Rackham Student Government Board Meeting: February 5, 2014 Agenda

I. Call To Order
II. Approval of Agenda
III. Approval of Previous Minutes
   a. January 22, 2014
IV. Guest: GEO, Fertility Justice Campaign
V. Officer Reports
   a. Graduate Student Body President, Phil
   b. Graduate Student Body Vice President, Vacant
   c. Graduate Student Body Treasurer, Chuky
VI. Budget Presentation
VII. Michael Benson: Website Presentation
VIII. Committee Reports
   a. Academic Affairs
   b. Budgetary
   c. Communications Committee
   d. Legislative Affairs
   e. Student Life
IX. Break out session: RSG Priorities for Winter 2014
X. Open Discussion
XI. Adjourn

Included in packet:
RSG Board Minutes January 22
Background on Fertility Justice Campaign
AAC Minutes
BC Minutes
Communications Committee Minutes
SLC Committee Minutes
RSG Goals Worksheet
RSG Goals Worksheet Example
Resolution Template
RACKHAM STUDENT GOVERNMENT
BOARD MEETING
DATE HERE
RACKHAM GRADUATE BUILDING
2ND FLOOR WEST CONFERENCE ROOM, NORTH ALCOVE
7:45 P.M.

I. CALL TO ORDER: 8:00pm
   a. Present: Representatives Michael Benson, Adam Duran, Julian Bahr, Chris Tom, David Barton, Michael Benson, President Saccone, Malcolm Tariq, David Weinreich, Erin Sullivan, Ben Sweeney, Pier Davis, Sidney Ellington, Treasurer Mbagwu (14 PRESENT)
   b. Absent: Alex Gutierez, Shijun Ma
   c. Excused: David Malewski,

II. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA
    Motion by MB, seconded by Adam. Approved unanimously.

III. APPROVAL OF THE PREVIOUS MINUTES
     Motion by Michael B. with change to correct Ben S’s name. Also to grant editorial authority to the executive board and advisor for nonsubstanative changes for the remainder of the semester., seconded by Julian.
     Approved unanimously.

IV. Holly M-R & Darline Ray-Johnson

     Holly: Really appreciate the time that you’re giving us and that we’re taking away from your important agenda. We, Darlene and I are co-chairs of the committee that have put together these recommendations. This is an overview of why we’re taking this issue on and what the process has been to arrive at our draft recommendations which we will also present. We will also discuss remaining steps.

     To start us out, the student sexual misconduct policy is housed at studentsexualmisconductpolicy.umich.edu. Hopefully you’ve all heard about this policy. It has been a two year process in the making including anumber of stakeholders, including RSG. What you may be less familiar with is the Violence Against Women Act reauthorization of March 2013. The most recent reauthorization includes new elements:
     Required policy elements
     Mandatory training for ALL incoming students
     Mandatory training for all incoming staff.
Prior to this most recent authorization, most campuses didn’t really pay much attention to VAWA, now campuses (under the prevue of the department of education) have a great deal to do to comply with the law. Many campuses, however, were in full compliance with the law, including U of M. Given the new changes, there are some things that we need to change to stay in compliance. In particular, training for incoming staff and students. We provide a comprehensive training program for our undergraduate students both in person as well as online. During the first 8 weeks of the fall semester, students receive additional training (Freshmen). In total, comprehensive training:

- Bystander intervention information
- Risks and Warnings signs for abusive relationships
- ... more from slides

We want to have a comprehensive program for our graduate students. However, the program will need to look very different than what we provide to our undergraduates. However, we know that this training will need to be very different than what we currently provide. To figure out how to provide this, we created a campus wide committee that Darlene and I chair. It includes folks from the graduate academic and professional schools. We also hosted round table for all graduate students (across schools). These were hour long discussions that focused on 3 questions. How does this issue show up for you? What do you need? And what should we make sure that we offer for graduate students? (What do you have, what do you need, and what do you want)

In the professional schools, students receive far less information on sexual assault, sexual harassment than Rackham students. Those that do receive some information primarily indicated that the training that they receive is primarily focused on the students’ roles as employees of the university and not spending as much or any attention to the student component.

