Rackham Student Government
Board Meeting: November 15, 2012
Agenda

I. Call To Order

II. Approval of Agenda

III. Approval of Previous Minutes
   a. November 8, 2012  * (p. 2)

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

V. Guest Speaker / Discussion: Anthony Walesby, Associate Vice Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs and Senior Director, Office of Institutional Equity* (p.11)

VI. RSG Election – November 27th, 28th & 29th Logistics

VII. Graduate & Professional Student Governance Ballot Question * (p. 10)

VIII. Town Halls / Lunches with the Deans * (p. 28)

IX. Committee Updates
   a. Academic Affairs* (p. 5)  f. Student Life Committee *
   b. Budgetary (p. 9)
   c. Community Outreach & Social Action
   d. Elections Committee
   e. Legislative Affairs*  g. Graduate & Professional Student Assembly
   (pgs. 7, 36)

X. Individual Projects – Update

XI. Open Discussion

* - 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
11/8/12
RACKHAM GRADUATE BUILDING
2ND FLOOR WEST CONFERENCE ROOM, NORTH ALCOVE
6:39 P.M.

a. CALL TO ORDER: 6:39pm

b. Present: Eli Benchell Eisman, Kaitlin Flynn, Michael Benson, Alex Toulouse, Anna Belak, Dan Trubman, Phil Saccone, Brandon Filter, Lauren Knapp, Vanessa Cruz, Evan Arthur

c. Absent: Chris Tom, Alex Emly, Alex Gutierrez, Heidi Pedini, Haven Allen, Matt Filter, Pete McGrath, Matt Waugh

d. Excused:

II. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

a. No quorum at the start of the meeting

III. APPROVAL OF THE PREVIOUS MINUTES

a. Motion by Vanessa and seconded by Alex T. Approved unanimously.

IV. OFFICER REPORTS

a. President Michael Benson. Thanks for everyone helping out with the election forum, going forward we will advertise more to get students and the community engaged. National, state and local elections are over and SAGE is quite happy. Student government elections in three weeks. GPSASC will be meeting next week and organizing the ballot language for approval next week.

b. Vice President Kaitlin Flynn. Newsletter going out this week. Apportions have happened given current enrollment and Division III now surpasses Division I in size. Another seat has been added to Division IV and will be a Winter seat.

c. Treasurer Alex Toulouse. $20,500 in the account. Funding announcement went out this week and funding requests are rolling in.

V. Martha Pollack, Vice Provost for Academic and Budgetary Affairs

a. Martha gives introductions and opens up the floor for questions. Dan asks about the sequestration issue and if Michigan would become a private school (there have been rumors). Martha answers that she just can’t believe that the sequestration and fiscal cliff would even happen. But the University has been planning for it, and the biggest impact will be in the Medical School and Health System. Most of the money that would be frozen would be in the research sector. Regarding tuition, on a per student basis, the U is getting less than half of what they were from the state as they were 10 years ago. More budget discussion ensues. President Coleman said that we will always be a public university and it is not just about money, but about commitment to a certain set of values and the U is
committed to that. Alex T asks hypothetically what it would mean to go private. Martha explains. Alex T asks about how the U is going to implement Coursera into the curriculum. Martha explains the background. She was very supportive in the beginning. Coursera is really an incredible resource and the U signed on really quickly. In April there were 4 schools: UM, Stanford, Penn and Princeton that had signed on. The U is very involved in the MOOCs—Massive Open Online Courses. Both creating and broadcasting classes for free globally. In return, the U gets to pursue its mission, learn more about using technology to engage students on campus, and so on. Can the U use this technology to be more efficient at some parts of our learning?

b. Michael asks a number of questions. Martha is supportive and would welcome a resolution on Assisted Technology in order to continue to press Google on these issues. Regarding the Urban Planning departmental dissatisfaction issue, the students really do need to go through their dean to make changes. Recently a slew of projects went through and were approved for classroom renovation. Regarding Master’s student funding, the funding for Rackham comes out of Rackham and the Provost does not allocate money in this way as far as need-based goes. All of the other funding (merit-based) are handled by the schools and colleges. The main challenge is that budgets are tight. Regarding the non-Rackham Master’s program issue, sometimes these changes are made to change academic degrees to professional degrees (as in the School of Information, for instance). It is somewhat expensive to be a part of Rackham and sometimes it does not make sense for certain degrees. It is very important that students who are feeling disadvantaged

c. Vanessa asks regarding strategic steps to address the retention rates of undergraduate and graduate students of color. She wants to know structurally what the University is doing to diversify the applicant pool. Martha says that with undergraduate recruitment they are very concerned with the lack of socioeconomic diversity. Some of these issues are financial aid related. So those are problems getting students in. Now about retention rates. There are efforts at the undergraduate level but at the graduate level it’s harder. Vanessa also asks re: undocumented students that are here as undergraduates. Martha says it is a very tangled issue as the U must follow legal guidelines and there is a working group. She stresses that this is a very serious issue. Eli asks if Martha knows what percentage of the UM budget comes from licenses from drugs and other inventions. Martha says it’s unfortunately a small portion of the budget.

VI. RSG Election- November 27, 28, 29
   a. Elections are coming up and word-of-mouth advertising is going to be crucial for the elections.

VII. Election Forum Recap

VIII. Town Halls/ Lunches with the Deans
   a. First LwtD event is next week on North campus.

IX. Committee Updates
   a. Academic Affairs: met last week. Motion by Kaitlin and seconded by Eli. Approved unanimously.
b. **Budgetary**: minutes show groups and budget requests as well as allocations. Alex makes a motion to accept and approve all of the minutes. Seconded by Evan.

c. **Community Outreach and Social Action**:

d. **Elections**:

e. **Legislative Affairs**: Motion to allocate up to $30 for a gift certificate. It’s approved. Motion by Michael to approve the minutes and seconded by Alex T. Approved with two abstentions.

f. **Student Life Committee**:

X. **Individual Projects—Update**:

XI. **Open Discussion**— Dan asks regarding an update on the SAGE committee after the call this week.

XII. **Adjournment**— 7:47pm motion by Alex T and seconded by Brandon.
RACKHAM STUDENT GOVERNMENT
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Tuesday, November 13th 2012
8:00 pm, Espresso Royale Cafe, 324 State St.

I. CALL TO ORDER: 8:15pm

II. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS

Present:
Chair Chris Tom, Co-chair Anna Belak, Unofficial Vice-Chair Kaitlin Flynn, President Michael Benson, Alex Gutierrez

III. CURRENT INITIATIVES & TASKS
a. Town Halls/Lunch with the Deans –
   i. Rooms: Have one in EECS but it might be too small so Michael is going to fix that tomorrow morning. Then he will move on to Central.
   ii. Food: Happy’s and Quizno’s both willing to take orders, having a mix of pizza and sandwiches to have variety and will stay under budget. Get drinks through either place. Will get sub trays, not lunch boxes. Both restaurants will deliver. $1200 in the budget, 140 people registered thus far. Chris is spearheading this.
   iii. Deans: Michael is going to email Janet an overview of the currently submitted questions after AAC tonight.
   iv. Board member email—Kaitlin will take care of this
   v. Logistics: Michael will give overview, Janet will speak, then Michael will moderate the Q&As.

IV. OPEN DISCUSSION: Execs and chairs meeting with Janet re: BOR in December.

V. ACTION ITEMS
a. Michael- email Janet question overview for LwtD.
   b. Kaitlin- Send reminder email, location email, and board member reminder email, facebook event, google doc with name program division unique name, email your platform with RSG elections. Also secession pamphlet.

VI. ADJOURNMENT: 8:31pm
RACKHAM STUDENT GOVERNMENT
GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL STUDENT ASSEMBLY STEERING COMMITTEE
NOVEMBER 11, 2012
ASHLEY’S
338 SOUTH STATE ST

Note: This meeting was originally scheduled to take place at Espresso Royale but due to a lack of space, was moved to an adjacent establishment.

I. CALL TO ORDER 4:10 pm

II. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS
   b. Absent: Alex Kim, Victor Andrews, Alex Emly

III. Committee overview

Chairman Benson provided an overview of the genesis of this committee as well as asked the members to introduce themselves. Graduate students from Rackham, Law, and Public health were in attendance. The committee discussed the current state of graduate academic and professional representation.

IV. Ballot Language
   a. The committee discussed proposed ballot language and approved an amended version unanimously. This ballot language will be submitted to each of the graduate academic and professional student governments for review and hopeful approval to place it on the ballot in the coming weeks and months.
   b. The language approved by the committee reads as follows: Shall the Graduate and Professional Student Body of the University of Michigan (including) formally take steps to separate from the Central Student Government and be recognized by the University as a distinct self-governing body in regards to financial and representative capacities for graduate and professional students?

V. Open Discussion
   a. Questions were raised about how we can educate our constituents about the issue presented in the ballot language. Kaitlin volunteered to construct a FAQ as well as a flyer. The committee will review these documents and then publish them to our constituent student governments for distribution to the student body at large.
   b. Questions were raised about next steps, after an election. The committee discussed options should the question be approved by the voters and if it is defeated.
   c. Future meetings were discussed. The next meeting of the committee will take place at the end of November.

VI. ADJOURNMENT: 5:05 pm
I. CALL TO ORDER 8:04 pm

II. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS
   a. Present: Representatives Lauren Knapp, Anna Belak, Vanessa Cruz, Brandon Erickson, Phillip Saccone, Brandon Erickson, Treasurer Alex Toulouse, Students at-large David Barton, and President & Chair Michael Benson
   b. Absent (excused):
   c. Absent (unexcused): Representatives Dan Trubman, Matthew Filter, Haven Allen, and Chris Tom

III. Appointment of Secretary for 11/14/12 Meeting
   a. Representative Erickson was appointed to serve as the committee’s secretary for the 11/14 meeting.

IV. Chair’s Report
   a. Michael: Thanks for hard work with forum, need better advertising. The U thought it was good, may be willing to co-sponsor in the future.

V. SAGE Fall Summit
   a. UM delegation is responsible for presentation of potential new advocacy issues with UCSD. Vanessa has suggested tuition equality for undocumented students. What other issues might we look for. A few years ago Berkeley wanted to include the DREAM Act in the SAGE Advocacy platform. Michigan and other members vetoed this move due to the scope of the Dream Act. Generally, this an undergraduate issue. Additionally, we wanted to focus on other issues more relevant to graduate students, since there were already a significant number of DREAM advocates. Are we interested in other immigration issues?
   b. Everyone on the committee (excluding Alex T as he is running other aspects of the summit) should come up with a potential issue. Email to the committee (rsg-sage@umich.edu), by the Tuesday (Nov. 27th @ 5pm).
   c. SAGE sessions: SAGE case studies, best practices, new potential issues, review of current advocacy issues, decide advocacy issues, history of sage, planning for days on hill conference, sequestration, NAGPS, forum on Friday
   d. We are collecting flight times from people to prepare for transportation. At Berkeley last year it was a huge problem. We have volunteered, where possible, to provide rides. Mileage reimbursement will be provided. People we can't give rides we will suggest AirRide. Can we rent University Vans? Yes.
   e. Lodging: Everybody at Bell Tower, Campus Inn or the League.
f. Finances: SAGE Fall Summit will be cheaper than in some years past, good. We are paying for breakfast every day, lunch Friday and Saturday. Dinner is out of pocket. Where will we have dinner? Sava's. A pub? Pub discussion. Jolly Pumpkins leads after discussion.
g. Schedule for Fri Sat. Sun.: Waiting to set Senator Richardville and Duderstadt time, will build some of the schedule around them.
h. Starting at 9:30am on Friday and Saturday. Meetings will be held around campus including in Rackham and the Law School. Saturday will also include a campus tour including the Big House.
i. COSAC wants to do a community fundraiser.

VI. State level advocacy with MSU
a. We will probably go three times during the winter term, open to the student body. Testify before Education Committee, Budget Committee, another one.
b. We need to coordinate with MSU to determine which issues we will advocate jointly, vs advocate as just UM. Most of this will be in February/March.
c. We will send email soliciting the student body for ideas.
d. This committee will make a budget request next term for buses.
e. We will also visit the capitol for a combined public university graduate education day (with the Graduate School) which will include a poster session and advocacy.
f. We need to come up with ideas to advocate at the state level. Cynthia Wilbanks has suggested we advocate for funding the U, especially specific types of funding (e.g. capital expenditures). Talk to your peers and constituents, see what they think.
g. We are hopefully going to have a joint meeting with MSU folks in December or January.
h. Vanessa: Can any other institutions be involved? Michael: We have tried to form a statewide group in past years, didn't pan out. This is why we collaborate closely with MSU. We will be inviting Eastern. Wayne State has no graduate student government.

VII. Open discussion
a. Michael provided an update on the Graduate and Professional Student Assembly Steering Committee and noted that the Board would be voting to place a ballot question on the November student government ballot at Thursday’s Board meeting. The other graduate student bodies will also talk about this. FAQ on pros and cons is being developed. If yes, we will form a multi-school committee to write a constitution and a plan for what we will do.
b. Lunch with the deans tomorrow at noon sharp. 1200 EECS. We have 160 people registered for the two events. (Tomorrow and Monday next week).
c. RSG elections are coming, you are all encouraged to run.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT: 8:43 pm
I. Call to order 7:17PM
II. Roll call of members
   a. Present: Alex Toulouse, Michael Benson, Eli Benchell Eisman, Alex Emly
   b. Absent (excused): Matt Waugh
   c. Absent unexcused: Evan Arthur, Kaitlin Flynn
III. Events
   a. ABC Event early January to fundraise for H4H
   b. South U is meh
   c. Ann Arbor Biergarten – early spring
   d. Circus has lots of space which is nice
   e. Conor’s is also lovely.
   f. Both Alexs dislike Bar Louie.
IV. More Events
   a. Pistons game 12/7, advertising going out next week
   b. Pinball Pete’s event in January – donate mittens or something to make it a fundraiser
V. Adjourn 7:52 PM
Motion Recommendation:

I move that the Rackham Student Government place the following question on the November 2012 student government ballot.

