Rackham Student Government
Board Meeting: November 6, 2013

Agenda

I. Call To Order
II. Approval of Agenda
III. Approval of Previous Minutes
   a. October 23, 2013
IV. Guest Speaker: Laura Patterson, Chief Information Officer (CIO), UM
V. Officer Reports
   a. Graduate Student Body President, Phil
   b. Graduate Student Body Vice President, Kaitlin
      i. Newsletter
      ii. Website update
   c. Graduate Student Body Treasurer, Chuky
VI. First Read: Binding Resolution on Instructor Reports
VII. Committee Reports
   a. Academic Affairs
      i. Lunch with the Deans
      ii. Chris non-discrim. Policy update
   b. Budgetary
   c. Legislative Affairs
      i. SAGE Review
      ii. Leasing forum review
   d. Student Life
      i. Pistons game volunteers
      ii. Bowling
VIII. Open Discussion
IX. Adjournment

Included in packet:
RSG Board Minutes October 23, 2013 (p. 2)
Resolution: Instructor Evaluations (p. 5)
AAC Minutes 10/29/13 (p. 7)
BC Minutes: Electronic meetings between 9/27/13 and 11/04/13 (p. 9)
SLC Minutes 10/16/13 (p. 18)
RACKHAM STUDENT GOVERNMENT
BOARD MEETING
10/23/13
RACKHAM GRADUATE BUILDING
2ND FLOOR WEST CONFERENCE ROOM, NORTH ALCOVE
7:07 P.M.

a. CALL TO ORDER: 7:07pm

b. Present: Kaitlin Flynn, Phil Saccone, David Malewski, Julian Bahr, Michael Benson, Mike Hand, Chris Tom, Michael Benson, David Barton, Ryan Roberts, Yiting Zhang, Erin Sullivan, Ram Balachandran

c. Absent: Krithika

d. Excused:

II. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

a. Motion by MB and seconded by DM, approved with one abstention.

III. APPROVAL OF THE PREVIOUS MINUTES, 10/16/13

a. MB moves to postpone approval of the minutes until next week when MB will have time to complete them. Seconded by KF. Approved unanimously.

IV. OFFICER REPORTS

a. President Phil Saccone: Welcome and thank you all for attending. Lots of events going on in the next few weeks, including lunch with the deans and all members are required to attend one or both events. Next Wednesday will be the lease-signing forum which is mandatory for all representatives. Board meeting will not happen next week, but the lease-signing forum will be happening. SAGE fall summit is coming up next weekend and it should be a great meeting. Kaitlin and Phil have been involved in conversations about career development and professional development tools. Phil is also going to be meeting with the president of GEO to discuss how our groups can work together. November 4, Laura Patterson will be here to visit the board and discuss disability accessibility for the Google suite of products. On December 4 the provost will be visiting the board.

b. Vice President Kaitlin Flynn: Apologies for not being able to be here last week. Kaitlin will be gone for the next three weeks out of the country. The communications committee will be taking care of the communications business while she is gone. Kaitlin is also taking over the reigns to complete the website and is meeting with the developer on Friday.

c. Treasurer Chuky Mbagwu:

V. Guest Speaker: Ben Alterman, Program for Survivors of Sexual Abuse
a. Ben is a CSG representative for Rackham and is here to present his cause and ask for RSG’s support. A resolution will be presented to the board at a later date. Ben starts by giving background on the issue of survivors of sexual abuse. He shares numbers and statistics suggesting that with current trends, up to 20% of the Rackham student population could be survivors of sexual assault or abuse, both male and female. Ben feels that there are a number of campaigns and initiatives to create safe spaces for female survivors. But he feels that a considerable effort must be made to create similar spaces for male survivors of sexual assault. One way to do this is through the MaleSurvivor project. A wide array of groups and departments on campus are coming together to raise awareness and create a safe space for male survivors on campus. The project is funded on pilot grants for the next semester to create a space on campus facilitated by licensed therapists for male survivors to come together and share their experiences. He is asking for our support with this program. Ben is also asking for short-term support for a panel and documentary screening to happen on November 21.