We heard from graduate and professional students that mandatory obligations often cause people to complain BUT that they send a strong message of institutional support. I spoke with the college of Engineering steering committee and one of the students brought up the fact that students have to do mandatory training for research. Another student used to work for Ford and every year received sexual harassment training. Over and over again, we’ve heard that we shouldn’t single anyone out, everyone should go through this.

Engineering feels singled out and mandatory training should happen.

Many expressed hope that faculty would also receive training. “There is an assumption that faculty know about these issues… but they don’t.”

Phil: There appears to be a generational component with the faculty. Are there any plans to integrate this training for those that are tenured?

Holly: Great question! Gosh, you’re probably thinking that there are people that have been here for over 45 years. My hope is that we can get this training out quickly.
University HR as well as the Abuse Hurts initiative and the office of institutional equity will be taking this on.

David W: Is there a reason why we wouldn’t train the existing faculty.

Holly: It isn’t a cultural norm for there to be training for faculty for any issue (Mandatory training) We need to create a cultural shift such that faculty would be willing to accept the training. We’re really calling this the new normal. There is currently NOTHING that all faculty are trained on. This will be a new norm.

Phil: Is there anything in the VAWA that requires existing employees to be trained?

Holly: No. However, there is a requirement that all members of campus engage in ongoing programming. How that is defined is something that

Michael: VAWA + mentoring training?

Holly: I think any training for incoming staff would incorporate that.

Former Representative Chris Tom joined the discussion at 8:17pm

Julian: Do other institutions have similar requirements?

Holly: I believe so, it varies by department. Many universities face barriers similar to the ones that we face, including cultural issues which could be hard to overcome.

Holly: Most graduate students that we heard from were most interested in an on-line training that ‘covered the basics’ and an additional in-person training that addressed program-specific cultural issues and needs. We heard that, in the law school, law students were interested in training relating to their working with clients. We heard from students that a research lab is a very different environment than someone involved in the humanities and have different training needs. Same difference for Pharmacy vs. Education.

DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS:

Basic level: Develop online training for all graduate and professional students to address minimum requirements of VAWA reauthorization 2013.

Second Level: In person.

We want this framed in terms of the institutional commitment. We as an institution aren’t only interested in addressing a mandate. We want to enable students to identify which types of scenarios or paths that they want to address. We aren’t required by law to provide information on intimate partner violence or workplace harassment. We will be
providing all of this both as employees and students. In addition, information about technology enabled stalking will be available.

The information will also be readily accessible.

These were the recommendations that were put forward for the online training.

For the 2nd level: We want to have an in-person training for all incoming international students studying in the US for the first time. Many schools have some in-person training, LS&A for example. Last but not least, we think that it would be helpful to add this training (in person) to your CV for those that do achieve it; perhaps a certificate or badge. We also want the training to be coallesed. Many students have different obligations, it would be very helpful if things were centrally located.

QUESTION TIME

Phil: Could you boil down into a couple of phrases what would be the most important or helpful for you to hear from RSG. How can we be the most helpful?

Darlene: In terms of the recommendations, reactions would be great. Are they accurate? Is anything missing?

David W: I think that this has not been articialated but I think one of the frustrations I feel in seeing this is that the students that are in the weaker position, the position of less power are the ones being asked to do this training but the professors that have a position of power, the ones that cause harassment from their position are not. That’s a frustration. I know that the University gives a great deal of funding to projects on campus as does the federal government. IT would seem logical that both entities could require this type of training for Tenured professors. That they would need this certificate to receive funding.

Holly: I agree with you. We don’t have that language in the legislation yet. As such we don’t have the same stick that we do for incoming faculty. The big stick is the availability of federal financial aid.

