Rackham Student Government
Board Meeting: April 23, 2013
Agenda

I. Call To Order

II. Approval of Agenda

III. Approval of Previous Minutes
    a. April 9, 2013* (p. 2)

IV. Public Hearings
    a. W-13-06: Semi-mandatory course evaluations (p. 26)
    b. W-13-07: PhD Candidate course bank (p. 28)
    c. W-13-08: Michigan Stadium football ticket policy (p. 30)

V. Officer Reports
    a. Graduate Student Body President, Michael
    b. Graduate Student Body Vice President, Kaitlin
    c. Graduate Student Body Treasurer, Phil

VI. Director Reports
    a. Events Director, Ryan Roberts

VII. SAGE DOH Spring Conference Delegation Report (p. 6)

VIII. Committee Updates
    a. Academic Affairs
    b. Budgetary
    c. COSAC
    d. Elections
    e. Legislative Affairs
    f. Student Life
    g. Grad. Gala

IX. S.B. Resolution: W-13-05: RESPONSIBLE INVESTMENT* (p. 22)

X. Resolution W-13-06: SEMI-MANDATORY COURSE EVALUATIONS* (p. 26)

XI. Resolution W-13-07: PHD CANDIDATE COURSE BANK* (p. 28)

XII. S.B. Resolution: W-13-08: MICHIGAN STADIUM FOOTBALL TICKET POLICY* (p. 30)

XIII. Open Discussion

XIV. Adjournment (Dissolution of the Winter 2013 Board)

* - 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
4/09/13
RACKHAM GRADUATE BUILDING
2ND FLOOR WEST CONFERENCE ROOM, NORTH ALCOVE
7:30 P.M.

a. CALL TO ORDER: 7:32pm

b. Present: Michael Lang, Chris Tom, Lauren Knapp, Yiting Zhang, John Forrest, Dan Trubman, Matt Filter, Michael Benson, Phil Saccone, Alex Gutierrez, Matt Waugh, Pete McGrath, Ryan Roberts, David Barton

c. Absent:

d. Excused: Eugene Daneshvar, Anna Belak, Ram Balachandran, Kaitlin Flynn

II. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

a. Motion to approve agenda, Michael Lang, and seconded by Matt Filter. Approved unanimously.

III. APPROVAL OF THE PREVIOUS MINUTES, 3/19/13

a. Please look over minutes. They will be formatted and we will work on them next week. Please submit any changes to execs.

IV. Guest Speaker/Discussion (Office of Development and Alumni Relations)

a. Jill McDonough (Director)

Introduction: Discussion of Centennial celebration/fund raising program. Thanked present RSG board and previous RSG board for input on the Centennial. Activities were structured toward future development. The Centennial was used as a marketing tool for the future of Rackham. Jill provided a synopsis of the different events that occurred during the Centennial. The fund raising goal was $2,150,000. It was exceeded. The money raised went directly to student support—another round of “awards” (financial aid/fellowship type stuff) will occur this summer. Centennial was also an opportunity to hone communication skills with donors and alumni.

The upcoming campaign: Publicity is underway—it will kick off officially in Fall 2013. The financial goal is has not been set. However, a good estimate would be in excess of $3 billion.

Dan: How are these goals set?

Jill: We ask the different groups (museums, schools etc.) around the University to estimate how much they anticipate needing in the years to come. This gives us a basis to set the goal. It’s a mixture of art and science. The economy is taken into account when the goals are set. We try to keep the goal realistic but ambitious.

Michael: How will fundraising impact students in general and masters students in particular?

Jill: We are raising money exclusively for student support. Fellowship, research awards, internships, both for PhD and masters students.

Pete: Perhaps cutting the tuition would be better than increasing aid for fellowships etc.
Chris: Are students involved in the fundraising campaigns?
Jill: Yes. For example, when there are fellowships given in name, we try to connect the donor with the student recipient. In other cases, the money donated is a bequest. Again, a likely student that will benefit is put together with the donor. Does anyone want to volunteer? One thing Michigan does not do is solicit students for money on day one. That may start to change on the undergraduate level. Question for all of us, should we do that here? Went around the table:
Chris: Should be tied to event. What about kick-starters. Consider working on that model.
Michael: Yes.
Ryan: Yes, good idea. Says it happens already.
Lauren: Echoes Chris.
Yiting: Depends on the circumstances.
Matt W: his university is already asking. But it was tied to a specific thing he was interested. Doesn’t reflect badly.
Pete: Right way and wrong way to do it. Tie it to a match.
Matt Filter: Not sure it would be great to ask for donations while people are still students—better to do after. Be careful. It’s important to introduce yourself to the student body. Let them know who you are and what you do.
Daniel: Thank you for coming. But, I will have a huge amount of debt. So it may seem a little ridiculous to ask me for money. Finds it offensive to be hit up for money.
John: Do not solicit me until I graduate. Tie it to something.
David: Something concrete that we are donating to. Solicitation is annoying.
Michael: Echoes a mix of everything. Have a donation system where a percentage is spent at the time for an immediate effect and the other is given to something in the future. Collect 5 year pledges. Different methods.
Phil: Seems like fundraising has been pretty successful without it. Make sure the cost benefit is in line. Is the money your raising as a result of this program canceling out the effect of turning off students? Maybe revaluate at some point after you get started to assess the impact.

b. **Paula Wishart (Academic Program Officer for Professional Development)**
Paula- Came from the career center having worked with graduate students in Rackham and Ford. Worked outside academia as well. She is interested in advocating for graduate students in the area of professional development. Two handouts were distributed Paula explained concepts map. Idea is to have an effect outside of the academic setting. Information has mostly been disseminated through seminars and talks. Our goal is to have more practice based stuffs. Make the information more accessible so people can use the information that is available. Paula reviewed development highlights.
Michael: Background—interest in non-traditional careers for PhD students in particular. It fizzled out but the want is still there. Students will also want in person help, no just seminars meant for a large audience.
Phil: Question on clarifying role. Is this office separate or the same from Career services? Paula: separate.
Phil: How does this compare to other schools?
Paula: It is ramping up. Right now we are not meeting the needs. Janet Weiss has pledged to support this.
Ryan: I think this should be college specific.
Paula: Yes, but Rackham can still be influential.  
Dan: Can we access information across schools?  
Paula: One reason why having it at the college level is not a good thing. Need more of a sense of community overall.  
Chris: Planning for academia—how is the information for that accessible?  
Paula: We can help in that area.  
Matt: Understands “siloing” effect. Is there something we can do to encourage this development?  
Paula: This is an achievable goal. We need collaboration. Too much redundancy. Let’s make this an issue.  
Chris: This is something that academic affairs will take up. We would like to have you as a guest. Chris and Paula will communicate.  
Michael will send around her contact information.