b. Questions from the board: MB: why November 21, and what support are you looking for from RSG? BA: November 21 was chosen for the speaker’s availability. A lot of what we can do to help with this event is to support the event and promote it as much as possible. KF: can you explain how SAPAC does not provide for this community? Where would this space be located? BA: SAPAC has a peer-led support group that is run by undergraduates and does not have a consistent attendance and the environment fluctuates. This also is difficult because commonly men begin to deal with these issues at an older age and they may feel uncomfortable coming into these situations. CAPS in the past has led these groups but they have been somewhat unsuccessful. BA: location cannot be disclosed as it could affect confidentiality but it will be located on campus and under liability. CT: are you hoping that the resolution that passed in CSG would be similar to RSG? BA: somewhat, but we will not be asking for money but the resolved clauses will likely be similar. Tabled discussion until further information is provided.

VI. Elections Committee Appointments

a. Elections coming up November 20-23. The elections committee needs to be appointed. The committee slate is: Benson, Phil, David Barton, Kirithika, motion by Julian and seconded by MH. Approved with 4 abstentions.

VII. Graduate Student Bill of Rights and Responsibilities

a. Debate for 10 minutes or so to discuss the Bill of Rights and Responsibilities. The general strategy is to approach this by either presenting the document as a bill of rights or as a best practices document. There is something to be said for certain right we believe are inalienable and to push for recognition of that. But we also want to work with the administration and not fight them too much on issues. The current plan is to tweak the current Bill of Rights to fit a less aggressive tone. The other document, the best practices document, will start being created and then we will begin to lobby for votes and discuss with faculty members. Without getting into strategy we just want to debate the document itself.
b. Comments from the board: RR: regarding point 16, guarantees the right to join open organizations. What about those organizations that are exclusionary or the number of organizations? Why is that important? BS: I’ve known students who’s mentors say that they are not allowed to join clubs. RR and BS agree: The language needs to be clarified. Brooke: how will we enforce these across a wide range of programs? She feels that a best practices document is more appropriate and realistic given our goals. MB: the administration still supports the idea in theory but the document and the specifics need to be worked out if we are to change from the approved version from March 2012. MB thinks it makes sense to continue to pursue this on two fronts. BP guide is the pragmatic approach but it makes sense to follow along with our other SAGE institutions and put together at minimum a draft for proposed enforcement plans. PS: there’s nothing lost to approach members of the REB with a Bill of Rights type of document and see what they say. There are more things in the BOR that are enforceable than those that are not enforceable. JB just to be clear one of these pie in the sky one pragmatic. PS shouldn’t be so clear the difference, we need to have two options at once in case one doesn’t have enough support. MH agrees, don’t want the perfect to be enemy of the good. Ram: what is the motivation behind right 8 (protecting faculty from discussing students’ progress with other students). KF explains. Ram understands but also doesn’t want to restrict the faculty member’s ability to speak. PS: the Supreme Court already protects against some of these issues. CT: points out contentious issue with the language. MB: gives further legislative background. Ram: if these issues are already protected by the federal court, he doesn’t see the need for proposing a restriction on the faculty and worries that might be harmful in the future for student-faculty relations. PS: agrees language is unclear. DB: feels that some of this is unreasonable as we won’t be able to police all discussion. Some of this needs to be more concrete and clarified. JB: doesn’t feel this needs to be more specific as we can leave it vague and up for interpretation by the governing bodies. PS: clarifies two documents again. KF: vague rights were vague when we initially planned to have a separate committee enforcing these rights. CT: we can replace BOR with something that is less confrontational in title. BH: there should be some sort of agency that can and will enforce these rights. RR: questions the logic behind releasing rights and responsibilities at the same time. He also feels that the language is way more important than the spirit of the document.

