Rackham Student Government
Board Meeting: July 19, 2012
Agenda

I. Call To Order

II. Approval of Agenda

III. Approval of Previous Minutes
   a. June 7, 2012*
   b. June 21, 2012*

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

V. Committee Updates
   a. Academic Affairs
   b. Budgetary
   c. Community Outreach & Social Action
   d. Legislative Affairs
   e. Student Life Committee
   f. Bylaw Review Committee

VI. Continuous Enrollment
   a. Policy Overview
   b. Dispute Resolution Board History and Overview
   c. Reinstatement Fee Changes – Discussion
   d. Future of the Dispute Resolution Board – Discussion

VII. Fall Picnic – August 31, 2012 Discussion

VIII. Open Discussion

IX. Adjournment

* - Item included in packet
** - Item will be provided on Day of Meeting or at Meeting
*** - Item was included in a previous packet
I. CALL TO ORDER: 6:35pm
   a. Present: Representatives Brandon Erickson, Alex Emly, Dan Trubman, Matt Waugh, Chris Tom, Eli Benchell Eisman, Matthew Filter, Anna Belak, Vice President Kaitlin Flynn, and President Benson.
   b. Absent: Lauren Knapp, Andrew Crawford, Evan Arthur
   c. Absent and Excused: Representatives Vanessa Cruz, Haven Allen, Ben Curtiss-Lusher, Pete McGrath, and Treasurer Alex Toulouse.

II. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA
   a. Motion by Alex E, seconded by Brandon Erickson, approved unanimously.

III. APPROVAL OF THE PREVIOUS MINUTES
   a. Motion by Eli and seconded by Kaitlin, with the changing of Dan Trubman’s attendance. Approved with one abstention.

IV. OFFICER REPORTS
   a. President Michael Benson. Reporting for Alex T- ~$18,000 in the bank. Budget committee meeting on Monday. President business: Graduate Deans Annual Meeting just happened in East Lansing last week. They discussed reporting of crimes, safety and student fees across the Big 10 universities. Kaitlin will be giving a speech to Summer Institute scholars on behalf of Michael next week. Michael also sits on the board of campus safety and has updates on how they want to use RSG to engage with the graduate student community.

   b. Vice President Kaitlin Flynn. Bylaw review committee will likely convene after the fourth of July weekend in order to allow for Kaitlin’s conference/travel schedule. Committee chairs will meet briefly after the board meeting to discuss committee operations. Finally Kaitlin is working on getting the Lions game situation worked out and takes a quick poll of the board to see how much they would be willing to pay for a ticket to the game.

V. Executive Order 12-03: Events Director. Michael introduces the executive order to create an events director, a non-exec position; this person will approve events, sit on all committees, calendar events, and ensure smooth production of the events. Michael issues
the order, “It is so ordered.” Chris makes a motion to open the agenda which is seconded by Alex E. The motion passes unanimously. Kaitlin moves to add the nomination of the events director to the following item on the agenda, seconded by Matt. The motion passes unanimously Closing of the agenda, motion by Alex E and seconded by Chris. The motion passes unanimously.

VI. Nomination of the Events Director. Michael is pleased to announce his nomination and appointment of Alex Emly to serve as the government’s first Events Director. Pursuant to EO 12-03, the Board is given the opportunity to appeal Michael’s nomination and appointment. The Board declines to do so.

VII. Committee Updates
   a. Academic Affairs: meeting to look at conflict resolution. Looking at 2 modes of attack: forming a conflict resolution board (an active action) and working on providing conflict resolution handouts and training with Darlene. Flowchart is included in the minutes. Motion to approve the minutes by Chris and seconded by Alex E. Approved with 3 abstentions.
   b. CoSAC: organizing four major events this summer: watershed council cleanup @end of June, volunteering at food warehouse with food gatherers, volunteering with parks and rec, and the beach cleanup event on 7/21. Motion to approve the minutes by Eli and seconded by Alex E. Approved with one abstention.
   c. Legislative Affairs: Motion by Michael to approve and seconded by Dan, approved with one abstention. The committee has been working at the federal level to host the SAGE fall summit and we will begin fundraising soon to keep RSG’s total cost low. The agenda from last year’s summit is included in the packet. We will be putting a focus on Michigan issues during our summit and making policy recommendations for the administrators in attendance. The committee has also discussed state issues such as the budget and University autonomy. At the local level, there will be forums for candidates and other debatable issues.
   d. Student Life: Finalizing Rackham events, trying to extend happy hours for a bar night, plus sporting events and an arb event. Also working on student group registration. Motion to accept the minutes and seconded by Matt. Approved with one abstention.
   e. Bylaw Review: Meeting in July.

