA scale and Jill answers likely no. Michael asks where the alumni money raised from Jill’s office goes and she answers that donor money goes primarily to the students. Heidi asks if the donors can choose which graduate students get their funding. Jill answers no, there is a firewall up to protect from any conflicts of interest. Eli asks if there are pots of money are not used up every year by giving to graduate students. Jill answers that that was once the case, but now due to budget issues, most funds get tapped in one way or another. Chris asks about the stigma associated with nontraditional graduate students and if a fellowship could be created and how one might be able to go about creating such a fellowship. Jill answers that she would be the person to ask, but there may be a fellowship already available for these students. But, if there is still an interest, it would be worth discussing with a director of development like herself would be the next step. Jill also mentions that the increase in student philanthropy on campus has been wonderful for her office. Eli supports this idea and points out that the undergraduate group Project Wolverine is becoming quite successful and adding this on to the graduate level or the professional student level.

5. Officer reports
   a. Michael Benson, RSG President: The law school student senate met with Michael and are looking to separate from CSG. A similar meeting is planned for next week with the medical school student council. UM also won the bid to host the SAGE fall summit. The election went well and we are in the process of verifying write-in candidates. Bylaws are included in the packet.
   b. Kaitlin Flynn, RSG Vice President: The GAC is taking place this Friday at MSU. About 50 students will be presenting. Also we attended SAGE in DC but will talk more about that later. Finally the bylaws have been updated and we’ll discuss later on the agenda.
   c. Alex Toulouse, RSG treasurer: $23,595 in the account but will drop after reimbursements. Budget requests are coming through and we will discuss later. Updated budget is not accurate so an updated version will be provided next week.

6. SAGE updates: Motion to postpone until next week when we will have more board members here by Dan, seconded by Ben. Heidi supports Dan’s mention.

7. Winter 2012 Election Results: Michael describes the problems with the elections and that some divisions have candidates with only one vote and so we are trying to figure out if they want to be representatives. Dan says that there is something from fundamentally wrong with students who only have one vote being able to get a seat when people who have more votes in other divisions. Alex mentions that he would support giving the extra seats to individuals who actually received votes. Kaitlin mentions that while it does seem like students who receive more votes should get seats, it would create a supermajority of students from one program or one division (as is currently the case in Biological chemistry, public policy and chemistry programs). Heidi asks if Dan has a better idea for how it could work. Dan mentions that he doesn’t want a supermajority but still doesn’t support people who have only one vote being able to get a seat. Eli says that he disagrees and says that it is the responsibility of the delegate to contact all constituents. Anna asks if traditionally the president and vice president run together. Michael and Kaitlin answer that yes
8. Graduate Student Bill of Rights: the final version is included without the enforcement piece and we will vote on it next week.

9. Rackham GPA: Haven presents a weighted 4.0 GPA scale as a memorandum including academic peers using each system. Haven makes a motion to adopt this weighted scale as the supported RSG system and Dan seconds. Alex T asks what the purpose of an E is and Heidi clarifies that a course with an E is not allowed to be retaken. He also asks why not to use a 4.3/4.3 scale and Ben clarifies that this is to make it more universally accepted. Kaitlin clarifies that additionally the students in the Fall election voted on having a 4.0 scale. Eli asks if this affects people who have already received degrees and their GPAs and the answer is no. Alex T motions to call to question, Kaitlin seconds. Unanimous vote. Roll call vote for this proposal and by a vote of 9-0-1 it is approved.

10. Winter 2012 Bylaw Amendments: Motion by Eli to add COSAC to the bylaws and seconded by Heidi, it’s unanimous. This will be in first readings until next week. Kaitlin walks through the edits and notes that MSA to CSG switch will need to take place. Kaitlin also mentions that the funding issue with class projects. The language has been changed.
   a. Ben suggests that we move the Projects in which students are receiving course credit for completion. Motion seconded by Eli. Alex and Michael object. Alex notes that moving this to the “may require additional information, section 9” would be ambiguous. Michael notes that he would rather see the language stay in section 10 but add “components of” to the beginning.
   b. Michael moves to amend Ben’s motion to insert “components of” prior to the language. Seconded by Chris. The board discussed Michael’s motion. 4 – 6 fails.
   c. Ben makes a friendly amendment to add f. to read “Symposia or presentations related to class projects in which students are receiving course credit but are not explicitly required under the course” Approved unanimously.
   d. Kaitlin notes that the divisions are updated.
   e. Alex notes that urban planning has always been in Division 3 but Pete will retain his current seat. Discussion continues.
   f. Kaitlin closes discussion with the caveat that we will fix the changes of MSA to CSG, addition of COSAC and addition of new language to the budgetary committee.