_Shall the Graduate and Professional Student Body of the University of Michigan (including) formally take steps to separate from the Central Student Government and be recognized by the University as a distinct self-governing body in regards to financial and representative capacities for graduate and professional students?_
THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN POLICY ON STUDENT SEXUAL MISCONDUCT

I. Introduction

The University of Michigan (University or U-M) values civility, dignity, diversity, education, equality, freedom, honesty, and safety, as described in the Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities, and is firmly committed to maintaining a campus environment free from sexual harassment, sexual assault, and other forms of sex-based discrimination (collectively referred to in this policy as sexual misconduct).

Sexual misconduct jeopardizes the mental, physical, and emotional welfare of our students, as well as the safety of our community. Sexual misconduct diminishes students’ individual dignity and impedes their access to educational, social, and employment opportunities. It can permanently impact students’ lives and may cause lasting physical and psychological harm. Sexual misconduct violates our institutional values and its presence in the community presents a barrier to fulfilling the University’s scholarly, research, educational, patient care, and service missions. Sexual misconduct, therefore, will not be tolerated at the University of Michigan and is expressly prohibited.

This policy provides information regarding the University’s prevention and education efforts related to student sexual misconduct, as well as how the University will proceed once it is made aware of student sexual misconduct in keeping with our institutional values and to meet our legal obligations under Title IX and other relevant law.

II. Building a Safe and Just Educational Environment Free from Sexual Misconduct

Members of the University community are encouraged to contribute to the prevention, intervention, and effective response to student sexual misconduct. All members of the community may play a role in building a safe and just educational environment by:

- Modeling healthy and respectful behavior in personal and professional relationships;
- Increasing personal awareness of what constitutes sexual misconduct;
- Speaking out against anti-social behavior that serves to encourage sexual misconduct or to discourage reporting;
- Developing the necessary skills to be an effective and supportive ally to survivors of sexual misconduct;
- Intervening in situations that can lead to sexual misconduct and related misbehavior; and
- Interrupting an incident of sexual misconduct when it is safe to do so.

The University has created or identified resources both across campus and in the larger community to reduce, eliminate, and address the effects of student sexual misconduct. Many programs or units serve to ensure a safe campus, educate and prevent sexual misconduct, assist and advocate for survivors of sexual assault, and ensure a fair process when misconduct occurs. To learn more about how to prevent sexual misconduct on campus and support education efforts, contact the Sexual Assault Prevention and
Awareness Center (SAPAC) and see the University’s Annual Security Report available online at the Department of Public Safety web site.

III. Policy Coverage

For purposes of this policy, sexual misconduct encompasses a range of behaviors that create a hostile educational environment including sexual assault and sexual harassment (including stalking).

This policy applies to sexual misconduct that is committed by a University student or by a participant in a University program whenever that sexual misconduct occurs:

(a) On campus; or

(b) In connection with a University or University-recognized program or activity; or

(c) In a manner that may pose an obvious and serious threat of harm to, or that may have the effect of creating a hostile educational or social environment for, any member(s) of the University community.

This policy and related processes may also, at the University’s discretion, apply to reported violations of other University policies if, in the University’s judgment, those other allegations are directly related to the reported sexual misconduct.

IV. Reporting Sexual Misconduct

The University encourages the reporting of sexual misconduct. The report may be made by:

(a) A person who believes they experienced sexual misconduct; or

(b) A person who has information that sexual misconduct may have been committed by a University student or a participant in a University program.

The report must be made within 180 calendar days following the last occurrence of the behavior giving rise to the concern. The Title IX Coordinator may pursue a complaint filed after the 180-day time limit for good cause shown.

The report should be made to the U-M Title IX Coordinator’s office. Reports may be made to other non-confidential locations and those reports will be directed to the Title IX Coordinator for further review. To access confidential assistance or resources or to explore reporting options without initiating further action from the Title IX Coordinator, contact any of the confidential reporting locations identified in this policy.

---

1 Sexual misconduct reportedly committed by faculty or staff, or otherwise not covered by this policy, will continue to be addressed in accordance with SPG 201.89-0.
Upon receiving a report of sexual misconduct, the Title IX Coordinator will notify the Department of Public Safety to ensure appropriate distribution of university-wide warnings and maintenance of accurate statistics. In addition, the University encourages anyone who believes they experienced a sexual assault to make a report to local law enforcement. University staff will, upon request, assist the individual in making the report. The Department of Public Safety, Housing Security, and Hospital Security can assist in identifying the appropriate law enforcement agency. Collection and preservation of evidence relating to the reported sexual assault is essential for law enforcement investigations in particular, so timing of the report to law enforcement is especially critical.

If the person who reports (the “Reporter”) or experiences (the “Complainant”) the sexual misconduct chooses not to participate in the University review of the report, the University may, as described below, pursue the report without that person’s participation.

V. The University’s Response Procedure

Upon receipt of a report, the University will proceed as follows.

A. Services

Once the University is put on notice that a U-M student or a participant in a University program may have committed sexual misconduct against another person, the Complainant will be offered appropriate support services and notified of applicable institutional policies. The University will take appropriate steps to prevent and/or address retaliatory conduct following a report. The Respondent will also be offered support services and appropriate information. The Dean of Students Office may coordinate services for students upon request.

B. Interim Interventions

The University may also implement interim interventions, as needed to protect the students involved and the larger University community. These may be kept in place until the end of any review or appeal process. Interim interventions may include separation of the parties’ academic and living situations or other interventions outlined in Section VI. below.

C. Decision to Proceed with Investigation

If the Complainant is willing to participate in the review and investigation process, the University will proceed as described in the Investigation section below.

If the Complainant requests confidentiality, asks that the complaint not be pursued, and/or the offender is unknown, the University will, before taking any further investigative steps, forward that information, along with all available information about the incident or allegation, to a review panel. The review panel will consist of the University’s Title IX Coordinator, the Office of Student Conflict Resolution (OSCR) and UM staff members who represent the interests of the University, law enforcement, survivors of sexual misconduct, persons accused of sexual misconduct and/or other offices as deemed necessary and appropriate under the circumstances.
This panel is charged with balancing U-M’s tradition of supporting survivor-centered practices with U-M’s equally strong commitment to providing due process to the Respondent and promoting a safe community.

Specifically, the panel members will provide information and advice to the Title IX Coordinator regarding:

1) Their perspectives on whether, and to what extent, U-M should further investigate the report of sexual misconduct;

2) What steps may be taken when a Respondent is unknown; and

3) What other measures or remedies might be considered to address any effects of the reported sexual misconduct on the campus community.

In all cases, the final decision on whether and to what extent the University will conduct an investigation and whether other measures will be taken in connection with any allegation of sexual misconduct rests solely with the Title IX Coordinator.

D. Investigation

The Title IX Coordinator will determine the most effective method of reviewing the concerns raised by the reported sexual misconduct. In all cases, the University will respond to the report in a prompt, thorough, procedurally fair, and effective manner. Upon receipt of a report, the University will strive to complete its investigation within sixty (60) calendar days.

In most cases, this will involve conducting a thorough fact-finding investigation, which includes meeting separately with the Complainant, Respondent, and pertinent witnesses, and reviewing and analyzing other relevant information. Occasionally, a different or less formal response to the report may be warranted (see, for example, Section VII. Adaptable Conflict Resolution).

At any time during the course of an investigation, the Complainant and Respondent may provide a written statement, and any other supporting material, regarding the matter under review.

During the investigative process, a Complainant or Respondent may have a support person(s) present at any meeting with the Investigator. The support person(s) may not participate directly in the investigative process, but may be present to provide support to the Complainant or Respondent.

E. Standard of Proof

The Investigator’s findings will be made using the preponderance of the evidence standard. This standard requires that the information supporting each finding be more convincing than the information offered in opposition to it. Under this standard, individuals are presumed not to have engaged in the conduct reported unless a preponderance of the evidence supports a finding that sexual misconduct occurred.
F. Investigation Findings and Outcome Notification

In most cases, when an investigation is conducted, the Investigator will prepare a written report at the conclusion of the investigation. Before the report is finalized, the participating Complainant and Respondent will be given the opportunity to review their own statement and, to the extent appropriate to honor due process and privacy considerations, will also be provided with a summary of the information collected during the investigation. Comments on the investigation summary and any related or additional information must be submitted to the Investigator within five (5) calendar days after receipt.

Following the receipt of any comments submitted, or after the five (5)-day comment period has lapsed without comment, the Investigator will address any identified factual inaccuracies or misunderstandings, as appropriate, and then make a determination. The Investigator’s written report will contain, at a minimum:

1) A summary of the complaint;

2) The Investigator’s finding(s): and

3) A summary of the Investigator’s rationale in support of the finding(s).

The Investigator’s report and findings must be reviewed and approved by the Title IX Coordinator. The University’s written findings will then be made concurrently available to the participating Complainant and Respondent, in the manner and to the extent appropriate to honor due process and privacy considerations. The University neither encourages nor discourages the subsequent disclosure or sharing of the written notification by either student.

In cases where a Complainant has chosen not to participate in the University’s review of the sexual misconduct allegation but desires to be notified of the outcome, the University may notify the Complainant. If a Complainant has expressed a desire, in writing, not to be notified of the outcome, the University will honor that decision and will not send the notification.

G. Resolution Options

If the Respondent is found responsible for sexual misconduct, the University will take further action to prevent the recurrence of that misconduct and remedy its effects. Any of the following three resolution options may be used to resolve the matter and determine the proper sanctions/interventions.

Regardless of the resolution option selected, the University will strive to complete the sanction/intervention process within fifteen (15) calendar days after the parties are provided notification of the University’s determination.
Option 1: Enter into an Agreement with the Resolution Coordinator

After being notified of the outcome, the Resolution Coordinator will consult with the participating Complainant, Respondent, Title IX Coordinator, the Dean of Students and other affected parties, as appropriate, and prepare a proposed resolution agreement. The agreement should address the behavior, prevent its recurrence, and remedy its effects. By accepting the proposed resolution agreement, the Respondent agrees to fulfill the sanctions included therein. The Respondent has the right to discuss the proposed agreement with others before deciding whether to accept it. Once an agreement has been reached, it may not be appealed by either party.

Option 2: Request a Decision from a Resolution Officer

If the Respondent is unable or unwilling to enter into an agreement as outlined above, the Respondent may request that a Resolution Officer (RO) be appointed to determine appropriate sanctions/interventions. The RO will not modify the findings of the investigative report and will address only what sanctions/interventions are appropriate. The RO will inform the decision by soliciting input from the participating Complainant, Respondent, and others. Depending on the circumstances, the RO may ask to meet privately with the participating Complainant and Respondent, or invite them to submit a statement to the RO for consideration. Either party may be accompanied by a support person(s) if they meet with the RO. The support person(s), however, may not participate directly in the meeting, but may only be present to provide support to the party.

To ensure fairness and consistency, as well as compliance with the University’s Title IX obligations, the RO must consult the Resolution Coordinator, the Dean of Students, and the Title IX Coordinator before making a final determination regarding appropriate sanctions/interventions. Once a decision has been reached and approved by the Dean of Students, the RO will issue a written statement containing the sanctions/interventions and the rationale for the sanctions/interventions imposed.

This statement will subsequently be made available to the participating parties, to the extent appropriate to honor due process and privacy considerations.

Option 3: Structured Restorative Dialogue

In some limited circumstances involving a finding of sexual harassment (but not sexual assault), it may be useful for the parties to engage in structured restorative dialogue regarding the harm created as a result of the misconduct and possible reparations for that harm. If the Resolution Coordinator, in consultation with the Title IX Coordinator, deems it appropriate under the circumstances, the Complainant may be given the option to engage in a structured restorative dialogue with the Respondent. If the Complainant elects this option, the option may then be
offered to the Respondent. If the Respondent agrees to accept responsibility for the behavior and violations articulated in the investigative report, a structured restorative dialogue may then be used to discuss the impact the behavior had on the community and to develop a sanction that meets the collective needs and interests of participating parties.

Individuals invited to the dialogue will typically include the Complainant, Respondent, Resolution Coordinator, other affected parties, and any parents, friends, or support persons whom the Complainant and Respondent would like to participate. All parties who intend to participate in the dialogue must successfully complete preparatory meetings with appropriate University staff.

Agreements reached in the dialogue must be made by consensus and approved by the Dean of Students, who will consult with the Title IX Coordinator to ensure consistency with institutional obligations, before becoming binding on the Respondent. If consensus is reached on the final sanction, and the Dean of Students approves the sanction, the Respondent will be required to comply with the agreement. Once an agreement has been reached, it may not be appealed. If an agreement cannot be reached, or if the Respondent declines to participate in a structured restorative dialogue, the Respondent may select one of the other two sanctioning options described above.

H. Review of the Decision

In the interest of fairness, either party may appeal the outcome of the matter except where a Respondent has accepted an agreement under sanctioning options 1 (Agreement) or 3 (Structured Restorative Dialogue) above. Given the personal and sensitive nature of these circumstances and out of respect for the rights of all participants, a review of the matter will be efficient and narrowly tailored. A party may seek review only on the following grounds:

1. A material deviation from the procedures affected the outcome of the case;
2. There is new and relevant information that was unavailable at the time of the investigation that could reasonably affect the investigation findings;
3. The sanctions/interventions are not appropriate and proportionate to the determined violation(s); or
4. The findings are clearly erroneous, indicating abuse of discretion by the investigator.