V. OFFICER REPORTS  
   a. President Michael Benson: Skipping officer reports unless there are objections. Thank you Dan for your help. This information will go out to the student body shortly. Any questions for Dan? One update on the health insurance issue. You can look on the updates to see how Michael voted. This is important going forward—we’re trying to keep premiums as low as possible. Next week a number of people will be gone for the SAGE conference. Dan will chair the meeting. Explained things about when terms ends etc. We will be making a few bylaw changes. If you have any changes please send them Michael as soon as possible.  
   b. Vice President Kaitlin Flynn.  
   c. Treasurer Phil Saccone: $21,246.00 in account. We just got $1500 in—late registration.

VI. Director Report  
   a. Elections Director, Dan Trubman: Dan felt the adding the last day was worth it. We should do it again next year. Dan makes a motion to approve and finalize the election results. Seconded by matt. Approved with 2 abstentions.  
   b. Events Director, Ryan Roberts:

VII. Committee Updates  
   a. Academics:  
   b. Budgetary:  
   c. COSAC: Clean up event in Detroit. Then head to Eastern Market in the afternoon. Meet on 4/20 at 9 am and will be back at 4p. Will not conflict with the gala. Pete is making a motion to authorize the event seconded by Dan. Approved unanimously. What is the capacity?  
   d. Elections: Update above.  
   e. Legislative Affairs:  
   f. Student Life:  
   g. GPC: Lauren moves to approve the budget seconded by Ryan. Board is voting to approve everything. (theme, money etc).
Lauren: Requiring a fee upfront. Wanted to make it more exclusive and to get a better idea on who was coming—so we can plan accordingly. Black tie masquerade. No alcohol at the event. There is a pre-event party where people can purchase alcohol. We don’t have to spend all the money budgeted for appetizers.

Ryan: UMEC is matching funds. FYI.

John: Can we look to eliminate people going to Bar Louie who are not going to the party? Concern is about appearance and dress. We want to keep the event formal.

Motion by John to restrict Bar Louie to those who have tickets to the formal. David second.

Dan objects. No need to exclude anyone. RSG are already subsidizing—no need to make it so exclusive; all Rackham graduate students should be able to attend if they want.

John takes motion off the table.

Motion by Michael Lang to give them advertising discretion. Seconded by Michael. **Motion is approved unanimously.**

Michael Benson: Please advertise ASAP. Can someone move to authorize up to $600 in case we don’t sell all the tickets.

Moved by Ryan seconded by John.

Dan: question/objection, why can’t we just go back to the board and ask for the rest of the money?

Michael: whether we approve now or later we are on the hook for the money—along with UMEC.

John: how will tickets be sold?

Michael and Lauren explain.

Motion is called by Michael to approve the budget increase. **Motion is approved 8-2-0.**

Approving the gala in general (theme, budget, advertising, etc.).

**Motion is approved unanimously.**

---

**VIII. All resolutions are postponed until next week**

**IX. Open Discussion:** none

**X. Adjournment:** Motion by Pete and seconded by Michael Lang. We are adjourned.
SAGE Federal Legislative Priorities

Student Debt and Taxation

Student Debt: A Growing Obstacle for Attaining a Graduate Education: The outstanding student loan balance—$1 trillion according to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau—surpasses credit card debt.\(^1\) 69.6% of graduate students hold student loans with an average cumulative debt of $47,503.\(^2\) The reduction in many student aid programs in addition to the increase in the cost of education is making the financial burden of an advanced education overwhelming.

SAGE Recommends:

- Amend the new Income Based Repayment rules to apply to all outstanding federal student loans, make Income Based Repayment installments regionally sensitive to cost of living, and exclude forgiven student loan debt from taxable income.

“Qualified Higher Education Expenses” Not Defined as Originally Intended: The Higher Education Act of 1965 (HEA) defines the cost of attendance for higher education as the total cost of education, including tuition, fees, books, supplies, housing, etc. In 1986, changes in tax law uniquely disadvantaged graduate students, making portions of fellowship and student aid, such as room and board, taxable income.

SAGE Recommends:

- Amend the tax code to define “Qualified Higher Education Expenses” and “Qualified Tuition and Related Expenses” to match the definition of “Cost of Attendance” in section 472 of the HEA.

Research Funding

Funding Federal Research is Crucial to Our Country’s Economy: The U.S. economy is dependent on groundbreaking research at leading research universities. If the U.S. is to remain a global leader in innovation and technology development, Congress should maintain or increase federal funding of graduate research, which produces cures to diseases, new technology, and a more powerful workforce.

SAGE Recommends:

- Congress should maintain, if not increase, federal funding of research.

Immigration

Visa Reform: Allow World’s Brightest to Create American Jobs: Domestic universities are global leaders that attract the best and brightest international students in pursuit of graduate and professional degrees. SAGE fully supports ongoing efforts for comprehensive immigration reform, and believes that these students play a critical role in US economic growth as well as the retention and advancement of our intellectual property. SAGE believes that changes to our visa system should be enacted to lower the barriers to permanent residency and incentivize these students to stay in the United States permanently.

SAGE Recommends:

- Reforms to establish a moving cap based on demand for H1-B visas, grant work permits for spouses of visa holders, exempt students earning a masters or higher degree in a STEM field in the U.S. from the numerical limits on EB visas.
- F-1 visa reforms to include the lifting of work restrictions and authorization of dual intent.

---

Student Debt and Taxation Policies
Stifle Job Creation and Economic Growth

Student Debt: A Growing Obstacle for Obtaining a Graduate Education
The outstanding student loan balance—$1 trillion according to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau—surpasses credit card debt.\(^1\) 69.6% of graduate students hold student loans with an average cumulative debt of $47,503.\(^2\) This growing burden has a tangible effect on the number of students who apply to graduate school and the time it takes them to complete their degrees. The reduction in many student aid programs in addition to the increase in the cost of education is making the financial burden of an advanced education overwhelming.

