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

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

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

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

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

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

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

12. **Motion to adjourn by Ben and seconded by Kaitlin.**