11. Committee Reports
   a. Academic affairs: minutes approval moved by Chris and seconded by Alex T, approved with two abstentions. Town hall event is next Tuesday, please come and get your constituents to come.
b. Budgetary committee: motion to accept the minutes by Alex T and seconded by Chris, approved with 3 abstentions.

c. Communications committee: newsletter coming out Monday, blurbs for full flyer needed by Sunday.

d. Elections committee: still verifying write in candidates and hope to have figured out within a week.

e. Legislative affairs: forums being done for local housing ordinance. The GSRA unionization bill is being taken up by Ingham county court.

f. Student life: bowling event on Saturday, sending out doodle for volunteers.

g. Bylaw review: done.

h. COSAC: DP day this Saturday with 24 people signed up to do downtown gardening. April 28 H4H date confirmed.

12. Sexual Practices Resolution: Heidi makes some points regarding this motion and Michael moves to postpone discussion until the full board can make it. Heidi will email out her points to the board.

13. Open Discussion: Haven makes the point that the sexual practices inclusion in the bill of rights and bylaws means that we should decide on the practice first before pushing. Ben makes the point that the agendas are getting a little long. Kaitlin makes the suggestion that perhaps we could do committee reports biweekly or something else.

1. Attendance: Tien Huei-Hsu, Eli Benchell Eisman, Chris Tom, Alex Emly, Anna Wagner, Heidi Pedini, Haven Allen, Ben Curtiss-Lusher, Dan Trubman, Pete McGrath, Michael, Alex Toulouse, Lauren Knapp, Andrew Crawford
   a. Absent: Pat Rooney, Nina White
2. Approval of Agenda: moved by Chris, seconded by Alex E. Approved with two abstentions.
3. Approval of Previous minutes
   a. March 22, 2012- moved by Eli and seconded by Chris. Approved with one abstention.
   b. March 29, 2012- moved by Alex E and seconded by Ben. Kaitlin motions to postpone the approval of the minutes seconded by Dan. Approved with three abstentions for one week.
4. Public Hearing on Resolution W-12-01: Resolution to Expand the University’s Non-Discrimination Policy. Michael asks for members from the public hearing of
   a. Discussion because we’re confused. Heidi motions to reopen the agenda, seconded by Chris. Pete objects. Heidi defines that she would like to move the public hearing to after the second reading. Dan mentions that in the bylaws we need to have the public hearing before the second reading. Andrew makes a motion to add a public hearing after Chris’s motion passes. Chris seconds. Heidi objects because she is hesitant to have a public hearing after the language change in order to allow people time to digest information. Motion fails with 3-2-10 (?).
5. Officer reports
   a. Michael: the town hall was very successful with the deans and students interacting. Next week is the last meeting of the term. There will be a dinner banquet afterwards.
   b. Kaitlin: The Graduate Academic Conference at MSU last week was great and 8 UM students won awards. We could do this event again with MSU. Additionally, I want to modify the minutes to include more events from the last meeting. I want to point out that we don’t always put things word for word in the minutes and don’t necessarily ascribe to document word for word what happens.
   c. Alex Toulouse: about $22,000 left in the account, still reimbursing groups and SAGE. In terms of elections, Alex is working on verifying newly elected candidates and providing more information where needed.
6. Winter 2012 Bylaw Amendments—second readings. Michael introduces the bylaws. Motion to approve the bylaw amendments by Heidi and seconded by Chris. Dan mentions that the election director section is unclear considering our most recent
elections when we have not hired outside for an elections director. Michael mentions that we will be modifying the elections during our review over the summer. Roll call vote for the approval of the bylaw amendments. Approved unanimously and in immediate effect.