SAGE Recommends:
• Amend the new Income Based Repayment (IBR) rules to apply to all outstanding federal student loans, and improve the outreach and servicing of IBR so it is accessible and helpful to borrowers.
• Make Income Based Repayment installments regionally sensitive to the cost of living.
• Pass H.R. 532: Private Student Loan Bankruptcy Fairness Act of 2013 and S. 114: Fairness for Struggling Students Act of 2013, which extend bankruptcy discharge to private student loans.

‘Qualified Higher Education Expenses’ Not Defined as Originally Intended
The Higher Education Act of 1965 (HEA) defines the cost of attendance for higher education as the total cost of education, including tuition, fees, books, supplies, housing, and other education-related expenses. This definition determines the amount of student financial aid and higher education incentives, such as subsidized student loans and tax deductions, for which a student is eligible. In 1986, changes in tax law limited this definition disadvantages graduate students, making portions of fellowship and student aid ineligible for higher education tax incentives. These include the lifetime learning credit and tax deductions on scholarship and fellowship monies.

SAGE Recommends:
• Amend the tax code to define “Qualified Higher Education Expenses” and “Qualified Tuition and Related Expenses” to match the definition of “Cost of Attendance” in section 472 of the HEA.

Background: Student Financial Burden is Overwhelming
Elimination of Federal Programs Add to Student Debt
Subsidized Student Loans. Effective July 2012 graduate students are no longer eligible for subsidized student loans. The elimination of the in-school and the after-graduation grace period subsidy has added to the overwhelming debt graduate students face. This loss has created a disincentive for prospective students to pursue advanced degrees.

---
\(^1\) The Project on Student Debt (2011). Student Debt and the Class of 2010. Washington, DC, The Institute for College Access and Success.
Graduate Student Aid is in Decline. Graduate students face cuts and elimination of funding in multiple need-based programs and a narrowing of benefits for those that do still exist. Indeed, the merit-based Javits Fellowship program (awarded to some of the highest achieving graduate students) has been suspended due to congressional cuts ($9.7 million), while awards for existing Javits Fellows will now be shared with the $31 million Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need (GAANN) fund.

Addressing Student Debt: Loan Forgiveness Programs

Income based repayment (IBR)\(^3\) is an important mechanism for graduate students to make student debt manageable. In 1994 Congress implemented a series of loan repayment options based on an individual’s income. These programs cap monthly payments on student loans and forgive remaining debt after the student has made a set number of payments. The monthly installment amount is a percentage of an individual’s “disposable income,” currently defined as the difference between Adjusted Gross Income (AGI) and 150% of the federal poverty line for the family size.

The Problem: IBR Programs Are Too Restrictive. The new IBR programs are an excellent first step at addressing the increasing debt of students, but do not help many graduate students or current borrowers. For instance, to be eligible for the current “Pay as You Earn” program, students must not hold student loans from before 2008 and must receive federal loans after 2011. Additionally, forgiven debt under IBR is treated as taxable income, resulting in a strenuous tax liability on individuals who have qualified for IBR precisely because they are unable to pay more.

In addition, the monthly payment amount under IBR does not account for the differences in cost of living faced at various regions of the country. Other federal programs use metrics, including the HUD Fair Market Housing Rate and the Department of Defense Basic Allowance for Housing, to account for regional cost of living adjustments in benefits. Students would greatly benefit if IBR allowed for regional sensitivity and defined disposable income to better represent the ability to repay student loans.

Approve the Expansion of new Income Based Repayment Rules for Everyone. President Obama’s 2014 budget proposes the expansion of the “Pay as you Earn” rules to apply to all student federal loan holders. The SAGE recommendation encourages this change.

Addressing Affordability: Qualified Higher Education Expenses

Current tax law limits “qualified higher education expenses” to tuition and registration fees only. By excluding income used for basic living expenses such as room and board from a qualified educational deduction, this limitation has a direct impact on the affordability of graduate education, The SAGE recommendation makes the definition of “qualified higher education expenses” consistent across all forms of federal education assistance.

Taxation of Fellowships and Scholarships. Education expenses paid with fellowship and scholarship monies can be deducted from gross income. The current definition excluding room and board reduces the benefit by 1 to 1.5 months’ worth of scholarship funds. Notably, education awards do not take this tax burden into account.

Lifetime Learning Credit. The Lifetime Learning Credit is equal to 20% of the taxpayer's out-of-pocket education related expenses up to a maximum of $10,000 in expenses (that is, $2,000 in benefits). However, because of the narrow “qualified higher education expenses” definition, most graduate students do not qualify.

---

\(^3\) We use “Income Based Repayment” (IBR) as the general term for all income based programs including the 2009 and 2014 versions of IBR, Income Contingent Repayment (ICR), and Pay as You Earn.
Cuts to Research Funding Put America’s Future at Risk

The U.S. economy depends on groundbreaking research conducted at top research universities to remain a world leader in innovative technology development and application. With the federal budget cuts under the sequester, our situation is critical; these short-term savings will have long-term consequences on job development, economic growth, and the U.S. university. To remain globally competitive, Congress should expand federal funding of graduate student research, which produces cures to diseases, new technology, and a more powerful workforce.

SAGE SUGGESTED FUNDING LEVELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2013 w/ sequester¹</th>
<th>SAGE recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSF R&amp;RA</td>
<td>$ 5.7 billion</td>
<td>$ 5.5 billion</td>
<td>$ 6.2 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIH</td>
<td>$ 30 billion</td>
<td>$ 28.6 billion</td>
<td>$ 31 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA SMD</td>
<td>$ 5 billion</td>
<td>$ 4.75 billion</td>
<td>$ 5 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEH</td>
<td>$ 146 million</td>
<td>$ 139 million</td>
<td>$154 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOE (OoS)</td>
<td>$ 4.9 billion</td>
<td>$ 4.2 billion</td>
<td>$ 5 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOAA</td>
<td>$ 651 million</td>
<td>$ 625 million</td>
<td>$ 733 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DARPA</td>
<td>$ 2.1 billion</td>
<td>$ 2.5 billion</td>
<td>$ 2.9 billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National Science Foundation (NSF)

NSF funds research and supports science, math, and engineering education across the country, in all 50 states. NSF funded the graduate student-driven project that grew to be Google, currently worth an estimated $250 billion and employing 54,000 people. At the estimated sequester funding levels, the NSF would fund 1,600 fewer research and education grants. This translates to 19,300 fewer student research positions and technical support personnel than FY 2012.