VIII. SAGE Fall Summit Visioning: Michael discusses the agenda for the summit. Three purposes of the summit: forum, sharing best practices at each University, and setting advocacy items for the spring visit to DC. In the packet you can find an analysis of the impact of the upcoming federal Sequester. Likely the LAC will draft a resolution this fall with recommendations as to what programs should not be cut.
   a. Ideas for the Fall Summit: Anna says that federal funding managers cannot pay for themselves, technically, so they could be free to come visit. Michael says we will likely focus on education and government education. Eli suggests a forum on international collaboration and how we pay students or researchers that come to visit, and looking to see what institutions are doing, etc. Alex E says that the CERC center on campus might be interested in collaborating. Dan mentions that
autonomy and same sex benefit issues might be of interest to some people. Student visas and state level officials. This summit will likely take place the last weekend in October. Eli would like if Sander Levin shotgunning a beer over the weekend.

IX. **Bylaw Visioning. Where is RSG in 5 years?**
   a. What do we do well? sporting event communication, enthusiasm for events
   b. What do we not do well? Communication issues within the board and then between the students and RSG, engaging students on Twitter, collaborating with the professional schools and other universities, convoluted emails, more money, GSRA communication issues, motion by Anna and seconded by Chris to put together tweetable facts for communication, approved unanimously. Taking advantage of nonacademic resources and communicating with other grad students on campus. Matt Filter suggests that reps should advertise via word of mouth. Twitter issues (getting people to follow) and Facebook ads to advertise RSG and the elections. Social media contests to promote issues and events on Facebook.

X. **Funding Requests Procedure:** The funding request worksheet is included in the packet and Michael discusses the process of funding requests.

XI. **Open Discussion**
   a. Kaitlin brings up the board social event. Michael asks if we have any ideas for speakers. People bring up how to effect change on our football seating by inviting Dave Brandon and others. Alex E suggests meeting with execs from other professional schools.

XII. **Adjournment at 7:47pm moved by Chris and seconded by Matt F.**
CALL TO ORDER: 6:42pm


b. Absent: Andrew Crawford, Alex Emly, Dan Trubman.

c. Excused: Kaitlin Flynn, Vanessa Cruz, Haven Allen, Ben Curtiss-Lusher, Pete McGrath, Chris Tom, Brandon Erickson, Heidi Alvey, Anna Belak.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

a. Motion by Matt Filter, seconded by Lauren Knapp, approved unanimously.

APPROVAL OF THE PREVIOUS MINUTES

a. Motion by Eli and seconded by Matt F. Approved with two abstentions.

OFFICER REPORTS

a. President Michael Benson. MB has been in contact with Michigan State for joint events, e.g. Tigers game, later September. Will be asking Student life to look into this. There have been number legislative issues such as petitions for new Bridge and ban for right to work on the state level. Will be meeting with president of the NAGPS to consider joining. Regents approved tuition raise of 2.83%. Will be meeting with CFO Tim Slottow to discuss issues with him. Very successful Bar night last night, and hopes to continue. The issue of graduate student mental health has been raised as a concern by some students that he’d like to see addressed.

i. Eli asks if SHIC addresses this at all. MB says he needs to appoint some representatives to SHIC, but not aware of them addressing these issues but UHS does have some facilities.

