I. **CALL TO ORDER:** 6:18pm

   a. **Present:** Representatives Matt G, Associate Rep Lu T, David M, Katie F, Associate Rep Caitlin H, David B, A Buke H, Brandon P, Nate H, President Saccone, Vice President Mbagwu, Treasurer Rodriguez

   b. **Absent:**

   c. **Excused:**

II. **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

    Motion by Abneris, seconded by David M. Approved Unanimously.

III. **Guest: Katy Holland, PhD Candidate, Psychology re: sexual assault survey**

    Katy: I’d like to give a bit of background for this survey. Current federal law requires all institutions to tackle sexual assault. The AAU then took on this project and made a push for these campus surveys. The issue with the survey is that it has not been studied or peer reviewed and this brings up a number of problems. Many AAU schools as a result have chosen not to disseminate the survey.

    I’m here to talk to you guys and top administrators to address the risks and answer questions about what will be done with the survey, how it is being disseminated, etc.

    One of the concerns we had is that some of the designers of the survey was… Secondly, they did not release the survey beforehand so institutions could not individually vet the questions/surveys. Third, they are not using verifiable metrics and it is important to get accurate results if these surveys will shape policy. Fourth, the word “sexual assault” is located on each page of the survey, which violates one of the biggest best practices regarding sexual assault. The survey format was somewhat confusing for takers. There was also responses saying that the survey triggered responses in assault survivors, etc. We felt that the students could have been more adequately prepared for this survey in why the questions were as targeted as they were, anonymity, and what would be done with the data. Another thing is that it was not approved by UM’s IRB, and this is something that should be done if it is intended to shape forthcoming policy.

    Lastly, the AAU was not clear on how they would distribute the survey results. They mentioned that the data would be given to the individual schools, but this was not properly or clearly communicated.
Myself and other students in the department of psychology have addressed an open letter explaining these issues and we are hoping to get some traction on them.

Phil: McCaskill bill. The response was mostly that there cannot be a one-size-fits-all federal response and that states/universities must handle it on that level.

This survey is not a bad effort, in and of itself. But, the pressure has built up such that it has become difficult for universities to opt out of this or similar surveys by virtue of being perceived as insensitive, etc. The purpose is to get some “reliable” data before anything (potentially federally) is put into law. I have put this on the agenda for our national organization SAGE conference call this Sunday.

Michael: We could help facilitate a meeting with the administration that would be taken seriously. That said, I agree that how it was rolled out could have been better, but I’d like to know what you’re looking for (as an ask).

Phil: What are you hoping to get out of a meeting with administration?

Katy: We want to know when we would be getting the data, and plans about what would be done with the data (with emphasis on the quality, or lack thereof, of the data), and also what future next steps would be. We don’t want this survey to be a “one and done.”

Phil: I’m finding that there is a trend of the publication of raw data such that people can do their independent analyses.

Katy: Please let me know if you have any further questions, etc. Thank you for having me!

:::Guest exits. Deliberation:::

Phil: I think that while it is a good issue, without having consulted with our peer institutions, doing our research and due diligence, I don’t think we can sign onto the letter in its current form. RSG has been good about not being reactionary to items so we will take this delicately. I absolute do believe that we can and will do what I can to put them in front of some adminstrators.

Matt G: I think the format, without a doubt, needs to change. The tone as well was seems a bit too strong or forward.

Buke: I agree with Matt on both points. I also think that the IP address tracking, etc may be fine to keep in there.
David B: I think the format needs to be more focused in the form of a specific ask. The document essentially comes down to a list of what is wrong with the survey. Perhaps instead add that as an attachment and take a different approach.

Michael B: Unless there are major revisions, I don’t think we should support it the way it is. In the discussion, what was in the document and what Katy said was the “ask” were very different. I agree that the focus should now be more on the future use of the survey since it has already been sent out (not trying to derail the current process). Secondly, anything that we support or draft should have facts and citations. There aren’t a lot of verifiable data in the document.

Katie: If Katy or their group wants to be a resource for data for the president’s office, they should be explicit about it.

David M: They may run into an issue where with their bullet points and hyper-specific survey style problems may go over the head over their intended audience. In concordance with what Michael said, if there really is an egregious problem causing survivor triggering then it would be good for us to intervene.

Phil: It is rare that we get graduate students with certain expertise to come and talk about this issue, and it is our job to then hone down the ask, determine next steps and get them in front of the right people, etc. I will follow up with them. For now we will leave our specific endorsement off the table. Good discussion everyone.

IV. APPROVAL OF THE PREVIOUS MINUTES
Motion to approve by Kyle, seconded by Michael B. Approved unanimously.

V. OFFICER REPORTS
   a. President Phillip Saccone
      This is my final meeting with all of you. I have loved every moment I’ve spent on RSG, it’s made all of graduate school much more manageable. I’m thrilled with the service we’ve been able to provide for the grad student body over the past 5-6 years. Before this there had never really been a concerted voice for grad students. During my time I’ve glad to have worked on pushing through instructor evaluations, Munger housing, sexual expression, etc.

      We have been improving our relations with administration. We have a new dean, and been in touch with the president’s office. A couple big issues I think are on the table for RSG are faculty/mentor evaluations and grad student/alumni relations, particularly in the sector of professional development services. Chuky and Abneris will be taking over on May 6th, and I’ll be helping transition.
I am very pleased to report that this semester, after working together with GSS in increasing the budget, we have been dutiful in funding students and have given it almost all away. This provides a good case for us regarding independence.

b. Vice President Chuky Mbagwu

c. Treasurer
   Abneris: I want to echo Chuky’s comment that we’ll miss Phil. I have enjoyed my time as RSG Treasurer, though not as much as being a rep. It’s a big position and I am happy and ready to hand it off. Please contact myself or Chuky if you are interested in serving the position. Due to the transition, the execs will appoint a new Treasurer come the spring term.

VI. COMMITTEE UPDATES
   a. Academic Affairs Committee
   b. Budgetary Committee

   Motion to approve to by Abneris, seconded by Michael B. Approved unanimously.

c. Elections Committee

d. Legislative Affairs Committee
   SAGE
   Phil: We met with many of our peer institutions on the Hill. There is a transition of leadership at SAGE, I am ending my term as Vice Chair and Chuky is the new legislative director.

   The Michigan delegation did very well this year, we visited 13 of the 16 offices. Far ahead of the other peer schools (Go Blue!).

   Abneris: It was a really fun time, if you have the chance to go next year I would recommend!

   Michael B: If you are interested, the RSG president selects the delegation so make sure to show interest and be involved in LAC. The meeting following the Board will be covering many topics, including a newsletter to our Michigan delegation in DC.

   Phil: These trips are crucial for our representation on campus and federally. RSG was requested to contribute for a UM panel hosted by Senator Deb Dingle to get feedback on student debt issues, etc.

e. Student Life Committee
i. Community Outreach & Social Action subcommittee

VII. OPEN DISCUSSION

Motion by Michael that the meeting be adjourned and the Winter 2015 Board be dissolved on 11:59pm of May 5th. Seconded by Kyle. Approved unanimously.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT at X:XXpm.