Rackham Student Government
Board Meeting: December 4, 2013

Agenda

I. Call To Order
II. Approval of Agenda
III. Approval of Previous Minutes
   a. November 20, 2013
IV. Special Guest: Provost Martha Pollack
V. Officer Reports
   a. Graduate Student Body President, Phil
   b. Graduate Student Body Vice President, Kaitlin
   c. Graduate Student Body Treasurer, Chuky
VI. Committee Reports
   a. Academic Affairs
   b. Budgetary
   c. Elections Committee
   d. Legislative Affairs
   e. Student Life
VII. Open Discussion
VIII. Dissolution

Included in packet:
RSG Board Minutes November 20, 2013 (p. 2)
Binding Resolution: Sexual Expression (p. 5)
Preamble for Resolution on Sexual Expression (p. 9)
RACKHAM STUDENT GOVERNMENT  
BOARD MEETING  
11/20/13  
RACKHAM GRADUATE BUILDING  
2ND FLOOR WEST CONFERENCE ROOM, NORTH ALCOVE  
7:11 P.M.

a. **CALL TO ORDER:** 7:11pm

b. **Present:** Kaitlin Flynn, Phil Saccone, David Malewski, Julian Bahr, Michael Benson, David Barton, Ben Sweeney, Ryne Peterson, Yiting Zhang, Erin Sullivan, Krithika

c. **Absent:**

d. **Excused:** Alex Gutierrez, Chris Tom, Mike Hand, Ram Balachandran

II. **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

a. Motion by Ryne and seconded by Ben, approved with no abstentions.

III. **APPROVAL OF THE PREVIOUS MINUTES, 11/13/13**

a. Motion by MB and seconded by Julian with the caveat that some items need to be flushed out in the President’s report and to fix the attendance.

IV. **Public Hearing on Instructor Evaluations**

a. No one here thus far, MB motions to leave the hearing open in case anyone shows up until we get to the second reading on the agenda. Seconded by Ryne and approved unanimously.

V. **OFFICER REPORTS**

a. **President Phil Saccone:** University Council met with campus safety and security this week and crime and fire statistics are available online. Some questions that came up were students traveling late at night in the hospital area. Busses are available and students are offered up to 6 free rides from the local cabs. Kaitlin mentions that traditionally these services must be hailed from libraries on campus and given that the Taubman library is closing that may be an issue. MB mentions that the rides used to be unlimited. Phil is eager to restart public safety town halls with the DPSS to communicate these policies across campus. Elections are kicking off. Some concern about time to preliminary exams has been moved up across many disciplines in Rackham. Rackham/Rackham Executive Board is looking into this, and the issue of candidates being able to take additional classes is tied up in this. The provost Martha Pollack is coming to our meeting in two weeks. No board meeting this week.

b. **Vice President Kaitlin Flynn:** Thanks to everyone who helped out with keeping things running smoothly while I was gone. Nothing much else to report but something interesting that has come up with a group called the Student Union of
Michigan who have written an extensive op/ed in the Daily about Munger and other issues. These students are independent of RSG and GEO. They are hosting a teach-in this Friday. RSG’s position on Munger is closed but if anyone wants to participate in the initiative please do so not under the guise of being an RSG member.

c. **Treasurer Chuky Mbagwu:** financial update coming next week. $28,400 in the account. Please turn in receipts ASAP to Chuky if you have any outstanding charges to be reimbursed for.

VI. **Second Reading of Binding Resolution: Instructor Evaluations**

a. Second reading of the Binding Resolution: motion by Ryne to bring this back on the table and this is seconded by Chuky. Bit of history from Phil on this resolution: the registrar has agreed to be the repository of the student course eval resolution. We would like that instructor evaluations be posted by the third week of the semester. Mike Hand has been meeting with the registrars office to get the ball rolling on this and they are supportive.

b. MB two substantive amendments: remove Brooke as the author, motion by MB and seconded by Ryne, objection by Julian. Julian objects due to the fact that Brooke put a lot of work into the document and may be interested still in signing it. Lots of discussion ensues. Vote: 6-3-3 and the motion carries to take her off. Next amendment: MB is not a huge fan of the last resolved clause. No motion just a comment. Motion to approve with the amendment that has passed. Roll call vote: passes with a vote of 7-1-3.

VII. **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

a. **Legislative Affairs:** Great meeting last week after the board meeting. Ryne would like to officially join the committee. The ACA is rolling out across the country and there are issues with how this will interact with student health insurance and there is a block at the state level for these policies. Committee minutes are included in the packet. MB motions to receive and approve these minutes and this is seconded by DM. Approved unanimously.

b. **COSAC/Student Life:** motion by MB and seconded by BS, approved unanimously. Bowling event this Friday starting at 8pm at colonial lanes.

c. **Academic Affairs:** Spoke mostly about the issues of accessibility to machine shops for engineering students and the expansion of the non-discrimination policy to include the term ‘sexual expression’ in the non-discrimination policy. Motion by KF to receive and approve minutes from last night’s AAC meeting, seconded by MB. Approved unanimously.

d. **Budgetary:** One application just finished up, no new applications.

e. **Elections:** Some minor issues with enrollment lists but those should be fixed now. Two folks in Division II are doing write-in campaigns and another email will go out soon.

