I. CALL TO ORDER: 7:16pm
   a. Present: Representatives Ellington, Duran, Malewski, Bahr, Barton, Tariq, Sullivan, Weinreich, Gutierrez, Ma, President Saccone.
   b. Absent:
   c. Excused: Benson

II. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA
    Motion by Barton, seconded by Chris. Approved unanimously.

III. APPROVAL OF THE PREVIOUS MINUTES
     Motion by Julian seconded by Dave M. Approved Unanimously

IV. OFFICER REPORTS
    a. President Phil Saccone - There has been a lot going on this week and we have a very busy agenda so I’ll try to keep this short. The two things that are percolating issue wise are:
       i. RSG gazette went out last week, next one out will have diversity theme, we reached out to student orgs to get their input for events and resources we can promote. We want to do more education of our constituents on these via our listserv. We should brainstorm more ways to get involved on these issues. How do diversity issues affect graduate students uniquely?
       ii. Speak-out Feb 18th 8pm-8am is a planned event on diversity issues to take place in Shapiro. Don’t know CSGs position but we feel positively towards the events and ideas related to these diversity issues being raised them.

V. Budget Presentation
   We are good. If you need to get reimbursed, contact Chuky

VI. COMMITTEE UPDATES
    a. Academic Affairs Committee
       Chris: Planned meetings on VAWA and NDP with faculty, dates on dean lunch coming up.
Phil: Ryne and ___ will be working on student eval issue, Phil updated executive board on our agenda like this and VAWA.

b. Budgetary Committee

No minutes. A lot of apps.

c. Communications Committee

Phil: we sent out email reaching out diversity themed student orgs. Also met with Mark K. from Rackham to talk about it. We can all sign in to website, start cleaning it up everyone. Brainstormed how improve gazette email, plan is brief html with links to more expanded pdf file.

d. Legislative Affairs Committee

SAGE didn’t meet this last week, but next week should have rough drafts of white papers that we plan to present on Capitol Hill.

Comments on Shared Services program across campus. Phil and Malewski describe it but no one has heard of any problems with it impacting students. Weinreich tells us of anecdotal problem of one staff that helps students with their grant being moved to separate area and hours cut back. Phil explains restructuring issue to board. Potential issue for grad students is face time students get with staff that do certain important assistance like grants. Erin suggests getting in touch with schools that have done this before and getting hard data instead of making assumptions. Weinreich, maybe we should get an invited guest to come talk to us about it. Also suggests a student survey for input. Julian thinks silently to himself that this could be a good question for a future newsletter.

e. Student Life Committee

Sidney: have short list of potential bars, plan is for next Thursday for the bar night

VII. NDP RESOLUTION

Phil: remember this is a binding resolution, two reads then public hearing and voting.

Motion: Chris tom, 2nd by Ben S. Approved Unanimously

a. Chris introduces and give background of NDP and describes that there does seem to be some support amongst specific faculty and administrators.

b. Open discussion: Barton: how does this overlap with other parts of things that are covered like sexual harassment rules? Chris: it does overlap, part is covered by sexual harassment rules, but this is not meant to step on the toes of those rules. You are protected from harassment but the reverse, discrimination, is not forbidden. Example it uniquely cover would be discrimination against symbols,
like wearing a collar for BDSM groups, which would be equivalent to wearing a wedding ring for those groups. Barton: only one other NDP protection related to expression, how does this compare? Everything else protects status why does this go further? Chris: full survey of top peer institutions is that this is unique. No point in protecting sexual identity if the actions related to it aren’t protected. Weinreich: reluctance about protecting appearance for example cross dressing at a conference where there is a dress code. Chris: people would still expect to dress according to a dress code so this wouldn’t protect wearing BDSM gear at a conference. Chuky: you mentioned consent, where does consent come in if the expression so public it makes people at work uncomfortable? Is that nonconsensual? Chris: if the clothing is work appropriate (safe in a lab for example) then it would be protected, this is necessary because before it was losing your job vs someone else being uncomfortable now it is still a grey area but you won’t lose your job while it gets resolved by HR.

c. Motion to table till next week:

VIII. VAWA
   a. Weinreich: Introduces VAWA resolution.
   b. Motion to bring before board Ben S, Weinereich approved unanimously
   c. Ben S: worried about push back from faculty right? Phil we expect some yes, some might make issue about how it impinges their academic freedom, but we don’t find that an adequate argument. Weinreich: agrees it isn’t a good argument, this is a safety issue for students and liability for university. Chris: if new faculty joins before law takes effect means it could take decades to come into full effect. David B: we should direct faculty and department heads to follow VAWA in the resolution.

Motion to adjourn Chris, 2nd by Erin.

IX. ADJOURNMENT at 9:11pm.