b. Treasurer Alex Toulouse. Currently have approx. $18,000 in the account. We have received approx. $1100 dollars for the Spring and Spring/Summer terms so far. We still owe approx $4500 to Rackham and approx $1500 to MB. We will be looking to update the funding procedures in the bylaws as well as the funding request form so any ideas or suggestions are welcome. Also budgetary committee members, please respond to the email requests promptly.
V. Committee Updates
   a. Academic Affairs: Eli: Chris put together flow chart for conflict resolution in packet. Still work to be done. Eli will be meeting with Darlene Ray Johnson to improve this and address it to incoming students.
   b. Budgetary: Alex T: We have a request to vote on as the board. Email will be sent out to vote because we do not have quorum.
   c. CoSAC: Eli: Did not meet last week, but have 2 events coming up in end of June and July. Looking to some
   d. Legislative Affairs: MB: Did not meet last week. Will be discussing state issues and forum for the fall.
   e. Student Life: Alex T: We had a successful event last night. Evan: We are planning other upcoming happy hours at other venues.
VI. Funding Request: Vaughan Symposium Organizing Committee: Vaughan Symposium
   a. Alex: The request is on page 12 in your packet. This is an event that happens in the Chemistry department and has since the early part of the century. This year’s keynote speaker is Dr. Arnold from CalTech. The entire event is run and organized by the students. The Chemistry department does provide some funding. This year the groups is asking for $1350 for a variety of purposes including speaker travel, lodging, t-shirts, and advertising materials. In your packet you also have last year’s event report and their corresponding request. The BC met with the treasurer last Monday and we voted to recommend funding the event at a rate of $800. This would include speaker travel and lodging as well as advertising but no money for t-shirts. While this is mainly a chemistry event, the group does reach out to a number of other departments and programs.
   b. Matt: How much money do we have in the budget for funding these types of requests? Alex: I believe we budgeted $3,000 for student group funding. MB: According to Supreme Court ruling we are not allowed to make decisions based on remaining unallocated funds. Alex: We fund on a first come first serve basis until the funds run out.
   c. Lauren: Is there a breakdown on how many students were from programs outside of chemistry? Alex: They didn’t give us an exact count but they do advertise to a big part of Division 1. (Eli lists off some of the programs) It seems that it’s a lot of interdisciplinary programs
   d. Matt Waugh: How much are they asking for from us? Alex: $1350. The BC met with group and is making a recommendation to fund $800. We funded the event $750 last year.
   e. Matt Waugh: Why are we funding $50 more than last year? Alex: There was concerns that some of the events we fund are not well enough advertised so the extra $50 was allocated for advertising.
   f. Lauren: Asks if RSG will help advertise the event? Michael: Yes, we will help the group advertise. Potentially send out a mini-newsletter
   g. Motion by MB to fund $800 for speaker travel and lodging and printing and advertising. Sconded by Eli. Votes in favor: 7 Opposed: 0
   h. An electronic vote will be administered to achieve quorum.
VII. **Continuous Enrollment:** MB refers to memorandum on status of continuous enrollment. Rackham Exec Board voted to reinstate the reinstatement fee. RSG passed resolution stating no purpose for the reinstatement fee. The resolution was approved until overturned by Rackham Executive Board. Dispute Resolution board was created to avoid any issues. To date the dispute resolution board has never met although it’s been established and trained. All issues have been dealt with before reaching the board. There is a request by Dean Weiss to disband the Continuous Enrollment Resolution Board. MB agrees with this request, and even if it is disbanded there is still a board that could potentially hear issues. MB is asking for someone to write a resolution disbanding the board. Opens discussion about the policy:

a. Matt F: Asks for overview of the policy. MB: Students come into program as pre-candidates and then proceed to candidacy. After candidacy some students could go on detached study without registering. Students could come back after any period of time, enroll for their last semester, and only pay the last semester before graduating. This policy says students must be enrolled. Reasons included the university didn’t know who its students were and some didn’t come back. Due to this policy tuition was lowered such that the total cost for an academic year did not increase.

b. REB has to approve all programs. There has been an increase in master’s programs approved recently.

c. Eli: What securities are there if students are interested in taking a hiatus. MB: Military service, medical reasons, extramural study, 1 personal semester for any reason can also be taken as reasons for a leave of absence. Lauren: Must this personal semester be taken before the start? MB: No not necessarily.

d. MB: Asks for consideration of the reinstatement fee, and to talk to students in respective divisions.

e. MB: Asks if people would be comfortable disbanding the dispute resolution board. Matt W: When was it put in place? MB: 2010. Eli: Asks if this falls in line with the re-envisioning that Darlene Ray Johnson has for the dispute resolution process. MB: Yes.

f. Eli: Asks if there are statistic on students that are not continuously enrolled. Thinks it would be pertinent to have the deans from those divisions to discuss with. MB: Primarily divisions 3 and 4 have been affected.

g. MB asks to please consider these issues before next meeting.

VIII. **Open Discussion:** None

IX. **Adjournment at 7:35 pm moved by Eli and seconded by Lauren. Approved unanimously.**

X. **Electronic Vote held 6/21/12 – 6/23/2012**

a. Alex T: Please find tonight's minutes attached. Due to the lack of quorum I need to request an online vote for a funding request that was brought before the board tonight. Please find the request and the minutes from the Budgetary Committee (BC) meeting attached. The BC voted to recommend funding $800 for this event at its meeting. There is a motion by Michael seconded by Eli to fund $800 for the event (including speaker travel and lodging, advertising, and printing but not t-
shirts). Please respond ASAP at the latest by Sunday at 7 pm to the full board with your vote 1) In Favor (Yes) 2) Objection (No) or 3) Abstain. Thank you for your timely consideration of this matter!

b. Vote:
   i. **In Favor**: Michael, Eli, Haven, Andrew, Bernardo, Dan, Alex E, Evan, Pete, Anna, Lauren, Ben, Matt W, Matt F, Alex T
   ii. **Opposed**: 
   iii. **Abstentions**: Chris, Heidi, Brandon
I. CALL TO ORDER
6:31 pm – Eli is eating a sandwich

II. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS
   b. Absent (excused): Representatives Pete McGrath, RSG President Michael Benson, Haven Allen.
   c. Absent (unexcused): Representatives Andrew Crawford, Alex Toulouse

III. CONFLICT RESOLUTION BOARD – INITIAL DRAFTS
   a. Mission Statement (rough draft attached) – Edits of rough draft was undertaken by the committee. Minutes of discussion follow. Additional edits were made on paper and submitted to CT for revision.