VIII. Potential Ballot Questions
   a. We have an opportunity to poll the student body in a way that we wouldn’t ordinarily. If there are questions that are better suited for surveying at this level during elections. We are past the deadline for binding questions.

IX. COMMITTEE REPORTS
   a. Legislative Affairs: committee had a good meeting this evening. Leasing forum is next week and all board members are required to attend. We really need help to continue to advertise. Another email will be going out shortly that will be a reminder for the event and including a link to a google form. The amphitheatre
can hold 220 people. Please continue to get the word out. Also in the process of getting information about how the sequester has affected the university and the Budget Control Act.

b. **COSAC/Student Life:** minutes next week. Halloween event coming up Sunday, pistons ticket sales and other events coming down the pipeline.

c. **Academic Affairs:** Lunch with the Deans next Tuesday and Thursday. Publications going out here. Course bank evaluation going back to AAC for edits next week.

d. **Budgetary:** skip

X. **Open Discussion:** none

XI. **Adjournment:** Motion to adjourn by MH and seconded by MB.
A RESOLUTION TO MAKE INSTRUCTOR REPORTS AVAILABLE TO STUDENTS

WHEREAS, voluntary course evaluations are provided by the students at both undergraduate and graduate levels\(^1\); AND

WHEREAS, these individual course evaluations are consolidated into Instructor Reports by the Office of Registrar\(^2\); \(^3\); AND

WHEREAS, these Instructor Reports are currently available only to instructors and departments\(^4\); AND

WHEREAS, the availability of these Instructor Reports to students would enable them to make more informed decisions about crediting courses, especially those from other schools and departments; AND

WHEREAS, the university-wide accessibility to Instructor Reports would motivate the students to provide thoughtful evaluations; NOW ON BEHALF OF THE STUDENT BODY OF THE HORACE H. RACKHAM GRADUATE SCHOOL, BE IT

RESOLVED, the Office of the Registrar, in conjunction with the Rackham Student Government, institutes a policy to ensure that the Instructor Reports are available to all students; AND BE IT FURTHER

RESOLVED, following the adoption of this policy, the Office of the Registrar would communicate this policy to all enrolled students prior to the third week of each academic term; AND BE IT FINALLY

RESOLVED, the compiled Instructor Reports shall be both hosted and disseminated by the Office of the Registrar to ensure accuracy, integrity, security and sustained

---

\(^1\) [http://www.ro.umich.edu/evals](http://www.ro.umich.edu/evals)
\(^2\) [http://www.ro.umich.edu/evals/#FS_Report_Types](http://www.ro.umich.edu/evals/#FS_Report_Types)
\(^3\) [http://www.ro.umich.edu/evals/Instructor%20Report.pdf](http://www.ro.umich.edu/evals/Instructor%20Report.pdf)
\(^4\) [http://www.ro.umich.edu/evals/CU_TE_TeachingEvals_QR.pdf](http://www.ro.umich.edu/evals/CU_TE_TeachingEvals_QR.pdf)
availability of the Instructor reports.

**AUTHORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Janakiraman Balachandran</th>
<th>Brooke Horton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representative, Division 2</td>
<td>Representative, Division 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Academic Affairs Committee</td>
<td>Member, Academic Affairs Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rackham Student Government</td>
<td>Rackham Student Government</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Julian Bahr</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representative, Division 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Academic Affairs Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rackham Student Government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ATTEST**

By Signing below, I certify 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 A. 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
I. CALL TO ORDER: 7:01 pm

II. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS

Members: Chris Tom, Brooke Horton, Phil Saccone, Janakiraman Balachandran, Alexander Gutierrez, Kaitlin Flynn, Erin Sullivan, Julian Bahr

Present: Brooke Horton, Phil Saccone, Alexander Gutierrez, Erin Sullivan, Julian Bahr

Excused: Chris Tom, Janakiraman Balachandran, Kaitlin Flynn

Unexcused:

III. OUTSTANDING ACTION ITEMS

a. [Phil] action plan for Best Practices document (attachment 1)
   Completed
b. [Chris] Legal advice for Non-discrimination policy expansion
   Chris was referred to the Title IX coordinator
c. [Alex] JoVE survey creation and distribution
   Survey created. To be included in next newsletter tentatively scheduled for Monday
d. [Ram] Edits to instructor evaluation bank resolution
   Work in progress
e. [Julian] Questions to the deans for the forum & status of RSVPs
   Worked out well today for Central Campus with a turnout of over 40 people despite email issues. Julian to order food for North Campus lunch.
f. [Brooke] In progress resolutions removed from website.
   Completed
g. [Brooke] Check on progress on women’s forum event
   Tentatively postponed to next semester (Winter)
h. [Everyone] fill out leadership survey
   Completed

IV. INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION RESOLUTION EDITS

a. Revisit board comments (attachment 2)
b. Go over edits (attachment 3): More changes need to be incorporated from the board votes. Need to change “must” to “shall”. Strike, due to redundancy, the second half of first resolved clause “except as it serves…”
c. Discussion and vote to send to board: Ram needs to make changes as above and according to previous board votes. Vote to send to board will occur at a later time (possibly online).
V. DEPARTMENT-ONLY TRAINING

a. **Introduction from Alex:** Machine shop training largely restricted to ME students and undergraduate student projects. Many grad students, particularly in EECS, need access to machine shops for help in research. Training is necessary to access machine shops. LSA Student Shop is currently the only place for all students to get trained, but wait list is months long. Only other option is off-campus private machine shops. North Campus has plenty of physical resources, but currently restricted as previously mentioned.
   i. Related issues of resources being restricted to departments also exist such as software licensing. Listen to constituents for potential future projects.

b. **Next steps:** Alex is meeting with Michael Folts of LSA Student Shop this Friday and Michael Benson, whenever he finds him, to learn more about the cause of the issue.

VI. OPEN ACCESS IN PROGRESS DOCUMENTS

a. **Discussion on value and responsible execution:** Could possibly host an online open forum for feedback on documents. On the website we could post some information about a working document and post the actual language after second reading. Short summary about the purpose of the document and a comment box for public feedback.

b. **Vote on uploading in progress documents:** No vote.

VII. LEADERSHIP & AAC IMPROVEMENTS (attachment 4)

a. **The good:** Autonomy & project ownership, strong organization, timeliness & clarity.

b. **The less good:** Too much concentrated authority, inability to gracefully accept criticism, committee members want more of a voice.

c. **The suggestions:** Documents saved in a format for lexicographical ordering, preservation of institutional memory via better documentation of events and contacts. Brooke should be less intense with people of a different opinion.

d. **Discussion:** None.

VIII. OPEN DISCUSSION

a. Phil reminds committee members to be more open and creative in looking for issues to address.

b. Phil discusses issues not covered consistently across all departments. These areas will be topic of next meeting regarding how to write into the best practices document.

IX. ADJOURNMENT: 8:04 pm

X. ACTION ITEMS

a. [Chris] Meet with Title IX coordinator

b. [Alex/Julian] Make sure newsletter is sent and keep track of responses

c. [Ram] Make further changes to instructor evaluation resolution

d. [Julian] Order food for North Campus LwtD (committee should consider better acronym)

e. [Alex] Meet with Michael Folts of LSA Student Shop and Michael Benson

f. [Alex] Make action plan for machine shop training project

g. [Phil/Julian] Make sure comment box and related ideas get pushed to new website
I. CALL TO ORDER:
   a. Present: Yiting Zhang, Treasurer Chuky Mbagwu, President Phillip Saccone, Vice President Kaitlin Flynn, David Malewski, Ryne Peterson, Ryan Roberts
   b. Absent:
   c. Excused:

FCF Harvest Festival

Call To Order: September 27, 2013.