VIII. **Collaboration with GEO: Student Survey**

a. How can we contribute questions? What should the focus be? The ideal format is online. MB comments that we should make sure we are getting new data when we
ask questions (make sure different from Rackham’s current survey they send out). MB feels that some of the questions are too focused on the Munger and other vague issues. MB thinks that we should have each committee come up with 4 or 5 things to suggest for the survey to distill out our top priorities for survey questions. KF agrees and thinks we should have clear, defined, explicit questions with a few open-ended questions. RP asks if we could include a question about GSI term limits for Masters students—some Masters students who get GSI positions are more likely to get them in the future. Krithika asks about including career services and what students think are the most important part of developing that. PS supports this and by having questions come out of communities.

IX. Open Discussion: none

X. Adjournment: Motion to adjourn by DM and seconded by BS. Adjourned at 8:12pm.
RESOLUTION TO EXPAND THE UNIVERSITY NON-DISCRIMINATION POLICY

WHEREAS, the Non-Discrimination Policy within the University of Michigan Standard Practice Guide\(^1\) exists to protect the diverse range of individuals employed by and attending the University from discrimination, harassment, and violence; AND

WHEREAS, the Non-Discrimination Policy states that the University “will not discriminate against any individual because of race, color, national origin, age, marital status, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, disability, religion, height, weight, or veteran status\(^1\);” AND

WHEREAS, “gender identity” is generally interpreted to refer to the subject’s self-identity\(^2\); “gender expression” is interpreted to the actions of that individual to actualize their gender identity\(^3\); AND

WHEREAS, the American Psychological Association defines sexual orientation to be “an enduring pattern of emotional, romantic, and/or sexual attractions to men, women, or both sexes\(^4\);” AND

WHEREAS, sexual orientation refers to the subject’s attraction to a person or persons that is the object of an individual’s emotional, romantic, and/or sexual attractions; AND

WHEREAS, University explicitly protects the subject and the object of emotional, romantic, and/or sexual attractions through its Non-Discrimination Policy; AND

WHEREAS, the Non-Discrimination Policy does not explicitly protect the actions between the subject and object of emotional, romantic, and/or sexual

---

\(^1\) University of Michigan Standard Practice Guide (sect. 201.35)

\(^2\) Jackie Simpson, Head of the Spectrum Center, adapted from personal communication on Feb 13\(^{rd}\), 2012.

\(^3\) Dr. Charlie Glickman, Adult Sex Educator in San Francisco, adapted from personal communication March 31\(^{st}\), 2012.

attractions that are the primary means to sexual and physical fulfillment; AND

WHEREAS, “sexual expression” would thus refer to the physical actions an individual does (or does not) take in order to manifest the emotional, romantic, and/or sexual attractions that are themselves manifestations of their sexual orientation; AND

WHEREAS, “sexual expression” is intended to refer to “sexual expression that occurs outside of the workplace” and does not interfere with the Sexual Harassment Policy of the University or other existing policies promoting a safe and healthy work environment; AND

WHEREAS, the Rackham Student Government, on behalf of the graduate student body, voted to amend the section 201.35 of the University of Michigan Standard Practice Guide to include the term “relationship status” in the Non-Discrimination Policy as an alternative to, and inclusive of, “marital status”; AND

WHEREAS, individuals face harassment and discrimination for realizing traditional forms sexual expression; AND

WHEREAS, individuals also face harassment and discrimination for realizing non-traditional forms sexual expression; AND

WHEREAS, stigmatization, harassment, and discrimination can have a significant and detrimental impact on the quality life of the individual; AND

---

5 University of Michigan Standard Practices Guide (sect. 201-89-0)


8 National Coalition for Sexual Freedom, Incident Response Report records

WHEREAS, an individual’s choice to express their sexuality and the manner in which they choose to express it has no significant impact on the quality of work or the professional character of that individual;¹⁰ AND

WHEREAS, no explicit language currently exist in the Non-Discrimination Policies of the University of Michigan or any peer institution to protect of sexual expression from harassment and discrimination;¹¹ AND

WHEREAS, without explicit protection from discrimination, there may be the threat of implicitly sanctioned discrimination; violence and related hate crimes can accompany the lack of explicit protection.¹²

NOW ON BEHALF OF THE STUDENT BODY OF THE HORACE H. RACKHAM GRADUATE SCHOOL, BE IT

RESOLVED, that the section 201.35 of the Standard Practice Guide of the University of Michigan be amended as follows (without emphasis):

“The University, in its employment and human resource policy and practices, will not discriminate against any individual because of race, color, national origin, age, marital status, relationship status,¹³ sex, sexual orientation, sexual expression, gender identity, gender expression, disability, religion, height, weight, or veteran status, except as allowed by the need for bona fide occupational qualification. Reasonable accommodation will also be provided to persons with disabilities, to disabled veterans, and to accommodate religious practices;” AND BE IT FINALLY

RESOLVED, that the President of the graduate student body is empowered and directed to work with the Administration of the University of Michigan to put into place policies that reflect the will and intent of this resolution.