IV. CONFLICT RESOLUTION FLOW CHART
   a. Eli will meet with Darlene Ray-Johnson re: the existing resolution boards. In this way the flow chart will be a complete reference for all sorts of conflict, regardless of whether CRB is utilized.

V. OPEN DISCUSSION

VI. ADJOURNMENT:
   Adjourn –
   Next meeting at 6:30pm June 28th at Espresso Royale on State.

VII. ITEMS & IDEAS IN QUEUE (NOT DISCUSSED THIS MEETING)
   a. Rackham administers faculty awards for mentorship
   b. The mechanism of funding for first year students should be standardized across Rackham
   c. List of Academic Resources for Twitter (Chris)
   d. Student Ombuds
VIII. ATTACHMENTS

1. Mission Statement for Conflict Resolution Board

The purpose of this Board is to act as an unbiased resource to formally resolve the interpersonal conflict between students and faculty. These are cases where there is no clear-cut definition of right and wrong, e.g. academic dishonesty or sexual harassment, which are handled appropriately by the Academic Integrity Board and the Office of Institutional Equality, respectively. This statement is unclear and needs to be reworked.

CT-Michael suggests having the Deans enforce conflict resolution. AB- is on board with enforcing, but doesn’t think the Deans will necessarily agree. CT- hopefully most things will be amicably resolved by the Board, but in instances where that does not take place, the Deans will be employed.

CT and AB- mention that policies in place by the department are not necessarily followed and need to be reconsidered.

AB- Are individuals expected to contact the ombuds office (eg DRJ) prior to contacting the Board? CT- yes. And Darlene is all over this.

AB- recommends that we provide discreet examples of cases in which this board would be utilized.

Edits were made.

The jurisdiction and responsibilities of this Board include:
- Formal complaints brought by faculty or staff for resolution. This will be a catch-all system for all matters not handled by other bodies. It operates in what is essentially a 'grey area' for the existing bodies.
- The complaints and conflicts that exist are individual and subjective, and thus the solutions are handled on a case-by-case basis.
- Should the complaint fail to be resolved in such a way that is amiable to both parties, the Board can make recommendations to the Deans, who will be vested with the authority to modify and enforce appropriate recommendations.
- Serve as an intermediary mechanism of communication of the complaint from the student body and faculty to the Administration that bypasses the program/departmental channels.
- A necessary channel for all matters of graduate student expulsion for non-academic/non-code of conduct violations. In this way the burden responsibility does not rest solely on the PI, nor can the decision be made exclusively by the PI. In this way as well, a solution can be sought after that does not include expulsion from school for reasons that are not explicitly codified.

The limitations of this board are:
- Will not have any jurisdiction over Academic Integrity or other well-defined code of conduct violations.
-Will not have any authority over legal matters, and the resolutions are not legally binding
-Will not have the authority to directly deal or enforce resolution

The board will be composed of:
-Excess faculty members appointed by SACUA and Rackham
-Excess student members appointed by RSG
-If any member of a given board has a conflict of interest in a given case, he or she will be replaced by someone from the pool of extras.

2. Conflict Resolution Flowchart
RACKHAM STUDENT GOVERNMENT  
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE  
Thursday, July 11th 2012  
6:30 pm, Espresso Royale Cafe, 324 State St.

I. CALL TO ORDER 6:37 pm

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

III. CONFLICT RESOLUTION BOARD
   a. Mission Statement
      i. Michael does not like the part of the mission statement in which we say ‘this includes cases…’. Eli mentions that the board doesn’t necessarily have ‘teeth’ but could serve as more of a guideline or suggestion for the conflict resolution. Eugene suggests that outlining common problems that graduate students face (perhaps by doing a poll) we might be able to describe some issues and potential solutions in this document. Michael responds that this board could or should be used for a large variety of concerns. Eugene mentions that this board could work as a compliance board for faculty members and other administrators to report if/when the administrators/faculty members do not follow protocol for dealing with and reporting such situations. Michael suggests that this board could direct Rackham and departments to follow these guidelines—could function as a ‘superboard’ (as termed by Eli). Discussion suggests that perhaps the board could have two arms: one advisory catch-all for hierarchical issues, depending on if the issue is stalled at the faculty/administrator level or another arm at the informal ‘student presentation of an issue’ stage. Eli says that centralizing these responsibilities also streamlines the process and allows for uniformity between departments to say that for instance, if at any point there is a conflict, this is what should happen. Eli says also that in his discussion with Darlene, they identified that there is not a point person in each department to be trained in and responsible for these issues. Eugene mentions too that having an unbiased party is the key requirement in this board, especially in order to protect against conflict of interest issues. Michael suggests either a ‘checklist’ option that each faculty member has to fill out and respond to the department chair. Michael also suggests identifying point persons in other departments that would allow for
addressing of concerns in a professional manner but outside of a department (IE: a chemical engineer has a problem with a faculty member and chooses to discuss the issue with a professor in EECS). Anna brings up an EECS prof who has a policy in his lab that allows for this type of interaction when students or lab members feel that there is a conflict of interest. Eugene and Michael like this idea. Michael also suggests that we could have people address issues at a college level, ie: college of engineering, LSA, etc. Eugene emphasizes that there needs to be training within the departments such that concerns and confidentiality are maintained, from the faculty to the administrative assistant level.