7. Motion by Alex E to switch items 7 and 8 in the agenda. Approved unanimously.

8. **Guest Speaker: Prof. Kate Barald, Chair of the Faculty Senate, Senate Assembly and SACUA.** Kate Barald was one representative on the senate that voted against continuous enrollment. The principal of continuous enrollment was to “recoup 980 tuitions and make money for Rackham.” Kate says that her and the faculty she represented were “opposed to balancing the budget on the backs of sponsored projects.” Phil Hanlon and Kate have discussed what sort of fine to assess for students being out of enrollment. RSG and SACUA worked together to suggest a level at $100. SACUA is the executive committee of the faculty senate and they are voted into their positions. Kate says that over the last year we have had more policy issues than normal at the University. For instance, the “most serious issue” to the committee is the GSRA unionization issue. Kate says that the stance of the committee is a matter that is up to the students and this should be a matter of policy and that the University and faculty have no business trying to sway the student’s vote, but are able to speak their minds on this issue. Kate says that the ‘basic bottom line’ says that no level of legislature should be weighing in on matters of academic policy at the University. The stance of the committee is that student’s are not employees but are trainees. This involves a lot of semantic divides. But from Kate’s perspective, the students who work in her lab are not employees because they are not told when to come in, or when to leave (and many other examples of how labor laws will apply to student employees). Kate also mentions that in the sciences they work in teams and that they view the students as colleagues in training. But she notes that there are other types of GSRAs, such as those in statistics, who are not working on their own projects and work hourly wages. Kate and the committee think that there are new titles that are needed to define these different types of work. And Kate notes that the definition of work needs some thinking. Academics have work that is a part of them, or a part of their endeavor. But to labor lawyers, work means the procurement of something that can be traded, like products or effort by a deliverable date. The concept of hourly work, for pay, or the concept of work itself, are semantic barriers for lawyers and academics/scientists/scholars. Kate notes that the graduate students and students in general are the lifeblood of the University and from her personal perspective, she has never considered any of her students to be her employees, but rather as members of her research group.

a. **Questions from the board:** Heidi asks if Kate feels as if it would be beneficial for the University to develop some kind of definition or structure for these issues. She also asks if whether the GSRAs feel like employees vs the MERC and University deciding if they are. Kate says that the points are well taken and that in her world, the government sets the limits for wages. There are also serious issues with NIH and NSF funding, for instance. Kate mentions that one of these issues was that continuous enrollment made it so that students were paying tuition even when they were ‘teaching themselves’ in their laboratories. But fellowship support for the science students is okay,
when you consider the support given to humanities majors. One of the things that SACUA is particularly interested in is to look into getting support for those kinds of students. Andrew asks if the programs changing their prelims to allow students to pass prelims their first year would really make a difference in the gap of money affected by continuous enrollment. Kate answers that this is not as much the case because Rackham considers this to not be an issue because students might finish quicker. Kate discusses more about prelims across departments. A member of the community asks for an action item and saying that he is being asked to fill out effort certificates for his job as a GSRA. Kate mentions that he should not sign it until the issue is resolved. She pontificates more on the process and courts. Chris comments that as a nontraditional graduate student he appreciates the loosening of the rules to allow him to take prelims as a first year. Kate mentions that a lot of students can’t find funding and don’t have a place to do their work. Alex T asks where RSG could play a role in pursuing the work of SACUA. Kate answers that we could help with creating definitions for students and employees. She also mentions that she took on her chair position to have funding for her students and research associates in her lab. Kate also wants us to think about the concept of the University as a corporate structure and how that would affect us in our own lives. Michael mentions that currently undergrads appoint grad students to serve on SACUA but we would be interested in doing this. Kate is receptive and says especially because we are faculty members in training. Eli asks about the issue of the student who was involved in a conflict of interest issue and if SACUA had any resources for students in this manner. Kate answers that SACUA is purely an adversarial board and truly "has no power" to do things for the students in this manner.