Chuky: The current funding application is for the Friends of the Campus Farm (FCF) Harvest Festival. It is an event where students from UM and people of Ann Arbor gather at the farm site, enjoy food, music, and learn about campus initiatives for sustainable food and farming, etc. The event site requires transportation, and the bulk of their funding request is for travel costs (the rest for advertisement). They reported an attendance of ~150 graduate students last year from a wide range of disciplines, and have a relatively large outreach. However, the event takes place at an off-site location which is typically a drawback for application. I think that supporting this organization and event in the range of ~$400 is reasonable.

Yiting: This events sounds fun and the number of attendance of our graduate student last year sounds good (~150). However, this event charges / requires people donate (~$8-$10/person), which will help them cover $2000-$2500 total cost. Meanwhile, they are also applying $4800 from other funding agency. So I do believe they will get enough money to cover this event. I may want to funding around $200 to show our support and cover partial of the blue bus rental + RSG advertise to let the whole student body get a chance to participate.

Ryne: Is 900 on China normal? It seems a little high to me, especially for a sustainability event. Other than this concern the 200-400 range seems appropriate to me. I also agree that RSG advertise the event to cut down some of the paper flyer costs.

David: Renting the china they intend to use is more sustainable than paperware, but I also agree that $900 appears a bit exorbitant.

I'm more amenable to covering the expense for the transportation at around the $200 to $400 level.

Kaitlin: I agree that the application and event seems solid. I support funding at a level of 200-400 as others have mentioned.
Ryan: I concur that the China bit seems excessive. I support funding in the 200-400 level as well.

Kaitlin: i'll make a **motion to fund at $300**.

Ryan: **Seconded**.

**VOTE**

Yes to $300: Kaitlin, Ryne, Yiting, Ryan, David
No: 0
Abstentions: Phil

*Motion carries for funding at a level of $300.*

**ADJOURNMENT** September 30, 2013.
**SPIC MACAY Nrithya Samarchita Event**

**Call To Order:** October 16, 2013.

Chuky: At our last budgetary meeting we already reviewed, discussed, and voted to fund SPIC MACAY’s cultural event at the **level of $350**. They reached out to me last week requesting that their application be reviewed again, given that they are now incurring additional unexpected expenses.

They submitted a new application with the added expenses (attached). The only difference from the previous application are the costs of the sound and light technician ($400). Please quickly review it and discuss if this affects your decision on funding level - I will entertain any new motions for additional funding.

Kaitlin: If anything I would consider giving them $50 more, but they should go back to CSG who has way more money than we do and also funded them much lower than their requested.

David: I concur with Kaitlin.

Phil: Yeah, I agree too. Plus we offered to give them space in Rackham but they were unwilling/couldn't move the event. I think it would have created more issues.

Chuky: If there are any motions for additional funding please do so. Otherwise, I will be closing the discussion for additional funding tonight and SPIC MACAY will be notified of their original award of $350.

Phil: I'll **motion for another $50** in funding to help cover room costs. I would also suggest that the Chair offer counsel on other sources of funding (i.e. CSG).

David: **Second**.

**VOTE**

Yes to $50, for a total of $400 in funding: David, Phil, Kaitlin, Ryan
No, for a total of $350 in funding: 0
Abstentions: Yiting, Ryne

**Motion carries for funding at a level of $400.**

**ADJOURNMENT** October 18, 2013.
**FEMMES Capstone Event**

**Call To Order:** October 18, 2013.

Chuky: Please review the attached application for the FEMMES Capstone Event. They are an organization aimed at improving accessibility and increasing interest in STEM to elementary/middle school girls. The organization consists of 100 members with over half being graduate students. For this event they are targeting and expecting 80-100 student volunteers, with ~50+ being graduate students (with past similar events). The event takes place on campus, and they plan to bus students from the surrounding schools to UMichigan.

This event is typically something that RSG supports, and historically we have funded them strongly for similar events. While they did not include a ranking for cost categories, I would consider funding at least enough to cover transportation.