ii. Action items: consider checklist, training for departments, identifying point people within departments (talking to Darlene about how to implement?), refine mission statement. Michael would like to take on the rewriting of the conflict resolution board. Eli mentions that Darlene is interested in having this board be a recommendation and not enforcement, whereas this committee agrees that it should have teeth and the board should not have to operate through the Deans for enforcement. Michael agrees and mentions that we will be meeting with Janet when she returns from vacation to discuss how we can implement enforcement.

b. Flow Chart- Kaitlin brings up that the flow chart is less than optimal for distribution to students during fall orientation that shows how to deal with conflict and what offices exist for conflict resolution on campus. Email this out?? Michael agrees and Kaitlin and Anna will work on this.

c. Resolution to give power to the Deans for enforcement—scratching this and will update once we meet with Janet.

d. Timeline for implementation- timeline: meet with Janet, meet with John Godfrey to hammer out policy details, present to RSG board in Thanksgiving with hopeful implementation in fall 2013.

e. Other Boards, Committees, and operating bodies—we will wait on the advisory boards and committees. We will need to also appoint students to the Dean’s advisory committees in the fall.

IV. GRADUATE STUDENT BILL OF RIGHTS

a. Status update: the GSBOR was approved by the RSG board and we are waiting to meet with Janet to discuss the next steps.

b. Timeline for submission for Rackham/implementation: Fall 2012

c. Identification/classification of all policies that are already covered in other documents—will be assigned over email.

V. OPEN DISCUSSION

a. Rackham graduation/dissertation policies have been passed and updated! Thank you Rackham Executive Board! Michael outlines some of the changes—we are no longer requiring students to use ProQuest,
dissertations will be submitted online to Rackham, and the deadlines have been extended. Also the embargo requirements have been changed to allow anyone to embargo their dissertation for one year, no questions asked. To extend beyond this, patent applications and other documentation must be provided.

b. Eugene asks what else he can do now as a student with conflict. Michael says that it seems he is doing everything he can (including addressing the Reagents, etc). Eugene might be interested in an investigation at the University level, in order for the university to perhaps determine what they can do to undo the damage that had already been done in this situation. We begin discussing what Eugene will say when he addresses the Board of Reagents.

c. We will add Eugene to the committee list-serv.

VI. ADJOURNMENT: 7:24pm

VII. APPENDIX:

Conflict Resolution Board

1. Statement of Purpose
   The Conflict Resolution Board (hereafter known as ‘the Board’) provides a formal venue to resolve the interpersonal conflict between students and faculty. ((This includes cases where no laws or codes of conduct have explicitly been broken (e.g. academic dishonesty or sexual harassment),)) but where resolution of this conflict is necessary to maintain a safe, productive, and comfortable work and research environment at the University of Michigan.

2. Powers and Responsibilities
   a. The Board addresses complaints brought before them by faculty and/or students. The Board hears cases brought by faculty against student, student against faculty, and student against student. The Graduate Ombudsman processes incoming cases and decides if the Board is the appropriate body for the case.
   b. The Board may decide to direct proceedings to more appropriate Boards and resources as necessary; e.g. such as Academic Integrity Board, the Graduate Ombudsman, and the Office of Institution Equality. The Board has full knowledge of these other resources.
   c. The Board hears each complaint on a case-by-case basis, and works with the parties to find appropriate solutions for the situation.
   d. The Board [will/will not] have subpoena power to bring faculty or students into discussion.
   e. Should the complaint fail to be resolved in an amiable manner, the Board makes recommendations to the Deans, who are vested by [Resolution XX-01] with the authority to enforce appropriate recommendations.
f. The Board may serve as a means of communication from the student body and faculty to the Administration when the traditional means of conflict resolution through the Department fails.

g. All attempts to expel a graduate student from the Rackham Graduate School for non-academic and non-code of conduct violations must pass through the Board. In this way, a solution can be sought after that does not include expulsion from school for reasons that are not explicitly codified.

3. Limitations of Power
   a. The Board has no jurisdiction over Academic Integrity or other well-defined code of conduct violations. As per the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), the Board will not view academic documents, nor are they admissible as evidence.
   b. The Board has no authority over legal matters, and the resolutions are not legally binding.
   c. The Board has no power to directly deal or enforce resolution. That power is left in the hands of the Deans.