To request a review, the party must submit a written appeal to the Resolution Coordinator within ten (10) calendar days of receiving the notification of decision regarding any sanctions/interventions. If the investigation concluded that no violation occurred, a party may seek review of that decision based on the above grounds for review within ten (10) calendar days of receiving the findings. The Vice President of Student Affairs (VPSA) may deem a late submission reasonable under certain circumstances and therefore waive the ten-(10) day limitation.
The matter will be reviewed by the Appeals Board described in the Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities. In a closed session, the Appeals Board will review the matter based on the relevant considerations identified in the request for appeal. The Appeals Board may conclude that there are no relevant issues of concern and therefore recommend that the VPSA affirm the final decision and any sanctions/interventions. If the Appeals Board identifies issues of concern, the Board will provide the VPSA with one of the following recommended actions and any additional instructions or recommendations it deems appropriate under the circumstances:

1. If there was a material deviation from procedure, remand the matter to the Title IX Coordinator and/or a new investigator with corrective instructions from the Appeals Board.

2. If new information appears relevant, refer the matter to the Title IX Coordinator and the original investigator to determine whether any modifications may need to be made to the original investigative report.

3. If the sanctions appear inappropriate or disproportionate, alter the sanctions or interventions accordingly.

4. If the investigation findings are clearly erroneous, indicating abuses of discretion by the investigator, refer the matter to the Title IX Coordinator to review the case and make any necessary modifications to the report.

After necessary consideration and consultation with others, including the Title IX Coordinator, the VPSA may accept or modify the recommendations made by the Appeals Board. The VPSA’s final decision will subsequently be made available to the participating parties, to the extent appropriate to honor due process and privacy considerations.

VI. Potential Sanctions or Interventions

The sanctions or interventions applied to students found responsible for sexual misconduct are designed to eliminate the misconduct, prevent its recurrence, and remedy its effects, while honoring the University’s educational mission. Sanctions or interventions may also serve to promote safety or to deter students from future threatening or harmful behavior. Some behavior is so harmful to the University community or so deleterious to the educational process that it may require more serious sanctions or interventions, such as removal from University housing, removal from specific courses or activities, suspension from the University, or expulsion.

Sanctions or interventions may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- **Formal Reprimand:** A formal notice that the student has violated University policy and that future violations may be dealt with more severely.

- **Disciplinary Probation:** A designated period of time during which the student is not in good standing with the University. The terms of probation may involve restrictions of student privileges and/or set specific behavioral expectations.
● **Restitution**: Reasonable compensation for loss, damage, or injury to the appropriate party in the form of community service or service learning, money, or material replacement.

● **Restriction from Employment at the University**: Prohibition of or limitation on University employment.

● **Structure Restorative Dialogue**: A facilitated conversation among affected parties regarding the harm created as a result of the misconduct and possible additional reparations for that harm. In cases of sexual assault, this process may be implemented only after the close of the sanctions process and only at the request of the Complainant and with the consent of the Respondent.

● **Class/Workshop/Training/Program Attendance**: Enrollment in and completion of a class, workshop, training, or program that could help the student or the University community.

● **Educational Project**: Completion of a project specifically designed to help the student understand why certain behavior was inappropriate and to prevent its recurrence.

● **Service**: Performance of one or more tasks designed to benefit the University community and help the student understand why certain behavior was inappropriate.

● **University Housing Transfer or Removal**: Placement in another room or housing unit or removal from University housing. Housing transfers or removals may be temporary or permanent depending on the circumstances.

● **Professional Assessment**: Enrollment in and completion of a professional assessment that could help the student or the University community.

● **Removal from Specific Courses or Activities**: Suspension or transfer from courses or activities at the University for a specified period of time.

● **No Contact**: Restriction from entering specific University areas and/or from all forms of contact with certain person(s).

● **Suspension**: Separation from the University for a specified period of time or until certain conditions are met.

● **Expulsion**: Permanent separation from the University.

VII. **Adaptable Conflict Resolution**

The University recognizes that Adaptable Conflict Resolution (ACR) may, consistent with institutional values and legal obligations, be an appropriate means of addressing some behaviors reported under this policy. This option is not available for resolution of reports involving sexual assault. Rooted in the principles and practices of restorative justice, the ACR option available under this policy recognizes that:

- Sexual misconduct impacts Complainants, Respondents, community members, family members, and others;

- Affected parties often benefit when resolution and sanctioning methods meet their needs and interests;

- Complainants and other affected parties may find it useful to meet with a Respondent who acknowledges that the underlying events happened and who acknowledges that the Complainant or others experienced harm as a result;

- Structured interaction between involved parties can facilitate long-term healing and reduce recidivism; and
Participants in ACR processes must be protected from secondary victimization and other potential harms.

To the extent deemed consistent with the University’s legal obligations under Title IX or otherwise, ACR may be appropriate and may be offered to the Complainant as an option to consider in lieu of the formal investigation described in Section IV.A. If the Complainant would like to pursue an ACR process, it may then be offered to the Respondent. The following conditions, however, must be present in order for the parties to engage in any ACR process:

- The Title IX Coordinator has reviewed the allegations to the extent necessary to confirm that they are of the kind that would be appropriate for ACR and that use of an ACR process would be consistent with the University’s legal obligations under Title IX or otherwise;
- The Title IX Coordinator has concluded, based on the information available at the time, that the allegations at issue relate to sexual harassment and not sexual assault (as matters involving sexual assault are not eligible to be resolved through ACR);
- Both Complainant and Respondent voluntarily elect to pursue ACR;
- Respondent acknowledges that the underlying events happened and acknowledges that the Complainant or others experienced harm as a result; and
- Parties who intend to participate in the ACR process have successfully completed preparatory meetings with appropriate staff.

ACR pathways include circle, conference, and mediation formats that permit participation from support persons, parents, friends, and/or other affected parties. All ACR processes are voluntary. A party may terminate his/her participation in the ACR process at any time to pursue other available resolution mechanisms.

Any agreements reached in the ACR process must be made by consensus and approved by the Dean of Students, who will consult with the Title IX Coordinator to ensure consistency with the University’s Title IX obligations. If an agreement is created, and the Dean of Students approves the agreement, the Respondent will be required to comply with the agreement. If an agreement is not reached, the matter should be referred to the Title IX Coordinator for a decision regarding further action.

Information shared or obtained during an ACR process will be treated as confidential, to the extent permitted by law, and will not result in subsequent action by the University, unless such action is deemed necessary to fulfill the institution’s obligations under Title IX. In any instance in which the Title IX Coordinator believes the University may need to take subsequent action as a result of information disclosed during an otherwise confidential session, the Title IX Coordinator will generally first solicit input from the University’s review panel before taking any further action.
For further information regarding ACR, including whether a specific matter may be eligible, please consult with the Resolution Coordinator.

VIII. Student Expectations and Rights

All students are afforded the rights outlined in Section II Student Rights, in the Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities. Certain additional student protections and expectations pertain to the process for resolving student sexual misconduct allegations. Respondents and Complainants participating in this process may also expect the following:

- Assurance of Privacy
- Information and Choice on Participation
- Access to Confidential Assistance and Resources
- Protection from Retaliation
- Timeliness of Process
- Coordination with Concurrent Legal Proceedings
- Respect for Medical Amnesty Provisions

Assurance of Privacy
Information regarding sexual misconduct reports will be shared among University employees or external parties with a legitimate educational interest and only on a need-to-know basis and only as permitted under University policy and applicable federal and state law.

Information and Choice on Participation
Student parties may choose to participate or decline to participate in the process. However, if parties decline to participate, as described in this policy, the University may nonetheless continue to investigate the matter and issue findings based on whatever information is available.

Access to Confidential Assistance and Resources
Before, during, or after any review or investigation process, students may find it helpful to consult with a counselor or seek other forms of assistance. Students who wish to seek information or support in a confidential manner may contact the following campus and community resources. All information shared with these offices will remain confidential to the extent permitted by law and University policy. Discussions with representatives of these offices will not be considered a report to the University regarding the problematic behavior and therefore will not, without additional action by the Complainant or a Reporter, result in further action by the University.

Sexual Assault Prevention and Awareness Center (SAPAC)
http://www.sapac.umich.edu
sapac@umich.edu
(734) 936-3333 (24 hr. Crisis Line)
(734) 764-7771
509 Michigan Union
530 State St. Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1308

SAPAC promotes healthy relationships, teaches non-violence and equality, supports survivor healing, and fosters a respectful and safe environment for all members of the University of Michigan community. SAPAC provides educational and supportive services for the University of Michigan community related
to sexual assault, intimate partner violence, sexual harassment, and stalking. SAPAC’s 24 hr. Crisis Line is staffed by professional staff advocates who can provide crisis intervention and support, as well as information and referrals.

Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS)
http://www.caps.umich.edu
(734) 764-8312
3100 Michigan Union
530 S. State Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1308

CAPS offers a variety of services aimed at helping students resolve personal difficulties and acquire the skills, attitudes, and knowledge that will enable them to take full advantage of their experiences at the University of Michigan.

SafeHouse Center
http://www.safehousecenter.org/
info@safehousecenter.org
(734) 995-5444 (24 hr. HelpLine)
4100 Clark Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48105

The SafeHouse Center HelpLine is staffed 24 hours a day to answer calls from survivors of domestic violence and sexual assault. Advocates and volunteer counselors are available to answer questions and provide support for survivors and their family members and friends. Advocates provide information and referrals, and will help answer any questions the caller may have about accessing SafeHouse services. The HelpLine also provides a service called the Language Line, which allows a survivor that speaks a language other than English to have a conversation with SafeHouse staff through a confidential interpreter.

Office of the Ombuds
http://www.umich.edu/~ombuds/
ombuds-DSA@umich.edu
(734) 763-3545
6015 Fleming Administration Building
503 Thompson Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48109–1340

The Ombuds Office is a place where student questions, complaints and concerns about the functioning of the University can be discussed confidentially in a safe environment. The Office offers informal dispute resolution services, provides resources and referrals, and helps students consider options available to them.

Rackham Graduate Student Ombuds
(734) 936-1647
1530 Rackham Graduate Bldg.
915 E. Washington St. Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1070

The Graduate Student Ombuds helps graduate students and postdocs resolve concerns, problems, or conflicts with regards to University policies, procedures, and decisions. The services of the Graduate
Student Ombuds are available to all Rackham graduate students and postdocs. The Ombuds provides a confidential and neutral place to express concerns. Individuals work with the Graduate Student Ombuds to identify steps to achieve a timely and fair resolution to a problem.

Students who are also employees of the University may also contact the following office:

Faculty and Staff Assistance Program (FASAP)
http://www.umich.edu/~fasap/
fasap@umich.edu
(734) 936-8660
2076 Administrative Services Building
1009 Greene St., Ann Arbor MI 48109-1432

The Faculty and Staff Assistance Program (FASAP) provides support and assistance to University staff and faculty in resolving personal or work-related concerns. Through a range of sensitive and innovative services, FASAP seeks to enhance the emotional health, well-being and job-performance of members of the University community.

Protection from Retaliation
The University will take appropriate steps to ensure that a person who in good faith reports, complains about, or participates in a sexual misconduct investigation will not be subjected to retaliation by the Respondent or by others with knowledge of the underlying report. The University also will take appropriate steps to ensure that a person against whom a report of possible sexual misconduct, or of retaliation in connection with a report of possible sexual misconduct, is made is treated fairly. Anyone who believes he or she is experiencing retaliation is strongly encouraged to report that concern using the same procedure for reporting possible sexual misconduct under this policy.

Timeliness of Process
Upon receipt of a report, the University strives to complete its investigation within sixty (60) calendar days and its sanction or intervention process within fifteen (15) calendar days after the University’s findings are shared with the participating Complainant and Respondent. There are, however, several factors that may affect the length of time needed to conduct a fair, equitable and timely investigation and other factors that may affect the length of time needed to determine the appropriate sanctions/interventions. As such, some matters will be resolved before the designated time frames, and some may be resolved afterward.

Coordination with Concurrent Legal Processes
Students may engage criminal prosecution procedures and/or civil litigation in connection with the same behavior that forms the basis of a sexual misconduct report under this policy. The University has a legal and ethical obligation to take immediate and appropriate action to investigate possible sexual misconduct, even if there are other external processes or procedures pending in connection with the same sexual misconduct reported to the University.

Similarly, if the University finds sexual misconduct has occurred, the University must take effective steps to end it, prevent its recurrence, and address its effects, regardless of what external measures may also be in play. Accordingly, the University will not wait for the conclusion of a criminal investigation or other proceedings to fulfill the University’s own legal and ethical obligations under this policy.
Standards for criminal investigations are different than the standards for a violation of this policy, and therefore the University is not required to rely on law enforcement reports and/or actions to make decisions under this policy. The University is, however, committed to appropriate coordination with its Department of Public Safety and with local law enforcement. This policy and related practices will therefore seek to respect appropriate boundaries as a means of supporting effective law enforcement action and police procedures.

**Respect for Medical Amnesty Provisions**
To better ensure that minors at medical risk as a result of alcohol intoxication will receive prompt and appropriate medical attention, the State of Michigan has adopted a medical amnesty law to remove perceived barriers to calling for or seeking help.