Kaitlin: This is an organization I participate in so I'll abstain from discussion. I support these efforts, think they're for a good cause and generally place this event in with other "outreach/science education" events such as BrainsRule.

Phil: This is a great organization and I'm generally supportive of this event. Chuky, I would really like to see them rank their requests given the large sum of money that they're requesting. There are certain things I feel much more comfortable supporting then others. Can you email them and get back to us?

Chuky: Attached is the updated application with their rankings included. They feel the most important items to fund are the student travel, food, and T-shirts (in that order).

Yiting: This event looks great. I would like to fund the transportation. On the other hand, I remember this society applied several events during this year (correct me if I am wrong), by consider funding student groups more diversely. I may not want to fund food and T-shirt.

Phil: Thank you Chuky for following up with them. I am the least supportive of funding the t-shirts. I would be willing to fund the transportation and the food to the tune of around $400 or so when the time comes. That is around the level we have supported them in the past.

Ryne: Do we know what we funded them for last year?

Chuky: Last term, for a similar event, RSG funded them $400. Phil may be able to speak on any events earlier than that.

David: I'm fine with funding them $400 whenever the motion is made.

Phil: In the winter we gave them $400. I wasn't treasurer before then, we can delve back even further if people like.

David: **Motion to fund at $400 level.**
Phil: Seconded.

VOTE

Yes to $400: Phil, Yiting, Ryan, Ryne, David
No: 0
Abstentions: Kaitlin

Motion carries for funding at a level of $400.

ADJOURNMENT October 21, 2013.
Engineering Graduate Symposium (EGS)

Call To Order: October 22, 2013.

Chuky: The attached application is for the Engineering Graduate Symposium (EGS), an event for graduate students in the College of Engineering (CoE) to present their current or past research in various poster sessions. This event typically has a draw of 300-400 graduate students, though the organizers have approached me saying that they are experiencing a record number of abstract/poster submissions. This is in part due to new initiatives and workshops they began this year to increase outreach and turnout.

The funds requested are for supplying food for their awards dinner. I think this event falls in line with RSG's funding guidelines for support, and I think we benefit greatly from being advertised as a sponsor at an event with large constituency turnout. The application is very well done and detailed, and the organizers have been diligent in approaching me with further details and requests for information. CoE is part of Division 2, RSG's largest division, and the majority (if not all) participants are Rackham students. Last year, RSG funded the EGS at $500.

Kaitlin: I echo Chuky's thoughts. This is the premier event for our division II students, is academic in focus, is entirely/primarily Rackham students and basically fits all of our funding criteria. I support funding them highly.

Yiting: I support Kaitlin's idea. It's a big event for north campus people and almost every PhD student in engineering participate.

Phil: Given that the relative "restriction" (for lack of a better word) on food items have been removed form the bylaws, I would consider funding the event at a slightly higher level compared to the previous years. I agree with the other discussants; our funding criteria are well met by this application.

Phil: I will motion to fund this event at $650.

David: Second $650.

Kaitlin: Motion to fund for $800 given size, focus and scope of event. is there a second?

Yiting: Second Kaitlin's motion.

VOTE

Yes to $800: Kaitlin, Ryan, Yiting, Ryne, Phil, David
Yes to $650: 0
No: 0
Abstentions:

Motion carries for funding at a level of $400.
ADJOURNMENT October 23, 2013.
Chuky: The funding application on the table is for the Fraker Conference, an on-campus conference held and organized largely by the Department of Romance Languages and Literature. Keynote speakers are brought in to give presentations on various topics, and other presentations and workshops are also part of the 3-day conference. There is an expected participation of 150-175 graduate students. This is a large event with high expenses, and they have applied for an been granted some funding from other sources as well. The second attachment has a detailed breakdown of their budget for the entire conference. I would be in favor of supporting this event in the $300-400 range, towards speaker honorarium and travel/lodging.