4. Composition
   a. Seven faculty members appointed by SACUA and Rackham Graduate School, which includes a reserve of extras for conflicts of interest, scheduling issues, and other unforeseen reasons.
   b. Seven student members appointed by Rackham Student Government, which also includes a reserve of extras.
   c. For each case that comes before the Board, three students and three faculty are randomly selected from the Board. These members form a sitting Board.
   d. If any member of the Board has a conflict of interest in a given case, he or she must recluse himself or herself and be replaced by someone from the pool of extras. This includes but it not limited to: friendships and relationships with either of the parties, financial interest, or departmental affiliation. If any member of the Board has a time conflict, they may also ask to be replaced.
   e. Either of the parties coming before the Board has a right to request that a sitting member of the Board be replaced.
   f. The Graduate Ombudsman in the ways of Conflict Resolution trains all members of the Board.

5. Examples of Use
   a. Eugene
   b. Jennifer

Resolution steps
MOU = Memo of Understanding
RRO = Rackham Resolution Officer

Student seeks informal mediation from S/C Resolution Officer

Resolved

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

No agreement: Dean requests Rackham's Dispute Resolution Process

MOU

RRO organizes formal dispute resolution process under Rackham procedures

RRO and Resolution Board asks school/college to reconvene mediation

RRO and Resolution Board sustains MOU

Rackham Dean determination of resolution

MOU

Student asks Rackham Resolution Officer for reconsideration
I. **CALL TO ORDER** June 19, 2012

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

III. **FUNDING REQUEST:**
   a. Organization Name: Michigan Energy Club (MEC)
   b. Event name: Michigan Energy Club Picinic
   c. Event date(s): June 27, 2012, 12 p.m.
   d. Event location: North Campus Diag
   e. Requesting: $300

IV. **DISCUSSION:**
   a. Alex T: We have a funding request for $300 from the Michigan Energy Club. I'm at fault because their request was submitted on the 6/11 and got lost in my inbox during a hectic week. It was submitted after the 15 business day minimum but I'd like us to still try to consider it. If possible please try to respond by **Friday at 5 PM**, and I will close the discussion at that point assuming we have enough responses. Thank you for your understanding! I know that MEC is a very active group on campus. They have had multiple events over the last year usually bringing in speakers and I think they do a pretty good job of advertising at least to the engineering school. It seems like the goal of their event is to bring together the many people who have signed up for their group and to encourage them to get more interested and be more active in the group. Although the money is strictly for food, I think the event does fall under the category of "programs designed to enhance the quality of life for the student body" by bringing people together to have a conversation about an issue of interest. I would be comfortable up to $200 for this event.
   
   b. Alex E: I'm fine with $300 provided that they announce it to the full listservs - SNRE/Engineering/any other ones clearly related to energy (I'm obviously fine with Alex's $200 as well). If we don't give them the $300 and then they do announce it to everyone, then it'd definitely be hard to make it work with only $200. Since I do get all the engineering emails, I know that it has not been announced, and since it's only a week away, they might not have been planning on announcing it to everyone. That being the case, I don't feel comfortable funding $200 for a group with 10 active members. And since the purpose of the event is to expose new people to the club, it doesn't seem like this would be accomplishing their goal. If you could ask about whether or not they were going to email the listservs, Alex, that would be great.
c. Dan: Do we have any records for how we have funded them in the past for similar events?
d. Matt: Could we also get a picture as to where we're at budgetarily with regards to student funding (overall)? Thanks.
e. Alex T: To answer some of your questions: - In the request they state that they DO plan to email the department listservs that they have access to including their own club list which has approx 250 total people, in addition to putting up fliers. My understanding is that they are waiting to hear back from us to decide if they'll have enough funds for the event given they have no other funding sources, so they'll likely send out emails as soon as they hear from us. - I'm not aware of any previous similar bbq events. We have funded speakers and energy expo events with amounts ranging from $50-$200 in the last year. - According to Michael, we can't base our decisions on remaining funds. We allocate funds on a first come first serve basis until we're out. Please let me know if there are more questions, and submit your motions and votes asap! Thanks again for your participation!
f. Alex T: So there's been a slight modification to the request. Due to OSEH regulations, it's very difficult to have a BBQ on campus apparently. So the group has submitted an updated request. Essentially the only change is they're calling it a picnic and will be buying picnic food at a grocery store. I'd still be comfortable with $200. Please vote when you get the chance. Thanks!
g. Dan: I'm ok with $200.
h. Matt: I'm with Alex -- $200 sounds fine.
i. Lauren: I abstain. (Conflict of interest - I'm a member in MEC).
j. Kaitlin: I vote to fund at a level of $200.
k. Brandon: Sorry for the late reply, it is well past 5pm on Friday but I have been traveling. I think $200 is fine.
l. Michael: I abstain on this motion.