SAGE Recommends: Fund NSF at the President’s FY2014 $6.2 billion budget request level.

National Institutes of Health (NIH)

NIH is the nation’s primary agency for supporting cutting-edge biomedical research with the goals of improving health and saving lives through medical discovery and scientific leadership. The NIH-funded Human Genome Project has accrued over $796 billion since its inception, a 141:1 return on investment. At the estimated sequester funding levels, 25% of grants are decreased or eliminated.

SAGE Recommends: Fund NIH at the President’s FY2014 $31 billion budget request level.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Science Mission Directorate

The NASA Science Mission Directorate outlines specific, unanswered questions concerning the Earth, Solar System and Universe that can be answered through the utilization of NASA resources and capabilities. NASA’s Jet Propulsion Laboratory developed a Global Positioning System to track satellite positions in real time that is now utilized in our phones and other navigation devices. At the estimated sequester funding levels, NASA is suspending all public outreach, releasing 5% fewer University research awards and at least 10% fewer missions.

¹ AAAS sequester estimates from FY 2013 apply percentage cuts provided by the Office of Management and Budget’s March 1 report to Congress.


**SAGE Recommends: Fund Science Mission Directorate at the President’s FY2014 $5.0 billion budget.**

**National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH)**

NEH is the lead federal agency focused on the dissemination of knowledge and how it relates to social, economic, and political challenges facing the world today. NEH funding supports important historical projects such as the publication of the papers of Martin Luther King, Jr. and an exhibit concerning the American Revolution on the Frontier. The preservation and interpretation of this and other primary historical documents allow us to pass on cornerstones of our nation’s past to future generations.

**SAGE Recommends: Fund NEH at the President’s FY2014 $154 million budget.**

**Department of Energy (DOE) Office of Science**

The DOE Office of Science funds scientific research for energy production and supports the development and operation of open-access scientific facilities. Funding from the DOE Office of Science enabled the path of carbon in photosynthesis to be mapped, which has direct application in solar energy research. At the estimated sequester funding levels, the DOE is canceling the FastForward initiative for an energy efficient computing project; this termination will threaten our energy independence and national security.

**SAGE Recommends: Fund DOE Office of Science at the President’s FY2014 $5.0 billion budget request level.**

**National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)**

NOAA conducts crucial science related to our oceans and atmosphere that provide federal and local decision-makers with important services that enhance the nation’s economy, security, and environmental understanding. Particularly, the Sea Grant program is a nationwide network of 30 university-based programs that work with coastal communities on research and outreach to promote better understanding, conservation, and use of our coastal resources. At the estimated sequester funding levels, 2,500 jobs will be furloughed and 2,700 jobs will remain unfilled further increasing unemployment. In addition these cuts also decrease NOAA flight time for hurricane reconnaissance and coastal surveying, thus prolonging disaster-reaction time and decreasing the likelihood for successful victim rescue.

**SAGE Recommends: Fund NOAA Office at the President’s FY2014 $733 million budget request level.**

**Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA)**

Pentagon officials recognize and hail the importance of basic research to keep our military armed with cutting edge technology and to provide our soldiers with the tools necessary to succeed on the battlefield. DARPA has played an important role in funding high-risk, high-reward research, which has led to many significant defense technologies, such as air-force tactical fighters, as well as civilian technologies, such as the Internet and Siri voice-recognition system. At the estimated sequester funding levels, DARPA funded university projects will be decreased by 10%, including research for advancing military communication efforts.

**SAGE Recommends: Fund DARPA at the President’s FY2014 $2.9 billion budget request.**
Student Immigration Reform Will Keep World’s Best in U.S.

As the U.S. economy globalizes and high tech industries continue to grow, restrictive visa policies limit our ability to retain the level of high-skill workers and innovators that such an economy demands. SAGE supports comprehensive immigration reform, and believes that changes to high skill occupation and student visas are critical for U.S. economic advancement and intellectual property retention. The export of some of the best and brightest American educated and often federally funded students is a wasted investment and hampers our economy and our standing as global leaders.

- More than half of Ph.D.s in many STEM fields are awarded to foreign students
- In 2013 the number of H1-B visa applications exceeded the yearly limit of 65,000 in a single week
- An estimated 25% of all U.S. patent applications are submitted by non-citizens
- Between 1995 and 2005 25% of new engineering and technology companies in the U.S. were founded by immigrants, many of whom were educated in the U.S.

I. Highly-Skilled Visa Reform: Allow World’s Brightest to Fill and Create American Jobs

High skill temporary H-1B visas are heavily dependent on the business cycle and their cap should be adjusted to meet demand. On the other hand, employment-based (EB) visas offer permanent residency and provide a long term solution to knowledge retention. Employment based immigrant visas should be the route of choice for international students by exempting them from numerical limits.

SAGE Recommends:

Include the following provisions in any comprehensive visa reform:

- Non-Immigrant visas:
  - Establish a moving cap for H-1B visas based on demand
  - Grant work permits to spouses of H-1B visa holders

- Employment-based Immigrant visas:
  - Exempt students earning a master’s or higher degree from an accredited institution in a STEM field in the U.S. from numerical limitation

II. F-1 Visa Reform: Remove Work Restrictions and Authorize Dual Intent

The F-1 visa is the primary visa for foreign, full-time students in the U.S. To continue attracting the world’s best students in the face of rising tuition costs, it’s particularly important to allow international students to hold jobs to help support themselves and their families. In an effort to retain these students, it is also important to allow dual intent status so that they may apply for immigrant visas upon graduation.