Michigan law continues to prohibit a minor from purchasing, consuming, or possessing, or attempting to purchase, consume, or possess, alcoholic liquor and from having any bodily alcohol content. Michigan law, however, includes an exemption from prosecution for the following:

- A minor who voluntarily accesses a health facility or agency for treatment or observation after consuming alcohol;
- Any minor who accompanied a minor who voluntarily accesses a health facility or agency for treatment or observation after consuming alcohol; and
- Any minor who initiated contact with law enforcement or emergency medical services personnel for the purpose of obtaining medical assistance in connection with their own personal consumption of alcohol or consumption by others.

**IX. Definitions**

**Complainant**
An individual who reportedly experienced sexual misconduct, regardless of whether that individual participates in the disclosure or review of that report by the University at any point. The University may assume the role of a Complainant.

**Consent**
Clear, freely given, and unambiguous agreement to engage in a particular activity. Consent can be withdrawn by either party at any point. Moreover, consent to engage in one sexual activity, or past agreement to engage in a particular sexual activity, cannot be presumed to constitute consent to engage in a different sexual activity or to engage again in a sexual activity. Consent cannot be validly given by a person who is incapacitated. For purposes of this policy, the issue is whether the accused student knew, or should have known, that the activity in question was not consensual.

**Incapacitated**
Lacking the physical and/or mental ability to make informed, rational judgments. This lack of ability can have a variety of causes, including, but not limited to, sleep, alcohol, drugs, blackouts, or flashbacks.

**Investigator**
A University employee who reviews and investigates reports of sexual misconduct under this policy.
**Reporter**
An individual who reports to the University a concern regarding possible sexual misconduct. A Reporter need not be a Complainant.

**Resolution Coordinator**
A staff member in the Office of Student Conflict Resolution who is assigned to each case to support all participants and facilitate appropriate processes.

**Resolution Officer**
A University official, recommended by the Faculty Senate or Vice President for Student Affairs, who is trained to review reported violations of the *Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities*.

**Respondent**
A University student or participant in a University program who is reported to have engaged in sexual misconduct.

**Sexual misconduct**
Umbrella term used to encompass unwanted or unwelcome conduct of a sexual nature that is committed without valid consent, including sexual assault, sexual harassment (including stalking), and other forms of sex-based discrimination. Sexual misconduct may occur between people of the same sex or between people of different sexes. Sexual misconduct can include both intentional conduct and conduct that results in negative effects, even if those negative effects were unintended. Sexual misconduct can also include retaliation in connection with a Complainant’s allegations under this policy. Sexual misconduct may include the following:

**Sexual assault**
Unwanted or unwelcome touching of a sexual nature, including hugging, kissing, fondling, oral sex, anal or vaginal intercourse, or other physical sexual activity that occurs without valid consent.

**Sexual harassment**
Unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature if: (1) submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of an individual’s education, living environment, employment, or participation in a University-related activity; (2) submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as the basis for or a factor in decisions affecting that individual’s education, living environment, employment, or participation in a University-related activity; or (3) such conduct has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual’s educational performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, offensive, or abusive environment for that individual’s education, living environment, employment, or participation in a University-related activity.

Examples may include but are not limited to: Unwanted sexual statements; unwanted personal attention including stalking and cyber-stalking; unwanted physical or sexual advances that would constitute sexual assault, as defined in this policy; electronically recording, photographing, or transmitting intimate or sexual utterances, sounds, or images without the knowledge and consent of all parties involved; touching oneself sexually for others to view; and voyeurism (spying on others who are in intimate or sexual situations). It is not a defense to a
claim of sexual harassment that the Respondent used technology or social media as a means to harass others. To learn more about sexual harassment go to [link to web site to be developed]

Conduct reported as sexual harassment will be evaluated by considering the totality of the particular circumstances, including the nature, frequency, intensity, location, context, and duration of the questioned behavior. Although repeated incidents generally create a stronger claim of sexual harassment, a serious incident, even if isolated, can be sufficient.

**Stalking (a form of sexual harassment)**

Any unwanted contact between a stalker and their target which directly or indirectly communicates a threat or places the victim in fear. Some stalking behaviors include: following a person; repeated and unwanted phone calls; making repeated and unwanted contact by e-mail or on social media sites like Facebook; or leaving gifts for their target.

**Title IX**

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (Title IX) (20 U.S.C. § 1681 et seq.; 34 C.F.R. Part 106) is a federal law that prohibits sex-based discrimination in education programs that receive federal financial assistance.

**Title IX Coordinator**

A University official charged with ensuring the University’s overall compliance with Title IX and related University policy.

**University Program**

A University sponsored activity that is geared toward elementary, secondary or postsecondary students.

**X. Related Information**

**Advocacy**

Investigators do not function as advocates for Complainants or Respondents. Investigators can, however, identify advocacy and support resources for Complainants and Respondents (See Confidential Assistance). The Dean of Students Office may coordinate services for students upon request.

**Anonymous Complainants**

The University may not be able to fully address reports received from anonymous sources unless sufficient information is furnished to enable the University to conduct a meaningful and fair investigation. The University will, however, take whatever steps it deems appropriate in the best interests of the overall University community, consistent with the information at its disposal.

**Non-Confidential Reporting Locations**

Non-confidential reporting locations include, but are not limited to, any employees whose roles include responsibility for the safety and security of any part of the University community and those whose knowledge of a possible violation could be imputed to the University. This would include: Regents; executive officers; deans; associate deans; assistant deans; department chairs; supervisors and managers; academic advisors; directors and coordinators of any undergraduate studies, graduate studies, or departmental, collegiate, or University off-campus academic programs (including study-abroad programs); the Dean of Students; employees within the Office of Student Conflict Resolution; the
Director of Athletics; coaches; assistant coaches; sponsors of sponsored student organizations; employees of Housing Security, Hospital Security, and the Department of Public Safety; faculty and staff with supervisory responsibilities within their department, unit, school or college; and those whom a student would reasonably believe would have the authority or responsibility to redress this type of concern (including anyone designated as a Campus Security Authority under the Clery Act). For more information about non-confidential reporting locations go to [LINK to web site to be developed].

Reports made to non-confidential reporting locations will be shared with the Title IX Coordinator’s office for handling in accordance with this policy.

**Student Employees**

Student employees who are reported to have engaged in sexual misconduct in their employment capacity will be subject to review under University of Michigan Standard Practice Guide 201.890. If a student-employee is found to have engaged in sexual misconduct after that review, the student-employee may be subject to sanctions both in connection with their employment and in connection with their student status, as appropriate under applicable processes and in accordance with any procedures set forth in any applicable collective bargaining agreements.

**Survivor-Centered Practices**

The University is committed to supporting survivor-centered practices, balanced appropriately with due process rights of the Respondent. Survivor-centered practices strive to affirm the agency and strength of all people who experience sexual misconduct. The term “survivor” refers to individuals who allege being subjected to sexual misconduct and is intentionally used by University staff whose role it is to support and advocate for students who have reported experiencing sexual misconduct. Those in non-advocacy roles refer to this individual as Complainant.

**XI. Offices and Roles**

The Title IX Coordinator is responsible for ensuring Title IX compliance across the University. The Title IX Coordinator manages coordination between all relevant University offices to ensure a fair, thorough, timely and appropriate response to reported concerns of sexual misconduct.

The Office of Institutional Equity (OIE) serves as the entry point for those who report sexual misconduct involving students. OIE provides support information to students and works closely with OSCR, the Dean of Students, and other offices to ensure that interim steps, if appropriate, are taken to address reported concerns. OIE staff members, working closely with the Title IX Coordinator, provide the investigative function regarding reported concerns of sexual misconduct. Once an investigation of student sexual misconduct is completed, OIE provides its findings to OSCR for distribution of the reports and to determine appropriate next steps, if any.

The Office of Student Conflict Resolution (OSCR) helps coordinate, with the Dean of Students Office, any interim interventions to address reported concerns, such as housing and classroom issues. OSCR is also responsible for managing the Resolution Options outlined above, including sanctions and interventions.