V. VOTE:
   a. $300: Alex E
   b. $200: Brandon, Dan, Matt, Kaitlin, Alex T
   c. Abstentions: Lauren, Michael

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

VII. ADJOURNMENT: June 23, 2012
RACKHAM STUDENT GOVERNMENT
BUDGETARY COMMITTEE
JUNE 11, 2012
RACKHAM BUILDING

I. CALL TO ORDER 7:30 PM

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

III. FUNDING REQUEST:
   a. Organization Name: Chemistry Symposium Organizing Committee
   b. Event name: Vaughan Symposium 2012
   c. Event date(s): August 2, 2012
   d. Event location: Chemistry Building
   e. Requesting: $1350

IV. EVENT DESCRIPTION:
   a. Shuwen: Had approx 270 people in the past. Expecting more this year and hoping to attract more students from other related departments using publicity.

V. DISCUSSION:
   a. Michael: Asks if Shuwen was involved in planning last year. She participated but not involved in planning. According to event report last year, there were approx 220 people. The total cost was approx 5900 last year. Curious why this year’s request is for 1200. Estimating 500 for speaker lodging. T-shirts are asking for aprox 200 more. Chemistry gave 5000 total last year and giving same again. Apparently they received funding from the REU program last year.
   b. Michael asks how they plan to advertise and how many students outside of chemistry. Not many grad students from other departments last year. This year they are planning on sending emails through all faculties with joint affiliations. Michael suggests including in the newsletter.
   c. Funded 750 last year, Michael asks why we should fund this given its mostly for one department. She says they are expecting more students and would like to attract students from other departments. They think there will be more students
   d. Kaitlin asks if getting funding from chemistry council. Yes.
   e. Alex asks what the purpose of the T-shirts. They want to use it as advertising and will be given away for free.
f. Kaitlin asks if there is preregistration. Answer is yes. It closed on 6/6.
g. Alex asks about the discrepancy in the budget and funding. They are hoping to find cheaper t-shirt vendors and housing.
h. Michael asks how many undergraduates will be participating. Approximately 60 last year and not expecting as many undergrads this year because no REU involvement. He wants to know realistically how many total students. She still expects some undergraduate involvement.

VI. CLOSED DISCUSSION:
   a. Michael moves that we level fund at 750 same as last year restricted to all but food and t-shirts. Second by Kaitlin
   b. Dan concerned that people actively try to spread the word and thinks flyers are useful. Michael suggests putting in the newsletter.
   c. $800 moved by Michael with the same stipulations. Seconded by Dan.

VII. VOTE:
   a. $800: Michael, Dan, Kaitlin, Alex

VIII. The committee votes to recommend funding of $800 for the Vaughan Symposium given the above mentioned stipulations to the full board.

IX. ADJOURNMENT: 8:00 pm
RACKHAM STUDENT GOVERNMENT
STUDENT LIFE COMMITTEE
JUNE 13, 2012
7:30 PM, ESPRESSO ROYALE 312 S. STATE ST.

I. CALL TO ORDER 7:45 pm

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

III. RACKHAM EVENTS
   We will not be doing Cedar Point since it’s so expensive
   Day in the Park : Set aside a certain amount of money like we did last year
   Tigers Game : $10 for a bus ticket, not $5
      Michael mentions that we should sell it as a coupled ticket price : i.e. bus
      ride and tickets
      Kaitlin, Alex and Benardo think that it’s not fair to be having to pay for
      the bus if you’re not going to take it.
      Lump ticket and bus price together - bus price will be $10

IV. BAR NIGHTS / HAPPY HOURS
   BTB Cantina : (update frm Bernardo) Happy hour can be extended until 8, normally runs until 7.  BTB probably isn’t a good place to be in the afternoon since it’s usually always empty
   Charley’s: 2:30 - 6 happy hour, manager kinda meh.
   Jolly Pumpkin : 4-6 only standing room , Kaitlin didn’t thikn it was very good
   GP: 3-6 every day, $1 off apps, Bell’s, drinks
   Bar Louie: 4-7 every day, Wed all day, something is special on Thursdays
   ABC : Happy hour all day Monday, Tues-Fri : 4-7 PM, Sunday 8pm-12am half off large beer, $6 apps M-F
   Blue Tractor: 3-6PM and 10-11AM, manager wasn’t really sure about who could designate happy hour speicals
   Blue Lep: every day until 8

Bar Louie, next Wednesday June 20, 6-8PM, email initial announcement
Friday, then send reminder on Wednesday
Aim for Charley’s 3rd week of July, then ABC then Jug (main street / south u rotation)
V. **BAR NIGHT**

   Alley Bar, July 6 or 7, Friday or Saturday

VI. **FAMILY FRIENDLY EVENTS**

   Fuller Pool event: Michael is meeting with the A2 Parks and Rec people next week to see if we can get a discount
   Walk in the Arb afternoon

VII. **OPEN DISCUSSION**

   Alex will be gone for the next meeting

VIII. **ADJOURNMENT:** 8:10 pm
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
The Continuous Enrollment Policy for Ph.D. students became effective at the beginning of the Fall 2010 semester. All active Ph.D. students, including those who had been on detached study or unregistered under previous policies and practices, are now registering in each fall and winter semester until the completion of all degree requirements, unless on an approved leave of absence.