SAGE Recommends:

- Authorize dual intent for F-1 student visas
- Remove off-campus work restrictions for F-1 visa holders
- Authorize employment for spouses of F-1 visa holders (F-2 visa holders)
### 2013-14 Domestic Student Health Insurance Plan (DSHIP) Ballot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Premium Information - Approximate dollar increase or decrease is toward the &quot;Student Only&quot; price.</th>
<th>% Increase or decrease to &quot;Student Only&quot; premium</th>
<th>Approximate $ increase or decrease to &quot;Student Only&quot; premium</th>
<th>Please enter an &quot;X&quot; next to your selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 1 - Please Choose One of the Three</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Out of Pocket Maximum Options for Co-Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Coverage for Co-Insurance - Annual Maximum Out-of-Pocket per member is $2500</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Co-Insurance - Annual Maximum Out-of-Pocket per member to $3000</td>
<td>Credit of 1.2%</td>
<td>Save approx. $40</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Co-Insurance - Annual Maximum Out-of-Pocket per member to $4000</td>
<td>Credit of 2.8%</td>
<td>Save approx. $92</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 2 - Please Choose One of the Two</th>
<th>Rx Copay Amounts -</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current 2012/13 Rx Copayment Pricing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic Rx meds $20 copay</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred brand name Rx $40 copay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Preferred brand name Rx $60 copay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Rx CoPayments to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic Rx meds $25 copay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred brand name Rx $50 copay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Preferred brand name Rx $80 copay</td>
<td>Credit of 0.7%</td>
<td>Save Approx. $23</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 3 - Please Choose One of the Two</th>
<th>Annual Rx Deductible Options</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Currently we do not have an annual Rx deductible</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Rx Benefit to include a $100 annual deductible</td>
<td>Credit of 1%</td>
<td>Save Approx. $33.00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Option 4 - Please Choose One of the Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ER Copayment Amount</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>$0.00</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Plan ER Copayment Amount $75 per ER visit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase ER Copayment Amount to $100 per ER visit</td>
<td>Credit of 0.2%</td>
<td>Save Approx. $7.00</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Option 5 - Please Choose One of the Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Existing Condition</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>$0.00</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A condition is considered pre-existing if member is treated for the condition any time in the 6 months prior to the Aetna DSHIP effective date and member did not have a comparable insurance plan within 63 days of Aetna DSHIP effective date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Plan, $1,000 maximum coverage for pre-existing conditions. Pre-Ex condition clause is dropped after enrollee has the Aetna DSHIP for 180 consecutive days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove Pre-Existing Condition Clause</td>
<td>Increase of 2.0%</td>
<td>Increase of approx. $66.00</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Please note:** If the pre-existing condition clause is removed, insurance open enrollment periods will only be allowed at the start of each semester unless the student has a "qualifying event". Aetna defines a qualifying event as "an involuntary loss of coverage (i.e.: exceeding the age limitations of parents' or loss of spouses' employer coverage; loss of employment resulting in termination of coverage; divorce resulting in the termination of coverage)."
February 20th, 2013

Lukas Garske, in his official capacity as General Counsel of the Central Student Government, Petitioner

v.

Michael Benson, in his official capacity as President of the Rackham Student Government, Respondent.

CASE NUMBER: W-13-002

PANEL:

CHIEF JUSTICE STEVENS, Presiding
JUSTICE PARIKH
JUSTICE ZERBE

Order of the Court

The Court ORDERS the Rackham Student Government to amend their Bylaws, specifically Article II §G on the appointments of students to University wide committees, in a manner consistent with this Opinion.

CHIEF JUSTICE STEVENS delivered the Opinion of the Unanimous Court.
Background

On January 28th, Petitioner Lukas Garska in his capacity as Student General Counsel of the Central Student Government filed a 51-1 form with this Court and Respondent Michael Benson in his capacity as President of the Rackhams Student Government. Petitioners claim that the Rackham Student Government (hereinafter RSG) had an improper supremacy clause and appointment clause in their documents. Petitioners requested that this Court issue an order to have the RSG bylaws fixed in such a way that they did not conflict with the Central Student Government (hereinafter CSG) Compiled Code and Constitution. A pretrial conference and trial were held on Thursday February 14th by a Panel of 3 justices.

Procedural Stance

A.

Article III §B.4 of the CSG Compiled Code grants the CSG Student General Counsel standing in “all cases submitted to the Central Student Judiciary,” when there is an alleged violation of the Compiled Code or All-Campus Constitution (Hereinafter Constitution).

The RSG bylaws state that the Central Student Judiciary (Hereinafter “CSJ” or “Court”) shall be the judiciary responsible for settling disputes between another student government, such as CSG. See RSG Bylaws Article I §F.2 (“Any conflict or ambiguity arising between the Bylaws and any other student government code (including CSG) shall be resolved by the Central Student Judiciary on a case by case basis.”)

B.

During the pretrial conference, Respondents motioned for the case to be dismissed for lack of effective remedy in pursuance with §51.16 of the Central Student Judiciary Manual of Procedure. Respondents argue that the issues “are not yet ripe for adjudication,” because no harm has been committed against the CSG. The Panel DENIED this motion.

The RSG has already appointed members to various University wide committees, thus a conflict is already present between the CSG and the RSG. If the CSG contends that it is to be the sole appointer of students to university wide committees, the argument that the issues are not yet ripe for adjudication does not hold. Furthermore, this panel notes that this clause does not limit us from ruling on issues where a conflict has not yet arisen. Were the RSG in the process of amending their bylaws or engaged in mediation with the CSG, then we would have been convinced that the issues were not yet ripe for adjudication as changes were likely forthcoming. Here however, we see no
such willingness of the parties to work together and arbitration seems to be the only option to remedy
the conflicting views of the parties. A decision by this panel today could prevent or limit future
harm, giving this jurisdiction to hear cases where an injury is possible but not present.

I.

A.