AUTHOR


¹¹ As surveyed in the US News and World Report (top 20 institutions), members of the Association of American Universities, and University of Michigan commonly held peer institutions.

¹² Rebecca Stotzer, PhD. Comparison of hate crime rates across protected and unprotected groups. Williams Institute, UCLA School of Law. June 2007.

¹³ Included by decree of Board Resolution W-12-01
Christopher Tuck Mung Baker Tom
Representative (Division 1), Rackham Student Government
Chair, Academic Affairs Committee

ATTEST

By Signing below, I certify the this resolution was dispatched by the RSG Board under the rules as prescribed in section IX of the bylaws and that the vote count appearing at the top of this resolution is accurate.

____________________________________
Kaitlin Flynn
Vice President, Rackham Student Government

PRESIDENTIAL ACTION

I, Phillip Saccone, President of the Rackham Student Body, do hereby approve / veto this resolution on this the _______ day of _____, 2013.

____________________________________
Phillip Saccone
President, Rackham Graduate Student Body
Preamble to Board Resolution F-13-xx: Expansion of the Non-Discrimination Policy

Currently, sexual orientation, but not sexual expression, is protected under the Non-discrimination Policy (NDP). Sexual expression is defined as the actions that an individual does, or does not, take to realize and manifest physical, emotional, or romantic attraction. This is strikingly similar to the already protected gender expression clause in section 201.35 of the University of Michigan Standard Practice Guide (Non-Discrimination Policy, or NDP). The University of Michigan protects individuals from discrimination based on their gender identity as well as the actions that express that identity (e.g., the way that an individual dresses, speaks, the pronouns they use for themselves).

We herein present a brief rationale for the inclusion of the phrase ‘sexual expression’ into the NDP to protect individuals from discrimination based on the expression of their sexual orientation.

The following arguments should be made to determine whether a particular attribute should be protected under an institutional NDP:

1. Provide evidence that discrimination and harassment exists for a given attribute; and
2. Provide evidence that this discrimination and harassment negatively impacts the individual; and
3. Provide evidence that this attribute does not adversely affect an individual’s professional capabilities and their occupational qualification; and
4. Provide evidence that these are uncovered and unprotected by current policies.

Below are examples of harassment & discrimination situations, which address these criteria:1

1. An assistant professor with a good funding and publication record is denied tenure. It is rumored that they engage in BDSM.2
2. A graduate student who is the second author on a seminal paper is chosen to go to a prestigious conference over the graduate student who is the first-author. The first-author is collared.3
3. One graduate student takes their partner to a departmental holiday party. Another graduate student takes their partner to the same holiday party. The second graduate student is later reprimanded by the department chair for inappropriate behavior.
4. "Photos of me from a [party] got out in the internet. People from the university found it and send it to organizations at the university. It ended up with people stopped talking to me and talking shit behind my back. It got so bad I quit my studying at the school."
5. A staff member overhears a conversation about how an employee, who is married, kissed another person. The position is later terminated without notice.
6. An individual goes for a routine medical checkup, at which point bruises are revealed. After explaining that it was from consensual sexual encounters, medical attention was denied and "the doctor ask me to find a new doctor once my sexual lifestyle was discussed."

---

1 Examples in quotes are excerpts from the National Coalition for Sexual Freedom’s Second National Survey of Violence & Discrimination Against Sexual Minorities.
2 “Bondage, Dominance, Submission/Sadomasochism”
3 A traditional symbol of long-term relationships and commitment in BDSM, much like a wedding ring.
It should be noted that discrimination occurs for individuals expressing traditional as well as non-traditional sexual identities. Including “sexual expression” in the NDP is intended to protect both sexual majorities and minorities.

Further for the existence of discrimination comes from so-called ‘closeting,’ or extreme measures taken to restrict the knowledge of their identity and actions from others. Such closeting has a long history in the LGBTQ community, and derives from the fear of professional, personal, and corporeal repercussions of being open and ‘out.’ A number of individuals at the University of Michigan at the undergraduate, graduate, staff, and faculty level are extremely closeted regarding their modes of sexual expression. Since by all reasonable metrics most of these individuals are successful researchers, teaches, professors, and students, their identity does not affect their professional or academic capabilities.

The Sexual Harassment Policy of the University covers many harassment situations; however, discussion with the Director of the Office of Institutional Equity has highlighted discrimination scenarios for relationship status and sexual expression that would be unprotected by the NDP or the Sexual Harassment Policy.

In closing, we strongly believe that this Resolution is in the spirit of the current NDP, but adds protection to marginalized individuals. Of over seventy universities and institutions of higher learning surveyed, this is the first time that words to this effect would appear. As the last clause of the Resolution states: “without explicit protection from discrimination, there may be the threat of implicitly sanctioned discrimination.” Let us, the Rackham Student Government of the University of Michigan set the precedence of tolerance.

---

4 Including all AAU institutions, US News and World Report’s top 20, selected liberal arts colleges, and traditionally conservative universities.