In the fall semester, 5357 PhD students were registered, an increase of about 500 from the previous fall semester. In addition, 74 students had an approved leave of absence for family or dependent care, health reasons, military service, or personal reasons. Eleven students were registered at another educational institution, and were approved for extramural study status.

To keep the policy revenue neutral, the Regents approved a reduction in tuition for Ph.D. candidates of 15.4% for the 2010-11 academic year. This has ensured that the University does not receive any additional revenue from tuition for Ph.D. students as a result of the policy.

To prevent new costs from falling directly on students, Rackham worked with each school and college to create tuition fellowships to pay the tuition for those students who are making satisfactory academic progress, who would not have registered under previous policies, and who are now registered under the new policy. The funding that was budgeted for these tuition fellowships has been adequate to cover all of the cases of need.

Active monitoring of the experience with the policy this fall has allowed us to identify some individual students with special circumstances that required flexibility; in those cases Rackham staff have worked with faculty members to design solutions that will work for the students’ academic situation and for faculty and graduate programs. Rackham staff members are willing to assist any student who is concerned that he or she has been adversely affected by the policy; please contact Assistant Dean Shelly Conner (shellyah@umich.edu).

Rackham Student Government also worked with Rackham to develop a process for Ph.D. students who wish to dispute the equity and fairness of decisions made about them by program faculty in relation to the continuous enrollment policy. The process begins with a conversation between the student and the Graduate Chair in his or her own program; if necessary, Rackham staff members are ready to help students in understanding their options in this conversation. If disputes cannot be resolved
informally, a more formal process is available. The Continuous Enrollment Dispute Resolution Board has the authority to hear and resolve disputes that are not satisfactorily resolved using informal methods. The Board is comprised of equal numbers of Ph.D. students, who have been named to the Board by Rackham Student Government, and academic administrators, who have been named to the Board by the Dean of Rackham. So far all issues have been resolved successfully through informal means, and no dispute has come forward to the Board. But the Board remains available to all Ph.D. students if it is needed. For questions and assistance with dispute resolution, please contact Darlene Ray-Johnson at Rackham (rayj@umich.edu).
Dear SHIC Members,

Thank you for being a valued member of the Student Health Insurance Committee (SHIC) during the 2011/12 school year! Included in this email are the benefits choices for the 2012/13 school year (which are based on your votes) and the premium rates for the upcoming school year provided by Aetna. Please let us know if you have any questions on the plan or Aetna’s pricing. We look forward to meeting with you in the fall!

Best Regards,
Laurie and Nina

Benefit Choices voted on by eligible SHIC members for the 2012-13 Plan:

- **Co-Insurance and Annual Out of Pocket Maximum**
  - In-Network services have 70% Aetna Coverage/30% Member Co-insurance with a $2500 Annual Maximum Out of Pocket member coinsurance
  - Out-of-Network services have 50% Aetna Coverage/50% Member Co-Insurance also with a $2500 Annual Maximum Out of Pocket per member coinsurance.

- **Rx Copay Amounts**
  - Three Tier Rx Copayment Pricing - $20 generic meds/$40 brand single source/$60 brand multi-source

- **Office Visit Copays**
  - Office visit copays $20 per visit

- **Emergency Room Visit Copayments**
  - ER visit Copayment $75; waived if admitted

- **Annual Deductible Amount**
  - Annual Deductible amount $500 per member; waived for prescription drug expense

- **Pre-Existing Condition Coverage**
  - $1000 maximum coverage for pre-existing conditions. (This limitation no longer applies after the member has been continuously insured for 180 days under this plan)

- **Enrollment Period**
  - Students may enroll in the plan at any time

**2012-13 Domestic Student Insurance Plan Premium Rates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost:</th>
<th>Annual 08/24/12 - 8/23/13</th>
<th>Winter 01/01/13 - 08/23/13</th>
<th>Spring/Summer 05/01/13 - 08/23/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Only</td>
<td>$2974</td>
<td>$1984</td>
<td>$1001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student + Adult</td>
<td>$8598</td>
<td>$5735</td>
<td>$2875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student + Adult+</td>
<td>$12,050</td>
<td>$8040</td>
<td>$4028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child(ren)</td>
<td>$6426</td>
<td>$4289</td>
<td>$2154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student + Child(ren)</td>
<td>$6426</td>
<td>$4289</td>
<td>$2154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>