Article I §2 of the Constitution states that “All student governance powers granted herein
shall vest in a Central Student Government...All student governance powers not granted herein shall
devolve to the additional governments for each school or college.” The constitution clearly outlines
that the power of the CSG is supreme in contrast to other student governments or groups. Only the
CSG is represented by members of all the departments and schools University wide, and is set up in
such a way to fully and equally represent all students. Thus it would also logically follow that the
legislation that the CSG passes, organized here into the Compiled Code, should also hold supreme
over other student governments. Only powers not outlined by the Assembly of the CSG can be
delegated to the individual schools. Indeed, our reading of Article I §3 of the constitution bounds
this Court to respect the Constitution and Compiled Code above any other student code. See
Constitution, Article I §3 Supremacy. Respondents argue that the correct reading of this is that the
CSG and any “other student government on this campus” are equals and that they shall jointly and
equally hold supreme over any other student code on campus. This panel agrees with Petitioner that
the wording is not clear, but we unanimously find that the Constitution is setting up a hierarchy, with
the Constitution being the highest document, then the Compiled Code and legislative acts of the
Assembly. The Constitution explicitly mentions the Compiled code directly next to where it  details
it’s own supremacy. Furthermore, the CSG is the representative of the student body, and is thus the
central power on campus and is the sole creator of regulations affecting the entire student campus.
See Article II §2 The Assembly (“The Assembly shall produce, publish, and maintain a Compiled
Code of legislation, which shall be a compilation of all regulations...currently and permanently
affecting student government or the student body,” emphasis added.) If the framers of the
constitution had intended for the reading to be as respondents claim, then this court would encounter
constant conflict between CSG and other student governments with no obvious solution. We find
that it is quite impossible to have two executive bodies be jointly supreme in regards to their
governing documents and simply cannot accept that this is what the framers had in mind when they
drafted the Constitution.
B.

Respondents also claim that they were not made aware of the regulations contained in the Compiled Code, and that the CSG failing to notify them of the draft violated the Fair regulation clause of the Constitution. See Article VIII §3 *Fair Regulation*. We note that respondents do not contend that the regulations are not “uniform in nature or not fully and clearly formulated [and] published,” and thus do not address these issues in this opinion. Rather we would like to address the application of the “made aware” wording of the Constitution and we set up a standard for applying this clause.

Respondents took particular issue with the fact that the RSG executive board, including the respondent, were not made aware of the Compiled Code or of any changes that are often made by the Assembly. This panel finds that it is unreasonable to assume that the CSG should find it necessary to inform each and every student government of changes to or about the All-Campus Constitution or CSG Compiled Code. In contrast, if a student government had never been informed about either of these documents, this would constitute a clear violation of the Constitution. Since the documents are published and readily available both online and in person at the CSG offices, having student governments be aware of their existence passes constitutional muster. This panel finds that clearly the RSG was aware of the Compiled Code and documents of the CSG, as the RSG Bylaws explicitly mention the Compiled Code in Article I §F.2.

II.

Petitioner asserts that RSG Bylaws Article 1 §F.2 is improper as the Compiled Code should reign supreme over any other student governments bylaws. While we do hold that the Compiled Code is the document that reigns supreme over any other student code, we do not feel that any amending is necessary to the RSG bylaws here. The wording of the bylaws is simply a statement that defines a clear path should any ambiguity or conflict evolve between the CSG and another student government. The RSG codifying a guarantee that ambiguity should be resolved on a “case by case basis,” is a completely legitimate right of the other student government. Without this section, it could be construed that the CSG has the authority to unilaterally declare that their reading and interpretation of a document is correct, and attempt to bind RSG to it. We grant that this would likely lead to a hearing before this Court, but RSG codifying this sets a clear path to resolution. We deem this clause to be entirely appropriate and do not believe RSG need amend this section.
III.

Article I, §2 of the UM Student Body Constitution ("Constitution") states: “All student governance powers granted herein shall vest in a Central Student Government” and “[a]ll student governance powers not granted herein shall devolve to the additional governments for each school, or college” (emphasis added). Therefore, if a governance power is clearly articulated within the supreme governing documents - the Constitution or the CSG Compiled Code ("Compiled Code") - that specific power shall vest with the CSG. Only when a governance power is not clearly articulated within the Constitution or Compiled Code, or when it is specifically conferred to an additional government within the Constitution or Compiled Code, will it devolve to the additional government, as we have already held.

With respect to Petitioner’s claim that Article II, §G of the RSG Bylaws improperly grants appointment power in violation of the Compiled Code, we look to Article III, §A (1)(b)(ii), which clearly articulates that “[t]he President shall...appoint student representatives to university-wide committees” (CSG Compiled Code at 267-68). Article I, §2 of the Constitution clarifies this issue further, stating that “[e]ach student government or organization [...] shall make appointments of student representatives to all student seats on committees whose purview is coextensive with the jurisdiction containing that committee” (emphasis added). As defined by Merriam-Webster dictionary, ‘coextensive’ means “to have the same spatial or temporal scope or boundaries.” As such, we find that Article 1, §2 dictates that additional governments for each school or college shall make appointments of student representatives serving on those committees whose authority and responsibility are bound exclusively within the jurisdiction or scope of the school or college served by that specific government.

Specifically, Article II, §G of the RSG Bylaws states, "RSG shall be the sole appointer of Student [sic] representatives for all University committees requesting graduate student views and input” (emphasis added). Because the Constitution specifically limits the appointment powers granted to ‘additional governments’ like RSG, and the Compiled Code specifically grants the appointment power for university-wide committees to the CSG President, we find that the current language of Article II, §G of the RSG Bylaws directly contradicts the Constitution and Compiled Code. Article I, §3 of the Constitution states that the Constitution and Compiled Code “shall hold supremacy over any provision of another student code,” as such, RSG must amend
Article II, §G of its Bylaws such that it complies with the Constitution and Compiled Code with respect to appointment powers to University wide committees.

* * *

For the foregoing reasons, the Court ORDERS the Rackham Student Government to amend their Bylaws, specifically Article II §G on the appointments of students to University wide committees, in a manner consistent with this Opinion

*It is so ordered.*
Sense of the Board: W-13-05

Presented to the Board on __March 26, 2013_______
Final Vote:   ____ Yea     ____ Nay    ___ Abs  _____ Date

DIVESTING FROM FOSSIL FUEL COMPANIES: ALIGNING THE UNIVERSITY’S INVESTMENTS WITH ITS COMMITMENTS TO SUSTAINABILITY

WHEREAS, the University of Michigan is actively committed to environmental sustainability, and climate change is a substantive threat to current and future generations here at the University of Michigan and around the world; AND

WHEREAS, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Fourth Assessment Report found that global warming is already causing costly disruption of human and natural systems throughout the world including the melting of Arctic ice, the acidification of oceans, flooding and drought1; AND

WHEREAS, scientists from the National Research Council, National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering, and Institute of Medicine agree that the Earth’s average temperature will increase between 2 - 12 degrees Fahrenheit by the end of this century given current trends and any warming above a 2°C (3.6°F) rise would be unsafe2; AND