The Dean of Students office coordinates and provides direct support to students as they navigate critical incidents covered under this policy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timestamp</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Uniqname</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Division of Rackham Graduate School</th>
<th>Which campus are you on?</th>
<th>Are there any questions that you have for the deans that you would like to have asked?</th>
<th>Are there any concerns with your program, department, Rackham, or the University of Michigan in general that you would like to have addressed?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 21:41:53</td>
<td>Zhengyu Jia</td>
<td>zhengjia</td>
<td>Master of Applied Economics</td>
<td>Division 3: Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td>Tricks for applying research funding</td>
<td>The logic of selecting interns before and after graduation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 21:43:50</td>
<td>Ping Guo</td>
<td>pingguo</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 21:44:24</td>
<td>Evan Arthur</td>
<td>evanarth</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td>Is it possible to arrange University discounts for students? I was thinking on the order of one discount ticket per student per semester. This would be much appreciated for those who live far from campus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 21:45:25</td>
<td>Kelly Houle</td>
<td>knhoule</td>
<td>Higher Ed., M.A.</td>
<td>Division 3: Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 21:46:19</td>
<td>Mengjie Zhou</td>
<td>zhoumj</td>
<td>MAE</td>
<td>Division 4: Humanities and the Arts</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 21:46:34</td>
<td>Di Gao</td>
<td>digao</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 21:47:04</td>
<td>Isha Patel</td>
<td><a href="mailto:isha@umich.edu">isha@umich.edu</a></td>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>Division 3: Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 21:48:36</td>
<td>Naveen</td>
<td>naveenmn</td>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 21:49:36</td>
<td>Nolan Sandberg</td>
<td>nsand</td>
<td>Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 21:52:23</td>
<td>Gaurav Paruthi</td>
<td>gparuthi</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 21:53:47</td>
<td>Mohammad</td>
<td>rasouli</td>
<td>EECS</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td>Yes, but I’d like to tell the deans in person and not in public.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 21:55:14</td>
<td>Xi Zhang</td>
<td>zhxi</td>
<td>MAE</td>
<td>Division 3: Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td>About MAE program, we are wondering about the future of us after graduation of this program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 21:56:07</td>
<td>Miles Spratto</td>
<td>milesspr</td>
<td>MSE in NAME School of Natural Resources and Environment</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 21:56:16</td>
<td>Ima Otudor</td>
<td>iotudor</td>
<td>School of Natural Resources and Environment</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td>will think of a few</td>
<td>none at the moment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 21:57:50</td>
<td>Lin Shi</td>
<td>shilin</td>
<td>MAE</td>
<td>Division 3: Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 21:59:03</td>
<td>Jasmine Jones</td>
<td>jazzij</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 22:00:03</td>
<td>Carrie Wenjing Xu</td>
<td>wjku</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Division 4: Humanities and the Arts</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 22:01:01</td>
<td>Xiaowei Zhan</td>
<td>zhanxw</td>
<td>Biostat</td>
<td>Division 1: Biological and Health Sciences</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 22:06:12</td>
<td>Hyunmin Han</td>
<td>coyojon</td>
<td>EEB</td>
<td>Division 1: Biological and Health Sciences</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timestamp</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Uniqname</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Division of Rackham Graduate School</td>
<td>Which campus are you on?</td>
<td>Are there any questions that you have for the deans that you would like to have asked?</td>
<td>Are there any concerns with your program, department, Rackham, or the University of Michigan in general that you would like to have addressed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 22:13:03</td>
<td>Deepthi Joshi</td>
<td>deejoshi</td>
<td>School of Education</td>
<td>Division 4: Humanities and the Arts</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td>How did you become involved in administration of higher education? What do you believe the graduate student role in recruitment is? What goals are the deans attempting to accomplish in the next ten years? What do you think that current graduate students should be aware of (advice?) in moving ahead in their careers?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 22:16:48</td>
<td>Yuchen Lu</td>
<td>yuchenlu</td>
<td>Master of Public Policy</td>
<td>Division 4: Humanities and the Arts</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 22:25:57</td>
<td>Anup Goutham</td>
<td>agoutham</td>
<td>eecs ms</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 22:26:58</td>
<td>Divya Brundavanam</td>
<td>bddivya</td>
<td>MEng</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 22:37:26</td>
<td>Mengshuang Li</td>
<td><a href="mailto:limengs@umich.edu">limengs@umich.edu</a></td>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>Division 3: Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 22:38:12</td>
<td>Ryan Cardinale</td>
<td>rcardina</td>
<td>Clinical Psychology</td>
<td>Division 3: Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 22:48:49</td>
<td>Dan Camacho</td>
<td>dcamacho</td>
<td>Biomedical Engineering</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td>More Job hunting/interview/career fair for graduate students and international students!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 22:51:13</td>
<td>Jianfan Chen</td>
<td>jianfan</td>
<td>Construction Engineering and Management</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 23:29:12</td>
<td>Sarah Suhadolnik</td>
<td>sarezesu</td>
<td>Humanities and the Arts</td>
<td>Division 4: Humanities and the Arts</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td>Too few research professors are good teachers. I strongly encourage exploring hiring &quot;teaching&quot; faculty, who have much less pressure to do research. Also getting an oversight person to talk to students and facilitate suggestions to make each program the top in the globe.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 23:32:01</td>
<td>Mengxing Ye</td>
<td>ymuriel</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td>what are your backgrounds? the mission of school. Role of research vs. <em>good</em> teaching. Theoretical learning vs. practical and applied learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/2012 0:03:08</td>
<td>Pawel Paczuski</td>
<td>pbpacz</td>
<td>Biostatistics - SPH</td>
<td>Division 1: Biological and Health Sciences</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td>Center for Chinese studies does not provide adequate career guidances.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/2012 0:19:43</td>
<td>Candi Esquina</td>
<td>cesquina</td>
<td>MCDB</td>
<td>Division 1: Biological and Health Sciences</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/2012 0:48:52</td>
<td>Gerul Wang</td>
<td>gerui</td>
<td>Chinese studies</td>
<td>Division 4: Humanities and the Arts</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td>In the past few years, there has been discriminatory defamation within Haven Hall, most often occurring in the wee hours of the night. I'm sure you can imagine the stress this may cause graduate students who often study late. What is on the horizon to make Haven Hall a more secure space for underrepresented groups? What is the timeline for putting these plans into fruition?</td>
<td>The Haven Hall incidents, and increased funding for social/behavioral science students. Thank you for all that you do, RSG!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/2012 1:45:36</td>
<td>Portia Hemphill</td>
<td>raportia</td>
<td>Political Science and Public Policy</td>
<td>Division 3: Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/2012 1:50:40</td>
<td>Colleen McIntee</td>
<td>cmcintee</td>
<td>SOE, Secondary MAC</td>
<td>Division 4: Humanities and the Arts</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/2012 7:29:13</td>
<td>Yvonne Small</td>
<td>yssmal</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Division 1: Biological and Health Sciences</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/2012 8:15:01</td>
<td>Sarah Graham</td>
<td>sarahgra</td>
<td>Biophysics</td>
<td>Division 1: Biological and Health Sciences</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/2012 8:17:28</td>
<td>Andrew Schaug</td>
<td>trygve</td>
<td>Mathematics PhD</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/2012 8:43:11</td>
<td>Jon McNaughtan</td>
<td>jonmcnau</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Division 3: Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td>Is there any chance of Rackham creating some interdisciplinary classes where Doc students from different disciplines could take on some issues, like healthcare costs, educational excellence, poverty, and the like?</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timestamp</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Uniqname</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Division of Rackham Graduate School</td>
<td>Which campus are you on?</td>
<td>Are there any questions that you would like to have asked?</td>
<td>Are there any concerns with your program, department, Rackham, or the University of Michigan in general that you would like to have addressed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/2012 8:44:36</td>
<td>Matthew Sullivan</td>
<td><a href="mailto:msulli@umich.edu">msulli@umich.edu</a></td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>Division 3: Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td>I'm curious to know if there are any efforts to control grade inflation among undergrads at least in social sciences and humanities. The B is the new C which makes it hard to acknowledge extraordinary achievement as well as fail those deserving of failing.</td>
<td>The four-month summers are hard to find funding for. I end up teaching every summer which is great but which also hinders my progress with respect to those people who seem to get funding each summer (where the difference largely comes down to doing quantitative vs qualitative work).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/2012 8:54:30</td>
<td>Yioros Nardis</td>
<td>yioros</td>
<td>Communication Studies</td>
<td>Division 3: Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/2012 9:38:13</td>
<td>Lily Mancour</td>
<td>liliv</td>
<td>Biological Chemistry</td>
<td>Division 1: Biological and Health Sciences</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/2012 9:40:37</td>
<td>Robin Zheng</td>
<td>zhengr</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Division 4: Humanities and the Arts</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/2012 9:43:57</td>
<td>You Wu</td>
<td>wwuoy</td>
<td>Master of Applied Economics</td>
<td>Division 3: Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/2012 9:49:28</td>
<td>Tamarie Macon</td>
<td>tamacon</td>
<td>CPEP</td>
<td>Division 3: Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/2012 10:29:23</td>
<td>Alexandra Charbi</td>
<td>alcharbi</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Division 3: Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/2012 11:21:08</td>
<td>Christy Iloca</td>
<td>itogac</td>
<td>Neuroscience</td>
<td>Division 1: Biological and Health Sciences</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/2012 11:27:32</td>
<td>Tingting Zhou</td>
<td>tkzhou</td>
<td>Biostatistics</td>
<td>Division 1: Biological and Health Sciences</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/2012 11:31:32</td>
<td>Brandon J. Davis</td>
<td>brandjov</td>
<td>Applied Physics</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/2012 11:50:44</td>
<td>LuoFu Ye</td>
<td>luofuye</td>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>Division 3: Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/2012 12:04:57</td>
<td>Colleen Good</td>
<td>goodolov</td>
<td>Communication Studies</td>
<td>Division 4: Humanities and the Arts</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/2012 12:31:49</td>
<td>NAN WANG</td>
<td>wnan</td>
<td>MAE</td>
<td>Division 3: Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td>Would you recommend international students to take up jobs in the USA or their home country after graduation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/2012 15:02:24</td>
<td>Samithita samraj</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Division 1: Biological and Health Sciences</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/2012 15:18:47</td>
<td>Yasaman</td>
<td>yasaman</td>
<td>SGUS</td>
<td>Division 1: Biological and Health Sciences</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/2012 20:05:56</td>
<td>Xiaoxue Song</td>
<td>sxiaoxue</td>
<td>Master of Applied Economics</td>
<td>Division 3: Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td>how can I find research opportunities ?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/2012 20:53:41</td>
<td>Qi Zhang</td>
<td>qizhangz</td>
<td>CEE</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14/2012 8:53:21</td>
<td>Meron</td>
<td>mhadero</td>
<td>MFA Prose</td>
<td>Division 4: Humanities and the Arts</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14/2012 12:54:05</td>
<td>Gillean Kitchen</td>
<td>gckitch</td>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td>Division 3: Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td>Can you elaborate on efforts for further interdisciplinary interaction across different schools?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14/2012 14:42:53</td>
<td>Matt Filter</td>
<td>mfilter</td>
<td>MPP</td>
<td>Division 3: Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14/2012 16:35:27</td>
<td>Dan Trubman</td>
<td>dtrubman</td>
<td>MPP</td>
<td>Division 3: Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td>What is the status of switching our 9 point GPA system to a more conventional 4 point system?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14/2012 17:02:54</td>
<td>JC Shen</td>
<td>jcschen</td>
<td>Biostatistics</td>
<td>Division 1: Biological and Health Sciences</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/2012 8:52:28</td>
<td>Alex Toulouse</td>
<td>atlounce</td>
<td>Applied Physics</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/2012 17:44:49</td>
<td>Alexander Gutierrez</td>
<td>avgutier</td>
<td>Computer Science and Engineering, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 21:40:41</td>
<td>Vijairam</td>
<td>vijaram</td>
<td>CSE</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timestamp</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Uniqname</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Division of Rackham Graduate School</td>
<td>Which campus are you on?</td>
<td>Are there any questions that you have for the deans that you would like to have asked?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 21:41:50</td>
<td>Zhong Ren</td>
<td>zhongren</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 21:44:05</td>
<td>Shafat Jahangir</td>
<td>shafat</td>
<td>PhD (EECS)</td>
<td>Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 21:44:48</td>
<td>Harshal</td>
<td>harshal</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 21:45:39</td>
<td>Sishir Bhowmick</td>
<td>sishir</td>
<td>EECS</td>
<td>Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 21:45:48</td>
<td>Cai Jinin</td>
<td>cajin</td>
<td>Aerospace Engineering</td>
<td>Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 21:46:06</td>
<td>Anirudh</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ranirudh@umich.edu">ranirudh@umich.edu</a></td>
<td>Materials Science and Engineering</td>
<td>Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 21:48:54</td>
<td>Nevena Paripovic</td>
<td>nevena</td>
<td>IOE</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td>Have you always wanted to be a dean? If not, when did you decide and why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 21:47:11</td>
<td>Maxim Markov</td>
<td>markov</td>
<td>EE/S PhD</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 21:47:52</td>
<td>Qi Wang</td>
<td>mewangqi</td>
<td>mechanical engineering</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 21:47:54</td>
<td>Xiaoxing</td>
<td>xiaoxing</td>
<td>Pharmaceutical Sciences</td>
<td>Division 1: Biological and Health Sciences</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td>Do we have any student exchange plan with the College of Pharmacy, University of California-San Francisco?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 21:48:19</td>
<td>Huichao Ma</td>
<td>huichaom</td>
<td>Biomedical Engineering</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 21:48:40</td>
<td>Anqi Dai</td>
<td>daianqi</td>
<td>CSE</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 21:49:17</td>
<td>Adrian Montero</td>
<td>admo</td>
<td>EE</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 21:52:03</td>
<td>Britton Bush</td>
<td>britbush</td>
<td>Engineering Masters Program</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 21:54:14</td>
<td>Matt Schottler</td>
<td>mshot</td>
<td>Aerospace SGUS</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 21:54:28</td>
<td>Yaoxin Ding</td>
<td>yxding</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 21:55:47</td>
<td>Che-Hung Liu</td>
<td>chehung</td>
<td>EECS</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 21:56:14</td>
<td>Linzhi Ma</td>
<td>Linzhima</td>
<td>EE</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 21:56:27</td>
<td>Anton Li</td>
<td>awli</td>
<td>PhD (MatSciE)</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 21:58:29</td>
<td>Nelida Escobedo</td>
<td>neldae</td>
<td>Urban Planning</td>
<td>Division 4: Humanities and the Arts</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td>More faculty related to latin american studies specifically in urban planning for developing countries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 22:00:31</td>
<td>Shannon Curry</td>
<td>smcurry</td>
<td>AOSS</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 22:03:08</td>
<td>Huai-Ning Chang</td>
<td>huaining</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timestamp</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Uniqname</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Division of Rackham Graduate School</td>
<td>Which campus are you on?</td>
<td>Are there any questions that you have for the deans that you would like to have asked?</td>
<td>Are there any concerns with your program, department, Rackham, or the University of Michigan in general that you would like to have addressed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 22:03:59</td>
<td>Xinyu Tan</td>
<td>xinyutan</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td>I don't feel the inconvenience with the new building being built aside G G Brown is being properly addressed. Bike racks were removed without adding any nearby, displaced offices overtook the only communal space in G G Brown, and no attempt was made to construct temporary structures (e.g. trailers such as those used in grade schools during construction) to make up for the losses. Additionally, the structure is being built without any additional classrooms which may be needed as departments expand.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 22:09:35</td>
<td>Johnathan Puff</td>
<td>jsbuff</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Division 4: Humanities and the Arts</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 22:11:42</td>
<td>Hisham Elmoquet</td>
<td>elmoquet</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 22:13:01</td>
<td>Weidi Sun</td>
<td><a href="mailto:weidisun@umich.edu">weidisun@umich.edu</a></td>
<td>SNRE</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 22:14:45</td>
<td>Michael Kane</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mbkane@umich.edu">mbkane@umich.edu</a></td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 22:18:01</td>
<td>Mikai Chen</td>
<td>mkchen</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 22:19:26</td>
<td>Anurag Panda</td>
<td>apanda</td>
<td>MSE</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 22:25:23</td>
<td>Mrinal Iyer</td>
<td>mrinal</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 22:25:35</td>
<td>Anup Goutham</td>
<td>agoutham</td>
<td>ms eecs</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 22:29:42</td>
<td>Yihao Zheng</td>
<td>yzheng</td>
<td>MS in ME</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 22:30:19</td>
<td>Yu-De Lee</td>
<td>leeyude</td>
<td>Environmental Policy at SNRE</td>
<td>Division 3: Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 22:30:44</td>
<td>Haitao Wang</td>
<td>wanghait</td>
<td>EE</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 22:33:49</td>
<td>Gi Zhang</td>
<td>qizhangz</td>
<td>CEE</td>
<td>Division 1: Biological and Health Sciences</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2012 22:36:01</td>
<td>Niloufar Emami</td>
<td>nemami</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Division 4: Humanities and the Arts</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td>I'm a first year PhD student and I have a question about duration of my studies. In my admission letter, it's mentioned that I need to reach candidacy within the first two years of my studies. What if I can't make that deadline? Thanks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am doing MS in Power and Energy which is a part of EE:Systems. However I was told that Rackham doesn't consider it to be a Major, however the department allows it, please let me know from when it will be counted as a separate Major. As of now it is counted under control.

I also want to know the job prospects in Power and energy in USA for international students, as I have heard that, most of the companies look for US residents in this field.
Aldo Marini

Is there any tutoring options for grad students? I.e. Grad student learning centers. Grad classes can be hard too.

Tingting Song

Why are we not allowed to have less 8 points of class in the last term as it was allowed before?

Mohammad Fatouraei

What can we do to ensure proper funding not just for our research but our labs? I work in a lab with broken tiles and rusty butcher block benches from the 1950's - what are my options?

Rui Chen

Besides internship, how could I get more practical industrial experience from class, could the professor with industrial background provide such industrial experience in a better way and how to assist their career after graduation? Not at present. Right now I am just interested in getting to know them and what they do better.

Yifan Li

I want to know more about accessss for international students to get their educations in a better way and how to assist their career after graduation? Not only in workshops in policy, but in a deeper way.

Yihao Zheng

I would like to have addressed.

Evelyn Anderson

Is there any questions that you have for the deans that you would like to have asked?

Tings Song

Why we are not allowed to have less 8 points of class in the last term as it was allowed before?

Mohammad Fatouraei

What can we do to ensure proper funding not just for our research but our labs? I work in a lab with broken tiles and rusty butcher block benches from the 1950's - what are my options?