9. **Board Resolution W-12-01:** Motion to approve the resolution by Chris and seconded by Andrew. Chris objects and makes a motion to bring a new draft of the resolution to amend by substitution the resolution and seconded by Heidi. 7-0-8. The amendment is substantive and the discussion will proceed with the document in first readings. Eli motions to limit the discussion to 10 minutes seconded by Pete. Eli mentions that the expected time allotted for the meeting would extend beyond the time of our night. Haven objects and mentions that he would like everyone’s opinions to be heard. 4-6-5 motion fails. Chris starts discussion by saying that based on the numerous conversations he’s had he has changed “sexual practices” to “sexual expression and relationship status” to split the terms and encompass a lot more of the point and addresses a number of concerns. Ben asks what the impetus for bringing this resolution to the board. Chris mentions that when he first saw the non-discrimination policy during the drafting of the Bill of Rights, he felt that there was something missing in the policy and he felt that there needed to be a clause for the university to stay out of student’s life in this way. Dan asks if this would cover polygamy. Chris mentions that this would not protect against illegal acts (such as multiple marriages like polygamy) but it is constructed to protect against things such as polyamory and who you like, as opposed to sexual orientation which only protects who you’re attracted to. Heidi mentions that having relationships with multiple people when the people are non-married is legal in Michigan. Ben asks...
about the specific language in the resolution and if Chris could talk more about the difference between sexual expression and action. Chris answers that the language is intended to protect the actions that take place between individuals. Chris mentions that this is also intended to protect against all actions for everyone. Paul (community member) says that he fully supports the intent behind the policy but his primary concern is behind the definitions of the terms and the ultimate interpretation of these terms. He mentions that when it comes down to interpreting the policy, how can we ensure that the terms are not being misrepresented or, for instance, how the sexual expression term in particular could be misconstrued. David (community member) asks why we need both relationship status and marital status in the policy. Chris answers that we would have both to protect other relationships that are not married. David asks if sexual expression issues on the fringe of being illegal means that in the policy then the University could discriminate against these individuals. Chris answers that state law is as state law, and getting into grey territory of stepping over the boundaries is the responsibility of the individual. Jason (community member) comments that he recommends language indicating “expression of intimate relationships” or something that removes the ‘sex’ part from the resolution. Heidi mentions that the policy does not specifically indicate illegal acts are excluded. Ben is concerned about the unintended consequences of the language and feels that there is too much uncertainty around the issue. Haven would like the board to consider separating these issues to vote on dividing the question. Michael answers that this will happen during the second readings. Haven makes a motion to strike ‘marital status’ and replace it with ‘relationship status’ in the NDP this is seconded by Andrew. Ben would like to make a friendly amendment that would say "WHEREAS relationship status includes but is not limited to marital status as defined as...". The motion now reads on lines 25 through 27, with the additional changes of relationship status instead of marital status throughout. Chris mentions that this might not be the right time or place to do this at this point because it could affect people’s perception of marriage and that it might seem unfriendly towards marriage. Heidi respectfully disagrees with Chris and thinks that having both terms in the proposed clause explicitly defines both. Dan agrees with Chris and says that this has the possibility of offending marriage supporters. Alex E. says that relationship status encompasses marital status and doesn’t think that we need to have both. Haven says that he doesn’t feel that this offends married individuals. Pete says that also marriage is a legally bound issue. Heidi mentions that having lots of words in the NDP allows for flexibility for the people who are determining what happens when issues arise. Kaitlin objects to call to question and Chris seconds. Motion carries 8-6-1. Chris explains that this amendment might be a lot to ask for people outside this room. Dan mentions that taking out the word marital status is just asking the University one more thing to do. Lauren mentions that this policy doesn’t mention or endorse illegal activities and Lauren’s amendment is to include an explicit mention saying that illegal activities are not endorsed. This would go under as a resolved clause. Change “no changes within section 201.5 should be construed to violate or supercede local state or federal law including polygamy.” Lauren motions to make the amendment and Dan seconds. Kaitlin, Chris and Alex T object. Lauren explains why she feels it is needed.
feels that the word polygamy will be inflammatory and adding the extra clause will sink the issue. Alex T asks if removing the word ‘polygamy’ would make the amendment non substantive. Michael says no. Ben makes a friendly amendment to Lauren’s amendment to include that clause but without the polygamy section. This is approved with 4 abstentions. Chris makes a motion to object to having a public hearing on the change next week. Heidi and Andrew object. Chris explains that we need to move forward and it feels redundant. Haven objects and also doesn’t see anything wrong with having the public and our constituents involved. The motion of not to have a public hearing fails.

10. March Madness: we have a number of ties for the March Madness event and will need to extend the budget for the application of more prizes. Haven motions and seconded by Ben. Alex E objects. She mentions that we shouldn’t give more money away just because people tied. Michael speaks in favor and says that we could get more people to participate in the future. Motion to call to question by Chris. Proceeding to the vote. The motion is to allocate $50 to the student life committee is 3-9-2 and the motion fails.

11. Rackham GPA: Haven has updated the memo adds an example and changes to say that you cannot get above a cumulative 4.0. Seconded by Dan and approved with one abstention.

12. Motion to adjourn by Ben and seconded by Kaitlin.
We currently have $21,968 in the account. I am currently processing reimbursement for most of the approved events, and SAGE reimbursements have not yet been processed.

I would like to ask for a motion to increase the Student Life Budget for this term by $1000 from its original $3700. Due to unforeseen costs associated with co-sponsored events with Rackham, including the Pistons game which we had not allocated any money for, we are over budget by almost $1000. These additional costs will be offset by money that was not spent by the elections, communications, or COSAC committees.

There should also be a motion by one of the academic chairs to increase their budget by approximately $60, which they went over their budget of $700.