WHEREAS, the emissions from the burning of fossil fuels negatively impact human health, with a recent estimate of at least $14 billion in healthcare costs linked to natural disasters caused by climate change3; AND

WHEREAS, for the purposes of this resolution, a “fossil fuel company” shall be defined as companies that are primarily involved in the exploration, extraction, production, distribution, and burning of fossil hydrocarbons; AND

WHEREAS, In its “Unburnable Carbon” report, the Carbon Tracker Initiative found that fossil fuel companies possess proven fossil fuel reserves that would release approximately 2,795 gigatons of CO2 if they are burned, which is five times the amount that can be released without exceeding 2°C of warming4; AND

---

WHEREAS, a 2009 study in the journal Nature by Meinshausen et al. found that to have an 80% chance of staying below the 2°C warming threshold, the world could only emit 886 billion tons of CO2, and having emitted 391 billion tons thus far this century we have only 495 billion tons remaining⁵; AND

WHEREAS, the University of Michigan is invested in fossil fuel companies holding 284 billion tons in carbon reserves, amounting to over half the world’s permissible carbon budget to stay below a 2°C temperature increase⁶; AND

WHEREAS, the University of Michigan investments include over $900 million in fossil fuel companies⁷; AND

WHEREAS, the University of Michigan’s mission is centered on “developing leaders and citizens who will challenge the present and enrich the future,” and its core values include (but are not limited to) teaching, research, and service in the fields of climate change, healthcare and public health; AND

WHEREAS, the University of Michigan has increased its total sustainability research funding by 200% since 2003, funding $181 million on research toward climate change research over the past decade, with 667 faculty currently conducting research⁸; AND

WHEREAS, President Mary Sue Coleman stated, “I want the message to be clear: Sustainability defines the University of Michigan... How we operate as a multi-billion-dollar enterprise is significant. It matters to the bottom line, which is important to students, parents, and taxpayers. It protects the environment, which is threatened. And it puts our values into practice”⁹; AND

WHEREAS, investing in fossil fuel companies is antithetical to the core values and mission of the University of Michigan with respect to sustainable and environmentally-friendly practices; AND

WHEREAS, the voluntary acquisition of financial stocks and holdings represent an implicit support of a company and its industry, and it is within the right of any stockholder to sell and purchase shares for reasons that lie outside mere financial self-interest; AND

WHEREAS, the University of Michigan has a history of successful divestments: in 1978 from Apartheid in South Africa and in 2000 from tobacco companies; AND

⁵ http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v458/n7242/abs/nature08017.html
⁷ Divest and Invest Campaign, http://divestum.org/resources/investment-data/
⁹ 2011 Speech: Going Green, Staying Blue: Sustainability at the University of Michigan, http://president.umich.edu/speech/speeches/110927sustainability.php
WHEREAS, The Aperio Group’s “Do the Investment Math” report showed that the effects of full fossil fuel divestment on the risk and expected returns of a portfolio is de minimus\(^\text{10}\); AND

WHEREAS, students at more than two hundred colleges and universities in the United States have launched campaigns to have their institutions divest from fossil fuel companies, and peer institutions have passed resolutions urging their Colleges and Universities to divest such as Harvard University, Northwestern University, Tufts University, UC Berkeley, and UC Santa Barbara. AND

NOW THEREFORE, ON BEHALF OF THE STUDENT BODY OF THE HORACE H. RACKHAM GRADUATE SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND ARTICULATED BY ITS ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES, IT IS THE SENSE OF THE BOARD THAT IN THEIR NAME, THE FOLLOWING BE

RESOLVED, the official stance of the Rackham Student Government is that investing in fossil fuel companies is antithetical to the core values and mission of the University of Michigan; AND BE IT FURTHER

RESOLVED, the Rackham Student Government urges the President and Board of Regents of the University of Michigan in their commitment to sustainability, to take the following actions:

1. To disclose all current investments, and immediately freeze new investments in the fossil fuel industry; and,

2. To divest from direct ownership in and commingled funds, that include public and private fossil fuel industry financial securities within 5 years; and,

3. Invest a substantial portion of such funds in socially, environmentally, and economically responsible companies.\(^\text{11}\)

AUTHORS

Ryan Roberts
Division II Representative, Graduate Student Body

Lauren Knapp
Division III Representative, Graduate Student Body

Ryan Moody
School of Natural Resources and Environment

Dave Marvin
Ecology and Evolutionary Biology


\(^{11}\) The definition of such companies will be determined by an ad-hoc committee established by the University of Michigan Regents to investigate fossil fuel divestment.
By Signing below, I certify 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 _____, 2013.

__________________________
Michael L. Benson
President, Rackham Graduate Student Body
A RESOLUTION TO CREATE A SEMI-MANDATORY COURSE EVALUATION SYSTEM AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN’S ANN ARBOR CAMPUS

WHEREAS, evaluations at the University of Michigan for Graduate Student Instructors (GSI) and faculty are completely voluntary on the students part; AND

WHEREAS, the evaluation completion rate for paper evaluations used to be >90%; AND

WHEREAS, the current digital system has around a 30% completion rate; AND

WHEREAS, teaching evaluations for GSIs are a training tool for junior colleagues; AND

WHEREAS, teaching evaluations for professors plays a significant role in professional advancement within the University; AND

WHEREAS, a smaller sample size becomes statistically less relevant for professional advancement and less useful as a training tool; AND

WHEREAS, a system of mandatory evaluations would benefit graduate student instructors, lecturers, tenure track faculty, teaching tenured faculty, and the University as a whole; NOW ON BEHALF OF THE STUDENT BODY OF THE HORACE H. RACKHAM GRADUATE SCHOOL, BE IT

RESOLVED, a student who has not filled out the relevant evaluations for a class shall not be able to see their grades for said class within a period of not less than one (1) month from the end of the semester; AND BE IT FURTHER

RESOLVED, that immediately upon completion of the relevant evaluations, a student shall be able to access their current semester’s grades; AND BE IT FINALLY

RESOLVED, the President of the Rackham Student Body in conjunction with the RSG Academic Affairs Committee shall work with the Office of the Registrar to set these changes in place.

AUTHORS
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 _____, 2013.