Yifan Li

Besides internship, how could I get more practical industrial experience from class, could the professor with industrial background provide such opportunities?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timestamp</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Uniqname</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Division of Rackham Graduate School</th>
<th>Which campus are you on?</th>
<th>Are there any questions that you have for the deans that you would like to have asked?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/14/2012 11:57:11</td>
<td>Melanie Batke</td>
<td>melbatke</td>
<td>Master of Urban Planning</td>
<td>Division 1: Biological and Health Sciences</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td>I would love to ask the deans how they deal with completely asinine questions that are only semi related to the topic at hand. (jk, jk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14/2012 14:19:34</td>
<td>Lauren Knapp</td>
<td>knlauren</td>
<td>SNRE</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14/2012 15:08:14</td>
<td>Erik Brinkman</td>
<td>ebrink</td>
<td>CSE</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14/2012 15:26:18</td>
<td>MD ZUNAID BATEN</td>
<td>mdzunaid</td>
<td>EECS</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14/2012 15:34:46</td>
<td>Zhe Feng</td>
<td>fengzhe</td>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14/2012 17:32:15</td>
<td>Ambarish Desai</td>
<td>ambar</td>
<td>Master of Science</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14/2012 20:38:32</td>
<td>ACE</td>
<td>aemly</td>
<td>Materials Science &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/2012 2:44:26</td>
<td>Neerad Phansalkar</td>
<td>neeradp</td>
<td>EE:S</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/2012 8:03:00</td>
<td>Brendan See</td>
<td>bdsee</td>
<td>Industrial &amp; Operations Engineering</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/2012 9:41:02</td>
<td>Morgan Parker</td>
<td>mcparker</td>
<td>NA&amp;ME</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td>There has been continuing discussion among students about the frustration from Rackham using the nine point GPA scale. This scale causes confusion for recruiting companies, is often incorrectly converted to the four point scale, and inconsistently applied in courses with both graduate and undergraduate students. Why does Rackham use the nine point scale, and are there any plans to change it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/2012 9:58:27</td>
<td>Longhan Li</td>
<td>longhan</td>
<td>EE:S</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/2012 10:28:46</td>
<td>Animesh abanerji</td>
<td>EE Ph.D.</td>
<td>EE Ph.D.</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/2012 10:38:30</td>
<td>Jinhong Qu</td>
<td>jinhongq</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/2012 10:44:54</td>
<td>Travis Martin</td>
<td>travisbm</td>
<td>CSE</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/2012 10:54:32</td>
<td>Fang Dong</td>
<td>ppfang</td>
<td>IOE</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/2012 11:13:36</td>
<td>Thomas McKenney</td>
<td>tmkenne</td>
<td>NA&amp;ME</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/2012 11:14:42</td>
<td>Douglas Rigterink</td>
<td>rigterin</td>
<td>Naval Architecture and Marine Engineering</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td>Why do we use the 9 point scale?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/2012 11:50:02</td>
<td>Ryan Morton</td>
<td>rmorton</td>
<td>CSE</td>
<td>Division 2: Physical Sciences and Engineering</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td>(will ask in person) A question regarding open-access machine shops for all (properly trained) students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Economic Effects of Policies Contributing to Fiscal Tightening in 2013

Substantial changes to tax and spending policies are scheduled to take effect in January 2013, significantly reducing the federal budget deficit. According to the Congressional Budget Office’s (CBO’s) projections, if all of that fiscal tightening occurs, real (inflation-adjusted) gross domestic product (GDP) will drop by 0.5 percent in 2013 (as measured by the change from the fourth quarter of 2012 to the fourth quarter of 2013)—reflecting a decline in the first half of the year and renewed growth at a modest pace later in the year.1 That contraction of the economy will cause employment to decline and the unemployment rate to rise to 9.1 percent in the fourth quarter of 2013. After next year, by the agency’s estimates, economic growth will pick up, and the labor market will strengthen, returning output to its potential level (reflecting a high rate of use of labor and capital) and shrinking the unemployment rate to 5.5 percent by 2018.

Output would be greater and unemployment lower in the next few years if some or all of the fiscal tightening scheduled under current law—sometimes called the fiscal cliff—was removed. However, CBO expects that even if all of the fiscal tightening was eliminated, the economy would remain below its potential and the unemployment rate would remain higher than usual for some time. Moreover, if the fiscal tightening was removed and the policies that are currently in effect were kept in place indefinitely, a continued surge in federal debt during the rest of this decade and beyond would raise the risk of a fiscal crisis (in which the government would lose the ability to borrow money at affordable interest rates) and would eventually reduce the nation’s output and income below what would occur if the fiscal tightening was allowed to take place as currently set by law.

In August, CBO presented estimates of the budgetary and economic outcomes that would occur under current law and under an “alternative fiscal scenario” that represents a continuation of many long-standing policies and thus a significant reduction in the amount of fiscal tightening next year. To provide additional information about the sources of that tightening and its effects, this report presents estimates of the budgetary and economic impact of the main changes to current law that would occur under that alternative scenario, as well as estimates of the impact of eliminating various other components of fiscal tightening scheduled for 2013.

In order to focus on the short-term impact of policy decisions, the analysis in this report is based on the assumption that the fiscal tightening would be removed and current policies maintained for two years and that the tightening provided by current law would occur thereafter. (In contrast, CBO’s August analysis of the alternative fiscal scenario was based on the assumption that those current policies would be maintained indefinitely.)

On the basis of its analysis, CBO concludes the following:

- Eliminating the automatic enforcement procedures established by the Budget Control Act of 2011 that are scheduled to reduce both discretionary and mandatory spending starting in January and maintaining Medicare’s payment rates for physicians’ services at the

1. The figures in this paragraph are unchanged from those in CBO’s previous analysis of this issue. See Congressional Budget Office, An Update to the Budget and Economic Outlook: Fiscal Years 2012 to 2022 (August 2012).
current level would boost real GDP by \textit{about three-quarters of a percent} by the end of 2013 (see Figure 1).\(^2\)

- Extending all expiring tax provisions other than the cut in the payroll tax that has been in effect since January 2011—that is, extending the tax reductions originally enacted in 2001, 2003, and 2009 and extending all other expiring provisions, including those that expired at the end of 2011, except for the payroll tax cut—and indexing the alternative minimum tax (AMT) for inflation beginning in 2012 would boost real GDP by \textit{a little less than 1½ percent} by the end of 2013.

- Making all of the changes described in the two preceding bullets—which captures all of the policies included in the first two years of CBO’s alternative fiscal scenario—would boost real GDP by \textit{about 2¼ percent} by the end of 2013 (as CBO estimated in August).\(^3\) Thus, of the total difference in the projected growth of GDP next year under current law and under the alternative fiscal scenario, about two-thirds owes to changes in tax policies and about one-third owes to changes in spending policies.

- The estimated economic effect next year of those changes in spending is about half the estimated effect of extending the expiring tax provisions, even though the budgetary impact of the changes in spending is less than one-quarter of the impact of the changes in taxes. The larger “bang for the buck” next year of the spending policies under the alternative fiscal scenario occurs because, CBO expects, a significant part of the decrease in taxes (relative to those under current law) would be saved rather than spent.

- Extending all expiring tax provisions other than the cut in the payroll tax and indexing the AMT for inflation—except for allowing the expiration of lower tax rates on income above $250,000 for couples and $200,000 for single taxpayers—would boost real GDP by \textit{about 1¼ percent} by the end of 2013. That effect is nearly as large as the effect of making all of those changes in law and extending the lower tax rates on higher incomes as well (which CBO estimates to be a little less than 1½ percent, as noted above), primarily because the budgetary impact would be nearly as large (and secondarily because the extension of lower tax rates on higher incomes would have a relatively small effect on output per dollar of budgetary cost).

- Extending both the current 2 percentage-point cut in the payroll tax and emergency unemployment benefits—extensions that are not assumed in the alternative fiscal scenario—would boost real GDP by \textit{about three-quarters of a percent} by the end of 2013. Making those changes along with making all of the changes in CBO’s alternative fiscal scenario would boost real GDP by \textit{about 3 percent} by the end of 2013.

### CBO’s Analytical Approach

For each potential change in law discussed in this report, CBO used evidence from empirical studies and econometric models to estimate the impact on:

- **Output next year**—specifically, the effect on real GDP in the fourth quarter of 2013 and on average nominal GDP in 2013 per dollar of total budgetary cost (measured in terms of additional government spending or reduction in taxes)—and

- **Employment next year**—specifically, the effect on years of full-time-equivalent (FTE) employment in the fourth quarter of 2013 and on average FTE-years in 2013 per million dollars of total budgetary cost in that year.

Although the analysis here focuses on those two measures, other criteria are also important for evaluating fiscal policies. Those other criteria include the economic effects in later years, consistency with long-term fiscal objectives, the distributional consequences (that is, who bears the costs and receives the benefits), and the value to society of any added goods and services that would be produced in the short term.\(^4\)

\(^2\) The economic measures presented in this report apply to calendar years. The budget figures are for fiscal years, which run from October 1 through September 30.

\(^3\) For a detailed explanation of the policies underlying the alternative fiscal scenario, see Congressional Budget Office, \textit{An Update to the Budget and Economic Outlook: Fiscal Years 2012 to 2022} (August 2012).

\(^4\) For additional discussion of those criteria, see the statement of Douglas W. Elmendorf, Director, Congressional Budget Office, before the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction, \textit{Confronting the Nation’s Fiscal Policy Challenges} (September 13, 2011).
### Figure 1.

**Estimated Economic Effects in the Fourth Quarter of 2013 of Eliminating Various Components of Fiscal Tightening Scheduled for Fiscal Years 2013 and 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inflation-Adjusted GDP (Percentage difference from CBO’s baseline)</th>
<th>Full-Time-Equivalent Employment (Difference from CBO’s baseline in millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.2 0.7</td>
<td>0.4 0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1 0.6</td>
<td>0.4 0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3 1.4 2.5</td>
<td>0.5 1.8 3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3 1.3 2.3</td>
<td>0.5 1.6 2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2 0.7 1.2</td>
<td>0.3 0.8 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6 2.2 3.9</td>
<td>0.8 2.7 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8 2.9 5.0</td>
<td>1.1 3.4 5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

Notes: The estimated budgetary effects presented do not include debt service.

GDP = gross domestic product; AMT = alternative minimum tax.

a. This component incorporates extensions of title I of the Tax Relief, Unemployment Insurance Reauthorization, and Job Creation Act of 2010 (which extended for 2011 and 2012 income tax provisions enacted in 2001, 2003, and 2009); of title III of that act (which modified estate and gift taxation for 2010 through 2012); of the higher exemption amount for the AMT (which was previously increased through the end of December 2011), along with an indexing of higher exemption amount and AMT tax brackets for inflation after 2011; of the treatment of nonrefundable personal credits (which also was continued through the end of 2011); and of about 80 other tax provisions (many of which expired at the end of December 2011). Nearly all of those 80 provisions have been extended previously; some, such as the research and experimentation tax credit, have been extended more than once.

b. This component incorporates extensions of title I of the Tax Relief, Unemployment Insurance Reauthorization, and Job Creation Act of 2010 (which extended for 2011 and 2012 income tax provisions enacted in 2001, 2003, and 2009) except for the reductions to the top two tax rates on ordinary income and to the tax rates on capital gains and dividends for taxpayers filing jointly with income above $250,000 and for single filers with income above $200,000 (with both thresholds indexed for inflation since 2009); of the elimination of limits on itemized deductions and personal exemptions except for those high-income taxpayers; of title III of that act (which modified estate and gift taxation for 2010 through 2012); and of about 80 other tax provisions (many of which expired at the end of December 2011). It also incorporates indexing the AMT for inflation.

c. The budgetary cost is for a two-year extension of the policies.

d. Implements the first two years of the alternative fiscal scenario, combining the first three components listed in the figure.

e. Combines the first three components and the fifth component listed in the figure.
The approach adopted to estimate the short-term economic impact of alternative policies is similar to the method that CBO has used to assess the impact of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act and the impact of various potential policies designed to increase output and employment.\(^5\) The estimated effects on output of a given policy include both its direct and indirect effects. Direct effects consist of immediate effects on economic activity. For example, government purchases of goods and services directly elicit economic activity and thereby have a direct dollar-for-dollar impact on output. Indirect effects may enhance or offset the direct effects. For example, if the economy has idle resources, as it does now, government funding for projects can lead to the hiring of otherwise unemployed workers. The additional spending by those workers, who would have more income, would constitute a positive indirect effect. In contrast, a substantial increase in government spending financed by borrowing tends to drive up interest rates, which discourages spending on investment and on durable goods by raising the cost of borrowed funds. Those indirect “crowding-out” effects would offset some of the direct effects. In its analysis, CBO chose, on a judgmental basis, low and high estimates of the effects on output for a given policy to encompass most economists’ views about the effects of that type of policy.

The monetary policy of the Federal Reserve has an important influence on the economic effects of changes in taxes and government spending. In its August 2012 An Update to the Budget and Economic Outlook, CBO anticipated that the economic slowdown brought about by fiscal tightening under current law, coupled with a lack of inflationary pressure, would prompt the Federal Reserve to introduce new policies to hold down the rate on 10-year Treasury notes. Changes in the laws governing federal taxes and spending that would offset the fiscal tightening scheduled under current law and ameliorate the projected economic slowdown could lead the Federal Reserve to scale back or eliminate those policies. In this analysis, CBO assumed that, at least through 2013, the Federal Reserve would react in that way. That reaction would increase long-term interest rates a little relative to the rates in CBO’s baseline projections and thereby slightly attenuate the economic effects of policies that would reduce fiscal tightening.

Fiscal policies may also affect spending by individuals and businesses by altering people’s uncertainty or confidence about future economic conditions or government policies. Many firms appear to be uncertain today about future demand for their products, and that uncertainty seems to be leading them to be cautious about increasing their investment and hiring. Fiscal policy actions that boosted demand might lessen that uncertainty and increase employment.\(^6\) However, some fiscal policy actions might exacerbate uncertainty about future government policies—for example, if firms’ managers wondered whether a temporary policy might later be extended or what other changes in fiscal policy might be made later. Because quantifying reactions of that sort to changes in fiscal policy would be extremely difficult, this report does not incorporate such reactions.