**Final Elections Results:**

Graduate Student Body President and Vice President - 1 seat:

Michael Benson (P) and Kaitlin Flynn (VP): 390 votes

Division I: Biological and Health Sciences Election - 2 seats:
- Matthew Waugh (write-in) - 8 weighted votes; 4 votes
**Tie with 1 write-in vote:**
- Jason Kehrl
- Hayley Warsinke
- Ryan Stock
- Robert Primeau
- Marisol Becerra
- Amber McCartney

Division II: Physical Sciences and Engineering Election - 6 seats
- Anna Belak - 1046 weighted votes; 198 votes
- Bernardo Orvananos - 882 weighted votes; 186 votes
- Evan Arthur - 101 weighted votes; 17 votes
- Heidi Alvey (write-in) - 6 weighted votes; 1 vote
- Brandon Erickson (write-in) - 6 weighted votes; 1 vote
Division III: Social Sciences and Education Election - 2 seats
- Vanessa Cruz - 294 weighted votes; 153 votes
- Matthew Filter - 130 weighted votes; 85 votes

Division IV: Humanities and the Arts Election - 1 seat:
None

Budget Update:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Life</th>
<th>Allocated</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ice Skating at Yost Arena</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$1,059.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pistons vs Lakers NBA Game</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$740.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling at Colonial Lanes</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$1,156.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karaoke Night at Circus Bar</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valentine's Day Event</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$182.31</td>
<td>$182.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Patrick's Day Event</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$545.00</td>
<td>$545.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March Madness Contest Prizes</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinball Pete's Event</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pistons vs Orlando NBA Game</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$615.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$3,700.00</td>
<td>$4,650.04</td>
<td>$977.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COSAC</th>
<th>Allocated</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth Education Outreach</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washtenaw area parks cleanup</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International student Peer-mentoring</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$375.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Affairs</th>
<th>Allocated</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall Meetings</td>
<td>$700.00</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$700.00</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budgetary</th>
<th>Allocated</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Group Funding</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td>$5,811.00</td>
<td>$2,345.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td>$5,811.00</td>
<td>$2,345.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communications</th>
<th>Allocated</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter Trivia Prizes</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSG Banner</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$230.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislative</th>
<th>Allocated</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Allocated</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAGE Federal Lobbying</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Lobbying</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council Town Hall</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,700.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Allocated</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elections Director</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising/Prizes</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$600.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Allocated</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary Funds</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$300.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Allocated</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jorge Cham Event - Water Bottles</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$200.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$200.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Balance Winter 2012</td>
<td>$25,034.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Allocated Funds</td>
<td>$15,805.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Costs</td>
<td>$11,411.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Spent</td>
<td>$3,323.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Reserve Funds</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Balance</td>
<td>$21,711.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated Final Winter 2012 Balance</td>
<td>$13,623.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AN EXECUTIVE ORDER CREATING CODIFYING COMMUNITY INPUT AT RSG BOARD MEETINGS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Michael L. Benson
President, Rackham Student Government
I was asked by Ben what the impetus for authoring this Resolution was. Though certainly reading through the GSBoR was a part of that, it was only a small part. More importantly, I think the question is: how I saw the hole in the NDP, and why I want to fix it. Both are reasons that come from interactions with people, because the motivation always comes from people, for the people.

There are two perspectives that have come from graduate students at the University of Michigan that have guided the rationale and inspiration in this process. The first is a student that I learned that dated two people at once. She feared repercussions if anyone found out she was dating two people. She was terrified of being exposed,outed. It wasn't that she had come out in an LGBTQ way, as she was already out in that way, it was that the social stigma and issue surrounding polyamory is something else entirely. Something else unprotected, separate from the way that sexual orientation is protected. The last line of this resolution says: "without explicit protection from discrimination, there may be the threat of implicitly sanctioned discrimination." She lived under this threat day in and day out. She could never talk to other people about this, never share the joys and troubles of this. Just as Jason, representative-elect said, it is only the same rights afforded without question to monogamous couples (both hetero and homosexual) that poly people ask for. The ability to bring both boyfriends, or both girlfriends, to a department picnic. The ability to talk openly about the difficulties inherent in any relationship, let alone a non-traditional one. This girl never felt safe and comfortable doing that, and this ultimately led to the demise of an otherwise happy, experimental, ethical, open relationship.