____________________________________
Michael L. Benson
President, Rackham Graduate Student Body
A RESOLUTION TO CREATE A COURSE BANK FOR DOCTORAL CANDIDATES

WHEREAS, classes are a critical, mandatory component of the majority of graduate student education at the University; AND

WHEREAS, many graduate level (> 500) courses are offered sporadically; AND

WHEREAS, doctoral candidates and pre-candidates will find various courses useful for their research; AND

WHEREAS, the current Rackham system for PhD candidates only allows for a single class to be taken free of charge per semester; AND

WHEREAS, currently, a student seeking to enroll in a second course in a given academic term will be charged a substantial fee; AND

WHEREAS, fellowships and training grants often require additional classes to be taken; these classes can negate the cost-benefits of candidacy and other training grants; NOW ON BEHALF OF THE STUDENT BODY OF THE HORACE H. RACKHAM GRADUATE SCHOOL, BE IT

RESOLVED, that the Rackham graduate school convert the current course system to a class-bank system; AND BE IT FURTHER

RESOLVED, that each Rackham program will determine the average number of semesters that its students are enrolled between achieving candidacy and successfully defending a dissertation (A); AND BE IT FURTHER

RESOLVED, that each Rackham program will determine the average number of courses that it requires students to take as PhD candidates (B); AND BE IT FURTHER

RESOLVED, that each Rackham program should be encouraged to review each PhD candidate’s course plans with the student on an annual basis; AND BE IT FURTHER
RESOLVED, that students exceeding the average number of semesters of enrollment as a candidate in their program be awarded an additional course in their course bank for each semester over the average; AND BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, the President of the Rackham Student Body in conjunction with the RSG Academic Affairs Committee shall work with the Office of the Registrar to set these changes in place.

AUTHOR

Chris Tom
Representative, Division 1
Chair, Academic Affairs Committee
Rackham Student Government

ATTEST

By Signing below, I certify that 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 _____, 2013.

________________________
Michael L. Benson
President, Rackham Graduate Student Body
A RESOLUTION TO EXPRESS THE DISPLEASURE OF THE GRADUATE STUDENT BODY ON THE UNIVERSITY’S ATHLETIC DEPARTMENT’S CHANGES TO THE FOOTBALL SEATING POLICY AT THE MICHIGAN STADIUM.

WHEREAS, the University of Michigan community has a strong tradition of supporting its football team; AND

WHEREAS, many graduate students at the University regularly attend home football games, including in organized groups and individually; AND

WHEREAS, the University’s Athletic Department (“Department”) and the University’s Division of Student Affairs jointly formed a working group in 2008 to review and amend the Michigan Stadium student section seating policies¹; AND

WHEREAS, the 2008 changes directly benefited graduate students by “having their credit hours weighted by 1.5 to make them more equivalent to undergraduate credit hours. Raw credit hours (without consideration to the number required for full-time status) were used in prior years to determine seating priority. As Rackham students require fewer credit hours per term to maintain full-time status, weighting was recommended by Rackham Student Government in its participation on a working group sponsored by the Athletic Department and the Division of Student Affairs to address seating policies;” AND

WHEREAS, without these changes, graduate students were generally regulated to some of the worst seats in the student section²; AND

WHEREAS, the Department announced on April 21, 2013 that admission to the student section at home football games would be on a general admission basis; AND

WHEREAS, neither the Department nor the Division of Student Affairs contacted RSG nor other student governments on campus to discuss the proposed seating policy change; AND

WHEREAS, under the Department’s assigned seats policy, many students in the student section changed seats and locations, creating cramped rows and areas within the section³; AND

¹ University Working group on Seating Priorities & Email to the Graduate Student Body dated March 24, 2009
² Experience of graduate students prior to 2010
³
WHEREAS, many attendees at home football games imbibe alcohol prior to arriving at the stadium; AND

WHEREAS, a general admission policy will encourage students to arrive earlier than with assigned seating to claim the prize near-field seats; AND

WHEREAS, students’ alcohol consumption will likely be unaffected by an earlier arrival and will likely continue in the stadium; AND

WHEREAS, the rush to the “best seats” could create a mob mentality wherein the stadium’s ushers would lose their current tool to avoid a mob, that being assigned seats and the ability to disallow entry into a seating section based on the student’s assigned seating section.

WHEREAS, the new seating policy was implemented along with a 23.08% increase in the price of student tickets, thereby raising the cost of attending Michigan home football games while decreasing the assurance of a consistent fan experience\(^4\); AND

WHEREAS, neither the central student government (“CSG”) nor the RSG were contacted by the Department as it considered its student section ticketing policy change; NOW THEREFORE, ON BEHALF OF THE STUDENT BODY OF THE HORACE H. RACKHAM GRADUATE SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND ARTICULATED BY ITS ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES, IT IS THE SENSE OF THE BOARD THAT IN THEIR NAME, THE FOLLOWING BE

RESOLVED, the official stance of the Rackham Student Government is that the athletic department should suspend its general admission ticketing policy for the Fall 2013 season and provide assigned seats throughout the stadium as it has in prior seasons; AND BE IT FURTHER

RESOLVED, the Rackham Student Government urges athletic director David Brandon, Vice President for Student Affairs E. Royster Harper, President Mary Sue Coleman, and the Board of Regents of the University of Michigan to consult with the elected representatives of the graduate and undergraduate student bodies when making decisions that directly affect said students; AND BE IT FURTHER

RESOLVED, that the President of the Graduate Student Body will work with the Department and the Division of Student Affairs as well as the representatives of the professional and undergraduate student bodies to implement the intent of this resolution; AND BE IT FINALLY

---

\(^3\) Experiences of graduate students at home football games

\(^4\) Michigan Daily Article, http://www.michigandaily.com/sports/athletic-department-change-student-football-seating-arrangements-and-math (\(\frac{280}{7\text{ games}} - \frac{195}{6\text{ games}}\) / (\(\frac{195}{6\text{ games}}\) )
RESOLVED, that the Board shall invite athletic director Brandon to attend a spring/summer meeting thereof to further discuss these changes, their rationale, and to provide feedback from the student body on the same.

AUTHORS

Kaitlin Flynn
Vice President
Graduate Student Body

ATTEST

By Signing below, I certify 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 _____, 2013.

Michael L. Benson
President, Rackham Graduate Student Body