To assess a policy’s impact on employment, CBO used a series of steps to translate the estimated effects on output into estimated effects on FTE-years (each FTE-year being 40 hours of employment per week for one year). First, CBO estimated the impact on the output gap—the percentage difference between actual output and potential output. Next, CBO calculated the magnitude and timing of effects of changes in the output gap on productivity, hours per worker, and employment using the historical relationships between those measures. Changes in the output gap affect employment gradually over several quarters, as part of a rise in output initially shows up as higher productivity and hours per worker rather than as increased employment. CBO also took account of the effect of changes in employment on the size of the labor force, because discouraged workers and people who have chosen to pursue activities such as schooling rather than work tend to return to the labor force when unemployment declines and the economic environment improves.

To measure the impact on employment in FTE-years, CBO incorporated the estimated effects of policies on the number of hours worked in addition to their effects on


the number of people employed. Projected increases in the average number of people employed during a year do not include shifts from part-time to full-time work or overtime and are generally somewhat smaller than increases in FTE-years.

For estimates of the amounts in 2013 of additional output per dollar and employment per million dollars of total budgetary cost, the cost used in the calculations was the effect on the federal deficit in calendar year 2013. Policy options with a smaller impact per dollar require more budgetary resources to generate given amounts of extra output and employment, and those with a larger impact per dollar require less budgetary resources.7

Since its November 2011 analysis presented in Policies for Increasing Economic Growth and Employment in 2012 and 2013, CBO has refined some aspects of its analytic approach and its presentation of results. For example, CBO now estimates that changes in GDP affect employment more gradually than it estimated previously. That change implies that generating a given increase in employment in the first year of a policy requires a larger increase in GDP. In addition, CBO now presents the effects of different policies on nominal GDP per dollar of budgetary cost, whereas the previous analysis presented the effects on real GDP measured with 2008 prices; that change in presentation (which better matches the effect on GDP to the budgetary cost of a policy, measured in nominal dollars) has slightly increased the effects on output per dollar of budgetary cost presented in this report, while leaving the effects on employment unchanged.

Since its August 2012 analysis of the alternative fiscal scenario, CBO has made one change of note: To focus on the short-term impact of the policies that constitute that scenario and the others analyzed in this report, the current analysis is based on the assumption that the policies would be maintained though calendar year 2014 and that the changes embodied in current law would unfold thereafter. In contrast, the August analysis was based on the assumption that the policies would be maintained indefinitely. Shortening the duration of the policies significantly reduces their cumulative budgetary effects and therefore their drag on output and income in the long run. However, that shorter duration makes little difference in the policies’ projected budgetary and economic effects in the short run. In particular, because the tax cuts have been in place for so long, CBO expects that households would view an extension of current tax rates as a continuation of established tax policy and would therefore alter their spending very little. If households viewed the two-year extension as less than permanent, they might spend less and provide a smaller short-term boost to economic output. However, that effect might be offset by a positive effect from a smaller increase in long-term interest rates if participants in the financial markets felt less concerned about the prospect of higher government debt in the future.

### Short-Term Effects of Policies Contributing to Fiscal Tightening

CBO estimated the short-term impact on output and employment of five sets of policies:

- Eliminate the scheduled automatic reductions in defense spending;
- Eliminate the scheduled automatic reductions in nondefense spending and the scheduled reductions in Medicare’s payment rates for physicians;
- Extend most expiring tax provisions and index the AMT for inflation;
- Extend most expiring tax provisions—except for the lower tax rates on income above certain thresholds—and index the AMT for inflation; and
- Extend both the payroll tax cut and emergency unemployment benefits.

CBO also estimated the impact of two combinations of those sets of policies:

- The alternative fiscal scenario, which encompasses the first three items listed above, and
The alternative fiscal scenario plus an extension of the payroll tax cut and emergency unemployment benefits (the first three items and the last one).

The effects of the policies differ both because they vary in their budgetary cost and because they spur output and employment by different amounts per dollar of budgetary cost.

Eliminate the Automatic Reductions in Defense Spending Specified in the Budget Control Act

The Budget Control Act specified automatic procedures to reduce both discretionary and mandatory spending during the coming decade in the event that specified amounts of deficit reduction were not achieved through legislation originating from a Congressionally appointed committee. Those automatic reductions will take the form of equal cuts (in dollar terms) in funding for defense and nondefense programs in fiscal years 2013 through 2021. For 2013, those reductions will be achieved by automatically canceling a portion of the budgetary resources (in an action known as sequestration) for most discretionary programs as well as for some programs and activities that are financed by mandatory spending. From 2014 to 2021, the reductions will be achieved by lowering the caps on discretionary budget authority as specified in the Budget Control Act and through sequestration for mandatory spending. The law exempts a significant portion of mandatory spending from sequestration, however.

CBO has previously estimated how much discretionary and mandatory funding will change under the automatic enforcement mechanisms, and those estimates are used in this analysis. However, the Administration’s Office of Management and Budget would implement any reductions on the basis of its own estimates.

CBO estimated in August that the automatic enforcement procedures will reduce outlays for defense programs by $24 billion in fiscal year 2013 and by $51 billion in fiscal year 2014 (see Table 1). Because mandatory spending makes up less than 1 percent of all defense spending, almost all of that reduction in outlays in the defense category will be achieved by sequestering discretionary budget authority provided for 2013 and by lowering the caps on defense appropriations in 2014.

CBO estimates that precluding those reductions in defense outlays would increase real GDP by 0.4 percent and increase full-time-equivalent employment by about 0.4 million in the fourth quarter of 2013 (see Figure 1 on page 3). Those figures represent CBO’s central estimates, which correspond to the assumption that the values that describe key parameters of economic behavior (in particular, the extent to which lower federal taxes and higher federal spending boost aggregate demand in the short term) equal the midpoints of the ranges used by CBO. The full ranges that CBO uses for those parameters suggest that, in the fourth quarter of 2013, real GDP could be between 0.2 percent and 0.7 percent higher, and employment 0.2 million to 0.7 million higher, if the scheduled reductions in defense outlays did not occur.

CBO measures the cost-effectiveness of a fiscal policy in generating additional output and employment by the ratio of its economic effects to its budgetary cost. On that basis, CBO estimates that eliminating the automatic reductions in defense spending would boost GDP in 2013 by about $1.20 for every dollar of budgetary cost in that year; the full range of estimates runs from $0.50 to $2.00 of GDP per dollar of budgetary cost (see Figure 2). That policy is estimated to boost employment by about 7 FTE-years in 2013 per million dollars of budgetary cost, but that amount could range from 3 to 11 FTE-years.

8. Discretionary spending is spending out of budget authority provided in appropriation acts. Mandatory spending is spending on programs that are not normally controlled by the annual appropriation process; many of them provide benefits based on formulas and eligibility criteria set in law.

9. Budgetary resources consist of all sources of authority provided to federal agencies that permit them to incur financial obligations, including new budget authority, unobligated balances, direct spending authority, and obligation limitations.


11. For a discussion of CBO’s approach to analyzing the short-term effects of fiscal policy, see Reichling and Whalen, Assessing the Short-Term Effects on Output of Changes in Federal Fiscal Policies.
Table 1.
Estimated Increase in the Deficit from Eliminating Various Components of Fiscal Tightening Scheduled for Fiscal Years 2013 and 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Billions of dollars)</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate the Automatic Reductions in Defense Spending Specified in the Budget Control</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act #$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate the Automatic Reductions in Nondefense Spending Specified in the Budget Control Act and the Scheduled</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reductions in Medicare's Payment Rates for Physicians#$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend Most Expiring Tax Provisions and Index the AMT for Inflation#b</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend Most Expiring Tax Provisions—Except for the Lower Tax Rates on Income Above Certain Thresholds— and Index the AMT</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for Inflation#c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend the Reduction in Employees' Portion of the Payroll Tax and Extend Emergency Unemployment Benefits#d</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement the Policies Assumed in the Alternative Fiscal Scenario#e</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement the Policies Assumed in the Alternative Fiscal Scenario and Extend the Reduction in Employees' Portion of the Payroll Tax and Emergency Unemployment Benefits#f</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

Notes: The estimated budgetary effects presented do not include debt service.

AMT = alternative minimum tax.

a. The estimated effect on the budget represents the cost in fiscal years 2013 and 2014 of a 10-year extension of the policy, as shown in Congressional Budget Office, An Update to the Budget and Economic Outlook: Fiscal Years 2012 to 2022 (August 2012).

b. This component incorporates extensions of title I of the Tax Relief, Unemployment Insurance Reauthorization, and Job Creation Act of 2010 (which extended for 2011 and 2012 income tax provisions enacted in 2001, 2003, and 2009); of title III of that act (which modified estate and gift taxation for 2010 through 2012); of the higher exemption amount for the AMT (which was previously increased through the end of December 2011), along with an indexing of higher exemption amount and AMT tax brackets for inflation after 2011; of the treatment of nonrefundable personal credits (which also was continued through the end of 2011); and of about 80 other tax provisions (many of which expired at the end of December 2011). Nearly all of those 80 provisions have been extended previously; some, such as the research and experimentation tax credit, have been extended more than once.

c. This component incorporates extensions of title I of the Tax Relief, Unemployment Insurance Reauthorization, and Job Creation Act of 2010 (which extended for 2011 and 2012 income tax provisions enacted in 2001, 2003, and 2009) except for the reductions to the top two tax rates on ordinary income and to the tax rates on capital gains and dividends for taxpayers filing jointly with income above $250,000 and for single filers with income above $200,000 (with both thresholds indexed for inflation since 2009); of the elimination of limits on itemized deductions and personal exemptions except for those high-income taxpayers; of title III of that act (which modified estate and gift taxation for 2010 through 2012); and of about 80 other tax provisions (many of which expired at the end of December 2011). It also incorporates indexing the AMT for inflation.

d. The budgetary cost is for a two-year extension of the policies.

e. Implements the first two years of the alternative fiscal scenario, combining the first three components listed in the table.

f. Combines the first three components and the fifth component listed in the table.
### Figure 2.

**Estimated Economic Effects in 2013 of Eliminating Various Components of Fiscal Tightening Scheduled for Fiscal Years 2013 and 2014 Relative to Budgetary Costs in 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GDP (Dollars of annual average GDP in 2013 per dollar of budgetary cost in 2013)</th>
<th>Full-Time-Equivalent Employment Years (Average in 2013 per million dollars of budgetary cost in 2013)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Congressional Budget Office.

**Notes:** The estimated budgetary effects presented do not include debt service.

GDP = gross domestic product; AMT = alternative minimum tax.

a. This component incorporates extensions of title I of the Tax Relief, Unemployment Insurance Reauthorization, and Job Creation Act of 2010 (which extended for 2011 and 2012 income tax provisions enacted in 2001, 2003, and 2009); of title III of that act (which modified estate and gift taxation for 2010 through 2012); of the higher exemption amount for the AMT (which was previously increased through the end of December 2011), along with an indexing of higher exemption amount and AMT tax brackets for inflation after 2011; of the treatment of nonrefundable personal credits (which also was continued through the end of 2011); and of about 80 other tax provisions (many of which expired at the end of December 2011). Nearly all of those 80 provisions have been extended previously; some, such as the research and experimentation tax credit, have been extended more than once.

b. This component incorporates extensions of title I of the Tax Relief, Unemployment Insurance Reauthorization, and Job Creation Act of 2010 (which extended for 2011 and 2012 income tax provisions enacted in 2001, 2003, and 2009) except for the reductions to the top two tax rates on ordinary income and to the tax rates on capital gains and dividends for taxpayers filing jointly with income above $250,000 and for single filers with income above $200,000 (with both thresholds indexed for inflation since 2009); of the elimination of limits on itemized deductions and personal exemptions except for those high-income taxpayers; of title III of that act (which modified estate and gift taxation for 2010 through 2012); and of about 80 other tax provisions (many of which expired at the end of December 2011). It also incorporates indexing the AMT for inflation.

c. The budgetary cost is for a two-year extension of the policies.

d. Implements the first two years of the alternative fiscal scenario, combining the first three components listed in the figure.

e. Combines the first three components and the fifth component listed in the figure.
Eliminate the Automatic Reductions in Nondefense Spending Specified in the Budget Control Act and the Scheduled Reductions in Medicare’s Payment Rates for Physicians

Estimating the amount of the automatic reductions for nondefense programs is more complicated than estimating those reductions for defense programs, particularly because provisions in the Budget Control Act limit cuts in most Medicare benefits to 2 percent and exempt many mandatory programs (including Social Security and Medicaid) from sequestration altogether. Taking those limitations into account, CBO estimated in August that, in fiscal year 2013, the automatic enforcement procedures will reduce Medicare spending by about $4 billion (including indirect effects), other mandatory spending by $5 billion, and other nondefense spending by $21 billion. In total, the enforcement procedures will reduce nondefense outlays by about $30 billion in fiscal year 2013 and by $45 billion in fiscal year 2014.

In addition, under current law, spending for Medicare will be constrained starting in January 2013 by a rate-setting system called the sustainable growth rate, which controls the fees that physicians receive for their services. If the system is allowed to operate as currently structured, physicians’ fees will be reduced by 27 percent at the beginning of the year and by additional amounts in subsequent years, CBO projected in August. If, instead, lawmakers override those scheduled reductions—as they have every year since 2003—spending on Medicare would be greater than the amounts projected in CBO’s baseline. For example, if payment rates stayed as they are now, outlays for Medicare (net of premiums) would be $10 billion higher in fiscal year 2013 and $16 billion higher in fiscal year 2014 than they are in CBO’s current-law baseline.¹²

Together, eliminating the automatic reductions in nondefense spending and maintaining Medicare’s current payment rates for physicians would increase outlays by $40 billion in fiscal year 2013 and by $61 billion in fiscal year 2014, according to CBO’s estimates.