The other influence is an active member in the greater Detroit BDSM scene. He organizes events, workshops, play parties, and to my knowledge is one of the most involved young leaders in this community. He tries to educate and involve people who are interested. However, like my other friend, he too separates his life. In one portion of his life, he goes by one name; and in the other, he refers to himself by a completely different name. If you mistakenly use the wrong name in a particular situation, he immediately corrects you. These two lives, he keeps separate. Though I haven't explicitly asked, there seems to be a disconnect between his leadership role within the community, his pride in what he does and who he is, his interactions within a certain context, and then all the interactions that happen outside of this context. I've seen how he reacts, sharply, adversely, to these lines being crossed, and that is an indication, a concern, a red flag.
RESOLUTION TO EXPAND THE UNIVERSITY NON-DISCRIMINATION POLICY

WHEREAS, The Non-Discrimination Policy within the University of Michigan Standard Practice Guide exists to protect the diverse range of individuals employed by and attending the University from discrimination, harassment, and violence; AND

WHEREAS, the Non-Discrimination Policy states that the University “will not discriminate against any individual because of race, color, national origin, age, marital status, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, disability, religion, height, weight, or veteran status”; AND

WHEREAS, “gender identity” is interpreted to refer to the self-identity of the individual; “gender expression” is interpreted to refer to the actions of an individual to realize their gender identity; AND

WHEREAS, the American Psychological Association defines sexual orientation to be “an enduring pattern of emotional, romantic, and/or sexual attractions to men, women, or both sexes;” AND

WHEREAS, sexual orientation refers to the nature of the person or persons that an individual is emotional, romantic, and/or sexual attractions to; AND

WHEREAS, University protects the subject and the object of emotional, romantic, and/or sexual attractions through its Non-Discrimination Policy; AND

WHEREAS, the Non-Discrimination Policy does not protect the actions between the subject and object that are the primary means to sexual and physical fulfillment; AND

WHEREAS, “sexual expression” would thus refer to the actions of an individual to realize their sexual identity; AND

1 Michigan Standard Practice Guide (sect. 201.35)
2 Jackie Simpson, Head of the Spectrum Center, adapted from personal communication on Feb 13th, 2012.
3 Dr. Charlie Glickman, Adult Sex Educator in San Francisco, adapted from personal communication March 31st, 2012.
WHEREAS, “relationship status” includes but is not limited to “marital status” which is defined as “never married, married, widowed and not remarried, divorced and not remarried, married but legally separated, de facto union”⁵; AND

WHEREAS, “marital status” does not protect a diverse range of emotional, romantic, and/or sexual relationships that can occur outside of, and coexistent with, the institution of marriage; AND

WHEREAS, it is known that individuals can and have been discriminated against for their methods of sexual expression and non-marital relationship status⁶; AND

WHEREAS, without explicit protection from discrimination, there may be the threat of implicitly sanctioned discrimination; violence and related hate crimes can accompany the lack of explicit protection⁷

NOW ON BEHALF OF THE STUDENT BODY OF THE HORACE H. RACKHAM GRADUATE SCHOOL, BE IT

RESOLVED, that the section 201.35 of the Standard Practice Guide of the University of Michigan be amended as follows (without emphasis):

“The University, in its employment and human resource policy and practices, will not discriminate against any individual because of race, color, national origin, age, marital status, relationship status, sex, sexual orientation, sexual expression, gender identity, gender expression, disability, religion, height, weight, or veteran status, except as allowed by the need for bona fide occupational qualification. Reasonable accommodation will also be provided to persons with disabilities, to disabled veterans, and to accommodate religious practices;” AND BE IT FURTHER

RESOLVED, that no proposed changes contained in this resolution to section 201.35 of the University’s Non-Discrimination Policy should be construed to violate or supersede local state or federal law; AND BE IT FINALLY

RESOLVED, that the President of the graduate student body is empowered and directed to work with the Administration of the University of Michigan to put into place policies that reflect the will and intent of this resolution.

---


⁶ National Coalition for Sexual Freedom, Incident Response Report records

⁷ Rebecca Stotzer, PhD. Comparison of hate crime rates across protected and unprotected groups. Williams Institute, UCLA School of Law. June 2007.
Christopher Tuck Mung Baker Tom
Representative (Division 1), Rackham Student Government
Co-chair, Academic Affairs Committee

ATTEST

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

____________________________________
Kaitlin Flynn
Vice President, Rackham Student Government

PRESIDENTIAL ACTION

I, Michael Benson, President of the Rackham Student Body, do hereby approve / veto this resolution on this the _______ day of _____, 2012.