David: Their application has some inconsistencies in comparison to their budget. The app says they are not planning on anything more than coffee, yet they have planned for 100 meals each for breakfast, lunch, and dinner. The app also says they fundraise for this event, but does not account for their anticipated fundraising total. Their total requested is $7k+, yet they have only been granted $3,800 so far, that's over $3k that they'll need to make up. Also, they indicated that if their funding is not enough then they will "pay out of pocket" which seems to roughly translate to them charging admission or something of that ilk.

Chuky: I want to bring our attention back to this application, as I have received the additional information we requested that was not clear from their initial application.

1) They are formally requesting $500 of funding from RSG
2) Their funding priorities are: honorarium/speaker costs, then publicity and advertising, in that order.
3) In response to our inquiry about how the plan to achieve their high funding goal: "In regards to your second question, this proposed budget is very much in line with budgets we have drafted for this conference previously. Fortunately, in years past we have been very well supported by the Rackham Graduate School, LS&A, our home department RLL and other humanities departments. We anticipate the same level of support this year as our speakers have already generated a great deal of interest in the humanities academic community."

David: We can up the amount that we grant them by maybe a $100 - $150 now that they specifically designated what they would want the funds to cover. I'm still a bit concerned about their under-reporting of how much they intend to spend on food and whether they're willing to cut that out of the budget, or if they are going to charge registration fees to make up the difference. At this point, though, that's more their business than ours since they are not asking us to fund any part of their event that goes against our usual funding.

Phil: After reviewing the application a second time, I am inclined to support this conference in full. I agree with Dave that certain aspects of their budget leave some questions unanswered. However, I do not necessarily believe that they will charge students for participation-- Chuky, perhaps we can get some clarification on this? Even so, the items that they are asking us to fund are entirely reasonable: honoraria and advertising. Given that the conference has accepted abstracts from across the country I think it is safe to assume that the event will enjoy strong
participation. Furthermore, I think the nature of conference suggests that graduate as opposed to undergraduate students stand receive the most benefit. Finally, since the funding climate for the humanities is particularly challenging, I think RSG should make financing events such as this a priority.

Therefore, I **motion to fund this event at the $500 level.**

David: **Second.**

**VOTE**

Yes to $500: Phil, Ryne, Ryan, David
No: 0
Abstentions: Yiting, Kaitlin

*Motion carries for funding at a level of $500.*

**ADJOURNMENT** November 4, 2013.
I. CALL TO ORDER:
   a. Present: Representatives Michael Lang, Yiting Zhang, Michael Benson
      President Phil Saccone, Chair Mike Hand
   b. Absent:
   c. Excused:

II. Recap- UM @ Penn State BWW Game Watch
    Great (except for the game)! (~65 people)

III. Plan for October/November Socials
      Phil following up with Natalie to get confirmation of this. Yiting taking point day
      of.
   b. Halloween Event 27th (Benson)
      Probably at Blue Lep. No budget, themed, etc.
   c. Pistons Game November 8
      Mike Hand will design graphics and update last year’s email.
   d. Bowling: November 22
      Mike Hand will design graphics and update last year’s email.

IV. Looking ahead to next semester:
   a. Ice Skating- Jan 24th
      Rackham handling lead-up logistics.
   b. Red Wings Game
      Need to find a new promoter. Phil will talk to Natalie about Rackham
      involvement.

V. COSAC
   a. Habitat –do we want to participate in specific builds
      Tabled until we have more committee members.
   b. Forsyth Middle School Science Fairs
      Waiting for update/blurb.
c. **Update on Other Service Events**
   **Wolverine Express:** Waiting for update/blurb.

VI. **OPEN DISCUSSION**
   RSG Barcrawl? Tabled until next time.

VII. **ADJOURNMENT—6:57**

**ACTION ITEMS:**
- Michael Lang: Continue to wait for email responses.
- Yiting: Apple Orchard pending from Rackham
- Hand: Email designs
- Benson: Red Wings
- Chuky: -
- Phil: Report back from Natalie with a number of things.
- Kaitlin: -
- Sweeny: -