¹². On November 1, 2012, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services issued a final rule specifying that Medicare’s payment rates for physicians’ services during calendar year 2013 will be 26.5 percent lower than current payment rates. That recent action is not reflected in CBO’s estimates used for this report.

CBO projects that the additional spending would increase real GDP by 0.4 percent (by 0.1 percent to 0.6 percent under CBO’s full range of assumptions) and increase full-time-equivalent employment by 0.4 million (with a range from 0.1 million to 0.7 million) in the fourth quarter of 2013. Dividing those economic effects by the budgetary cost of the policies yields an estimated increase in GDP of about $0.90 in 2013 for every dollar of budgetary cost in that year (the full range of estimates runs from $0.30 to $1.50); the increase in employment would be about 5 FTE-years in 2013 per million dollars of budgetary cost (the full range is from 2 to 8 FTE-years).

Those economic effects per dollar are smaller than the effects of the changes in defense spending because a larger share of the affected nondefense spending represents government payments to people or state and local governments, rather than direct purchases of goods and services. Because people and state and local governments would not spend all of such payments in 2013, the increases in nondefense spending have a smaller per-dollar effect on aggregate demand.

Extend Most Expiring Tax Provisions and Index the AMT for Inflation

CBO projects that federal revenues will increase by about one-third between fiscal years 2012 and 2014 as a result of several factors, including the scheduled expiration at the end of 2012 of a number of tax provisions and the expiration at the end of 2011 of certain provisions related to the AMT. As a result, under current law, revenues will reach 19.6 percent of GDP in 2014, compared with 15.8 percent in 2012, CBO estimates.

Under the rules that govern CBO’s baseline, all of the provisions of the Tax Relief, Unemployment Insurance Reauthorization, and Job Creation Act of 2010 are assumed to expire as scheduled. Those expirations will increase revenues in 2013 by raising individual income tax rates, reducing the child tax credit, eliminating the American Opportunity Tax Credit, raising estate tax rates, lowering the effective exemption amount for the AMT (which rose at the end of December 2011), and making other changes.

In addition, numerous other tax provisions—beyond the income tax, estate and gift tax, and AMT provisions—expired at the end of 2011 or are scheduled to expire at
The estimated economic impact of those policies per dollar of budgetary cost is smaller than that of eliminating the scheduled reductions in spending because people would save some of their extra after-tax income rather than spending it all in 2013. As a result, the short-run increase in aggregate demand and output would be smaller than it would be for increased government purchases of goods and services, which would directly add dollar to dollar to aggregate demand in 2013.

**Extend Most Expiring Tax Provisions—Except for the Lower Tax Rates on Income Above Certain Thresholds—and Index the AMT for Inflation**

The budgetary cost of extending the expiring tax provisions would be lower if certain provisions were allowed to expire that otherwise would apply to some high-income households. According to JCT and CBO’s estimates, if the AMT was indexed for inflation beginning in 2012 and all of the other expiring tax provisions were extended except for the specific provisions affecting high-income taxpayers (and the payroll tax cut), revenues would be lower and outlays for refundable credits would be higher by $288 billion in fiscal year 2013 and by $382 billion in fiscal year 2014, compared with CBO’s baseline projections.

CBO estimates that such changes would increase real GDP by 1.3 percent (by 0.3 percent to 2.3 percent under CBO’s full range of assumptions), and increase full-time-equivalent employment by 1.6 million (with a range from 0.5 million to 2.8 million) in the fourth quarter of 2013. Dividing those economic effects by the budgetary cost of the change yields an estimated increase in GDP of about $0.60 in 2013 for every dollar of budgetary cost in that year, with the full range of estimates running between $0.20 and $0.90, and an estimated increase in employment of about 3 FTE-years in 2013 per million dollars of budgetary cost (the full range is from 1 to 5 FTE-years).  

The estimated economic effects per dollar of budgetary cost of these changes in law are slightly larger than those of extending all of the expiring tax provisions (except for the payroll tax cut) and indexing the AMT for inflation because the income affected by the higher tax rate under this policy would be that of high-income taxpayers, who, in comparison with others, probably save a larger portion and spend a smaller portion of each dollar of reduced taxes. However, the differences in the estimated effects of the two sets of policies are small (and therefore are generally not visible in the rounded numbers shown in Figure 2 on page 8), in part because the tax savings on...
income above the specified thresholds are a small share of
the total tax savings under the broader option and in part
because high-income taxpayers are presumed to save only
a modestly larger portion of reductions in their taxes.

**Extend the Reduction in Employees’ Portion of the
Payroll Tax and Extend Emergency Unemployment
Benefits**
Employees’ share of the payroll tax was reduced by 2 per-
centage points (from 6.2 percent to 4.2 percent) for
calendar years 2011 and 2012, reducing federal revenues
in fiscal years 2011 through 2013. CBO estimates that
the scheduled expiration of that tax cut will boost reve-
nues as a share of GDP by 0.7 percentage points between
2012 and 2014.

Emergency unemployment compensation, which was
extended in the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation
Act of 2012, is scheduled to expire at the end of 2012, so
people will not be eligible to receive such benefits next
year or beyond. As a result, outlays for unemployment
compensation will be smaller in 2013 than in 2012 for
any given level of unemployment.

If the cut in the payroll tax and eligibility to receive emer-
gency unemployment benefits were extended through
2014, revenues would be lower and benefit payments
higher by a combined $108 billion in fiscal year 2013
and $150 billion in fiscal year 2014.\(^\text{15}\) Those changes in
law would increase real GDP by 0.7 percent (by 0.2 per-
cent to 1.2 percent under CBO’s full range of assump-
tions) and increase full-time-equivalent employment by
0.8 million (with a range from 0.3 million to 1.3 million)
in the fourth quarter of 2013, CBO estimates. Dividing
those economic effects by the budgetary cost yields an
estimated increase in GDP of about $0.70 in 2013 for
every dollar of budgetary cost in that year, with the full
range of estimates running from $0.20 and $1.10, and an
increase in employment of about 4 FTE-years in 2013
per million dollars of budgetary cost, with a full range
from 1 to 6 FTE-years.

The estimated economic impact of those policies per
dollar of budgetary cost is larger than that of extending
other expiring tax provisions and indexing the AMT for
inflation because a larger share of the additional
unemployment benefits and extended payroll tax cut
would be spent by the recipients in 2013. As a result,
the short-run increase in aggregate demand and output
would be greater.

**Implement All of the Policies Assumed in the
Alternative Fiscal Scenario**
Making all of the changes included in the first two years
of CBO’s alternative fiscal scenario—namely, making all
of the changes to federal spending described above,
extending all of the expiring tax provisions (except the
payroll tax cut), and indexing the AMT for inflation—
would increase spending and reduce taxes by a combined
$395 billion in fiscal year 2013 and $532 billion in 2014
(excluding the effects on interest payments), according to
JCT and CBO’s estimates in August.

CBO estimates that such changes in law would boost real
GDP by 2.2 percent (by between 0.6 percent and
3.9 percent under CBO’s full range of assumptions) and
increase full-time-equivalent employment by 2.7 million
(with a range from 0.8 million to 4.5 million) in the
fourth quarter of 2013. About two-thirds of those effects
would owe to changes in tax policies and about one-third
to changes in spending policies. The economic effects of
the tax and spending changes are not proportional to
their budgetary effects because, by CBO’s estimates, the
spending changes would boost GDP more than the tax
changes would for each dollar of budgetary cost.

**Implement All of the Policies Assumed in the
Alternative Fiscal Scenario and Extend the
Payroll Tax Reduction and Emergency
Unemployment Benefits**
Making all of the changes included in the first two years
of CBO’s alternative fiscal scenario as well as extending
both the reduction in the payroll tax and emergency
unemployment benefits would increase the deficit by
$503 billion in 2013 and by $682 billion in 2014. CBO
estimates that such changes in law would boost real GDP
by 2.9 percent (by between 0.8 percent and 5.0 percent
under CBO’s full range of assumptions) and increase
full-time-equivalent employment by 3.4 million (with a

---

15. The great majority of that budgetary impact—$86 billion in fiscal
year 2013 and $119 billion in fiscal year 2014—stems from the
payroll tax reduction. There would also be a small budgetary effect
in fiscal year 2015.
range from 1.1 million to 5.8 million) in the fourth quarter of 2013.\(^{16}\)

CBO’s August 2012 projection of the deficit under current law in fiscal year 2013—$641 billion—would represent a decline in the deficit of $448 billion from fiscal year 2012 to fiscal year 2013; that amount is less than the estimated $503 billion budgetary cost in 2013 of the combination of the policies in the alternative fiscal scenario plus extension of the payroll tax cut and emergency unemployment benefits.\(^{17}\) That difference occurs because CBO’s baseline projection of the deficit includes effects on the budget of the macroeconomic impact of the scheduled fiscal tightening, other scheduled changes in policy not part of the combination being analyzed here, and other factors that normally affect year-to-year changes in revenues and spending.

**Longer-Term Effects of Policies Contributing to Fiscal Tightening**

Although reducing the fiscal tightening scheduled to occur next year would boost output and employment in the short run, doing so without imposing a comparable amount of additional tightening in future years would reduce the nation’s output and income in the longer run relative to what would occur if the scheduled tightening remained in place. If all of the policies considered in this analysis were extended for a prolonged period beyond the two years assumed here, federal debt held by the public—which is currently more than 70 percent of GDP, its highest mark since 1950—would continue to rise much faster than GDP. Such a path for federal debt could not be sustained indefinitely, so policy changes would be required at some point.\(^{18}\)

Over the longer term, the nation’s potential to produce goods and services is the key determinant of output and income. That potential depends on the size and quality of the labor force, the stock of productive capital (such as factories, vehicles, and computers), and the efficiency with which labor and capital are used. Lasting changes in those factors can have an enduring influence on the economy’s ability to produce goods and services.

Federal budget policies affect potential output mainly by affecting the amount of public saving (the combined surpluses or deficits run by the federal government and state and local governments) and the incentives for people and businesses to work, save, and invest. Different methods of achieving any given increase in public saving could have different effects on those incentives. For example, increases in marginal tax rates on labor would tend to reduce the amount of labor supplied to the economy, whereas increases in revenues of a similar magnitude from broadening the tax base would probably have a smaller negative impact or even a positive impact on the supply of labor.\(^{19}\) Similarly, cutting government benefit payments would generally strengthen people’s incentive to work and save, but the actual impact would depend on the nature of the cuts.

---

16. CBO’s central estimate of a 2.9 percent increase in GDP in the fourth quarter of 2013 from the policies of the alternative fiscal scenario and extension of the payroll tax reduction and emergency unemployment benefits—undoing nearly all of the changes in policy that lead to fiscal tightening under current law—is notably smaller than a previous estimate of 3.9 percent for removing all of the scheduled fiscal restraint (see Congressional Budget Office, *Economic Effects of Reducing the Fiscal Restraint That Is Scheduled to Occur in 2013*, May 2012). Those estimates differ primarily because CBO now projects a smaller decline in the deficit between 2012 and 2013, in part because the deficit in 2012 turned out to be smaller than the agency projected.

17. In August, CBO projected that the decline in the deficit under current law would be $487 billion. Because the deficit in 2012 turned out to be smaller than CBO projected, that difference is now $448 billion.


19. Broadening the tax base would have opposing effects on the supply of labor. On the one hand, reducing taxpayers’ after-tax income would tend to cause them to work more to make up for the loss in income. On the other hand, some approaches for broadening the base would raise some taxpayers’ marginal tax rates—by pushing them into higher tax brackets, for example—which would tend to cause them to work less. Whether the net effect was positive or negative would depend upon the details of the base-broadening policy.
CBO has not estimated the longer-term economic effects of the fiscal policies analyzed in this report, but the agency has estimated the effect on output that would occur in 2022 under the alternative fiscal scenario, which incorporates the assumption that several of the policies are maintained indefinitely. CBO estimates that in 2022, on net, the policies included in the alternative fiscal scenario would reduce real GDP by 0.4 percent and real gross national product (GNP) by 1.7 percent. That projected effect primarily reflects two opposing forces: People’s incentives to work and save would be greater with that scenario’s lower tax rates, but the larger budget deficits and rapidly growing federal debt would hamper national saving and investment and thus reduce output and income.

In years beyond 2022, rising deficits under the alternative fiscal scenario would lead to larger negative effects on GDP and GNP and to larger increases in interest rates relative to the rates that would prevail under current law. Ultimately, the policies assumed in the alternative fiscal scenario would lead to unsustainable federal debt, from both an economic and a budgetary perspective.

20. Those figures represent CBO’s central estimates, which correspond to the assumption that the values that describe key parameters of economic behavior (in particular, the extent to which higher deficits crowd out private investment and the extent to which lower marginal tax rates on labor income boost the labor supply) equal the midpoints of the ranges used by CBO. The full ranges that CBO uses for those parameters suggest that in 2022 real GDP could be between 2.0 percent lower and 2.1 percent higher, and real GNP between 3.5 percent lower and 0.9 percent higher, under the policies of the alternative fiscal scenario than under current law.

GNP differs from GDP primarily by including the capital income that residents earn from investments abroad and excluding the capital income that nonresidents earn from domestic investments. GNP is a better measure for analyzing the impact of growing deficits and debt on income because projected budget deficits would be partly financed by inflows of capital from other countries that would lead to a future flow of income to those countries.

For a more detailed discussion of CBO’s longer-term estimates of economic effects of fiscal policies, see Congressional Budget Office, *The 2012 Long-Term Budget Outlook* (June 2012), pp. 29–40.
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