____________________________________
Michael L. Benson
President, Rackham Graduate Student Body
Important Information for Ph.D. Students

The reinstatement fee for Ph.D. students who return to graduate study after a period of non-enrollment will take effect for students who discontinue enrollment in Spring/Summer 2012 or later.

In March 2012, the Rackham Executive Board voted to lift the suspension of the reinstatement fee for Ph.D. students. A Ph.D. student who discontinues enrollment in Spring/Summer 2012 or later and subsequently is reinstated into the same program will be assessed a fee equal to one quarter of the prevailing candidacy tuition rate for each fall and winter semester that the student was not registered, up to a maximum of eight semesters. Responsibility for paying the reinstatement fee will be split between the graduate student seeking to re-enroll and the graduate program that agrees to reinstate the student, such that the graduate program will pay at least half of the fee.

Please note: Former Ph.D. students who discontinued their enrollment prior to Spring/Summer 2012 are not subject to this fee if they apply successfully for reinstatement.

Context and Rationale for the Reinstatement Fee

By staying registered in their programs throughout their graduate career, Ph.D. students stay connected with their faculty advisors and graduate programs, and are more likely to complete their degree. Ph.D. students register during each fall and winter semester until degree completion, unless they have an approved leave of absence or have been granted Extramural Study status. A student who withdraws from a PhD program, or who is discontinued by the faculty, may apply to be reinstated. The faculty in the department or graduate program decide about reinstatement.

In April 2009 the Rackham Executive Board approved a fee for any PhD student who withdraws or discontinues and subsequently returns to be reinstated in their program. The reinstatement fee was instituted to deter casual discontinuation, such as might occur when students are leaving their programs with the intention of returning at some point. They may, for example, not be ready for an examination, may be making slow progress on the dissertation, or may lack funding. Casual discontinuation, experience shows, is a risky strategy for addressing these problems.

The reinstatement fee was originally scheduled to take effect in the fall of 2010, but was suspended in order to monitor withdrawal and reinstatement activity to determine if a fee is needed. The activity since fall of 2010 shows that some students, with or without the advice of faculty, are leaving their programs with the intention of making progress on their doctoral work and of applying for reinstatement in the future. The reinstatement fee is intended to deter this activity, which undermines the goals of regular registration and active progress toward the degree with direct faculty support and supervision.

When payment of the reinstatement fee presents a significant financial hardship for a returning student, the student may apply to the Graduate School for a grant to cover the student’s portion of the fee. Graduate programs also have the option of paying more than half of the reinstatement fee.

Rackham Graduate School
Rackham Student Government Winter 2012
Compiled Goal Worksheet

Academic Issues

- GSRA issues, IP ownership
- **Bill of Rights**
- GPA issue (Ford school)
- Interlibrary loan efficiency
- Dispute Resolution Board to address student issues
- Ideas for non-traditional and international grad student funding
- PhD Candidate Courses
- Building Hours
- Masters Student Study Space

Local Issues

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

State/Federal Issues

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

Student Services Issues (non academic)

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

Social Events

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

**Academic Affairs Committee**

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

**Community Outreach and Social Action Committee**

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

**Student Life Committee**

- Earth Day
- Non-Traditional Careers

**Legislative Affairs Committee**

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

---

i Per Approved Board Resolution F-11-001: Creating Student Advisory Panels
Rackham Student Government
Graduate Student Bill of Rights
2012
DRAFT

March 29, 2012
Rackham Student Government
2012 Graduate Student Bill of Rights
DRAFT

1  PREAMBLE

Upon enrollment, all Rackham graduate students will be informed of the following rights and
responsibilities. These rights and responsibilities are derived from Masters and PhD students
roles as junior colleagues who contribute to the mission of the University of Michigan through
their research, teaching and extracurricular involvement. All graduate students will be free from
reprisal for exercising the rights and responsibilities contained within this document.

2  DEFINITIONS

1. University Refers to the University of Michigan as an institute of higher learning that
is authorized to grant academic degrees, and also to faculty, staff and administrators who
are associated with this institute.

2. Faculty/Advisor An employee appointed by the University who serves in teaching, service
and/or research functions.

3. Program/Department An academic unit as defined by the University.

4. Graduate Student An individual enrolled in an advanced degree program and for whom
the University holds academic records for.

5. Professional Development Skills or knowledge acquired for career advancement.

3  RIGHTS

1. Graduate students have the right to fair and equal treatment from University adminis-
trators, departmental staff and faculty free of discrimination based on gender, race, age,
family status, sexual practice, sexual orientation, gender expression, disability, religious or
political affiliations, country of origin, and citizenship.

2. Graduate students have the right to refuse to perform tasks unrelated to the requirements
of their individual academic program(s) or professional development.

3. Graduate students have the right to specific and concrete requirements for achieving an
advanced degree. These will be communicated clearly upon entrance to the program and
accessible in written form thereafter. Modifications to those requirements must be conveyed
to the students in a similar manner. No changes to degree requirements will affect students
previously accepted into the graduate program or academic focus, except at the option of
the student.

4. Graduate students have the right to change their faculty advisor(s) and the right to al-
ternative supervision, external to the university if necessary, in cases where the student’s
primary advisor departs from the university upon achieving candidacy. If a degree pro-
gram is to be discontinued, provisions will be made for students already in the program to
complete their course of study.
5. Prospective and currently enrolled graduate students have a right to know the average time to degree within a specific graduate program. These students have a right to know a programs attrition rate and the predominant reasons for failure of completion.

6. Graduate students that are required to teach by their program will be afforded a comprehensive training program for their teaching responsibilities.

7. Graduate students that are required to perform research by their program will be afforded a comprehensive training program for their research responsibilities.

8. Graduate students have a right to adequate space and material resources for their work (e.g. printers, telephones, computers etc.)

9. Graduate students have the right to objective evaluation, regular feedback and guidance concerning their academic performance and progress towards an advanced degree. Evaluations will be factual, specific and should be shared with the student within a reasonable period of time. The following will be available to the student in writing upon request: annual progress reports, decisions on qualifying examinations, and unusual or additional program requirements.

10. Graduate students have the right to correct or remedy deficiencies in their academic and/or research performance prior to dismissal from a program. Any intent to dismiss a student from a graduate program or advising relationship must be preceded by specific, written performance information at least one semester prior to actual dismissal.

11. Graduate students have the right to access professional training courses and seminars. This includes but is not be limited to: information about professional and academic associations and conferences, mock interviews, job opportunities and publishing articles in journals.

12. Graduate students have the right to be informed of financial support for their studies prior to entering and during their programs. Should this support change at any time during the course of study, graduate students have a right to be informed in writing of such changes in a timely manner.

13. All departments and graduate programs will include graduate student representatives in committees that make decisions affecting graduate student policies and academic requirements. This does not include bodies that determine an individual student’s academic progress.

14. Graduate students have the right to representation on all campus-wide administrative committees that affect graduate student, with voting privileges where appropriate. In addition, all departments and graduate programs will include graduate student representatives in committees that make decisions affecting graduate student policies and academic requirements.

15. Graduate students have the right to participate in extra-curricular activities including but not limited to student organizations and political processes without fear of retribution or academic consequence with the expectation that involvement not detract from progress toward degree completion.

16. Graduate students have the right to a non-biased arbitration process if seeing to resolve a violation of these rights. Official academic grievance procedures and informal complaint procedures will be provided and clearly defined by Rackham and at the graduate departments and graduate program level. These procedures will be presented to graduate students at time of entry.
17. Graduate students have a right to be informed of these rights upon enrollment, and to be free of reprisals for exercising these rights.

4 RESPONSIBILITIES

1. Graduate students have a responsibility to conduct themselves, in all educational activities, in a manner befitting a junior colleague. Graduate students behavior should be a credit to themselves, their program/department, and the University. They have the responsibility to respect and uphold all relevant university policies regarding professional conduct, including but not limited to the Code of Academic Conduct and the University Policy on Nondiscrimination, Sexual Harassment and Student Records and Privacy. Graduate students have the responsibility to uphold and respect all of the aforementioned rights for fellow graduate students.

2. Graduate students have a responsibility to devote an appropriate amount of time and energy toward achieving an advanced degree within a normative time, unless special circumstances apply.

3. Graduate students have a responsibility to uphold ethical norms in research and higher academic pursuits and provide accurate and honest reporting of research results, methodology, and scholarship.

4. Graduate students have the responsibility to take the initiative in asking questions that promote their understanding of the academic requirements and the financial particulars of their specific graduate program.

5. Graduate students have a responsibility to understand their role in the development of the relationship between faculty mentor and graduate student.

   (a) To have an awareness of time constraints and other demands imposed on faculty members and program staff.

   (b) To communicate regularly with faculty mentors and advisors, especially in matters related to research and progress within the graduate program.

5 ENFORCEMENT

Individual sections of this document will be enforced via various university policies and offices. They are listed here for reference.