David: But don’t we need language in the law? Couldn’t we as a University do this on our own?

Holly: Yes, we really do. Not for any employee… there is no consequence. The legislation says that all incoming employees must receive this training it doesn’t touch on existing employees (or students for that matter). Now, could the institution make this decision? It’s possible. They would need the collaboration of the faculty senate. It’s possible but I’m not the person to speak on their behalf.

Phil: I think we can help with that particularly with SACUA and the Faculty Senate as a whole.
Holly: I’m well aware that the type of harassment that can exist between students and

Piere: I have a couple of questions and comments. Are there results that have been shown to take place once people receive this training? How does the community benefit? I’m wondering how effective the 45 minute training would be for people that might commit acts of sexual harassment as compared to those that wouldn’t.

Holly: We don’t have an answer to that question. There is literally no training package available on the market for graduate students. On the other hand, there are over 9 vendors offering a variety of packages for undergraduates. Each of those packages has been refined, beta tested, and given to thousands of students. In order to do this, we’re going to have to build this from the ground up. We’re going to hire a curriculum expert. It is an important first step. Hopefully other institutions will follow (SAGE AGENDA ITEM).

Piere: What are the outcomes of the undergraduates?

Holly: Because no institutions have base rates between reported and unreported crimes, we have to look at changes in attitudes and beliefs. We look at “knowing how to ask for consent, how to hear yes or no to consent, and other markers.” We see high confidence when they come into the University as Freshmen. After our training their confidence goes down sharply. We feel this is good in that they realize what they know and what they don’t know. Over the course of the next 6 months it goes back up and we’re looking at what actually creates that confidence.

Piere: This might be more important for undergrads, but a female specific class might be helpful as many women don’t know how to express their opinions (ADD TO THIS.)

Holly: The real challenge will be delivering the content in a way that is relevant to everyone, including women and at all levels (faculty, staff, and students). We will be calling on you all again when we’re in the content delivery phase.

Darlene: One thing that we’ve heard is that you’re all busy. How much time would a graduate?

Response

Julian: On that last part, any online portions can be less than impactful. Making it longer than 45 minutes likely wouldn’t add much benefit. Though longer in person is different and likely more powerful. Who will be creating the training protocols? Particularly in PIBS.

Holly: At this stage, we’re not calling for every program to be required to create additional in person training. That did not have support at the workgroup level. Would there be someone from PIBS? We’d want any program that develops and in person training to call on the resources at U of M including CRLT and SAPAC.
Ben: Most people have covered what I wanted to say, but I’d say that in addition to the in person and online training it is critical that there be easy access to followup information. Perhaps at the end, “Please bookmakr this link” linking to various resources.

Holly: Great point. You all will have access to the undergraduate training to tell us what you think and what modalities you might want ot see. At the end they have local, state, and federal resources. Some people don’t want to seek support locally.

Erin: You mentioned that there are really different relationsihps at the graduate level. What relatioships will you be basing it on? (Professor – Student, Student – Student, Student – Staff, etc)

Holly: That might be exactly the place where one of those scenarios or paths would come into play. Every student needs to get some mandated information. Its really just good information to have about the laws and campus regulations on these issues as well as what your resources are… what does stalking look like for example and how to address it or deal with it.

Chris Tom: I’m wondering if you’d be interested in taking advantage of resources such as sex-per-team (sp) which is in the business of how to “do good things”

Holly: You’ll be happy to know that SAPAC and Sex-per-Team have been working hand in hand for over three years. We want to promote those positive behaviors because the more positive behavior there is, the less negative behaviors there will be. And how we navigate that is different for graduate and undergraduate students.

Phil: I have a couple of question as well. Thank you again for coming! I’m wondering if you can tell us who you’ve spoken to who are in faculty or administration that have heard the idea that faculty should be doing this too… partiucarlly have people in the Provosts’ office heard that if students should do this, the faculty should too…

Holly: We did have a member of the Provosts’ office as a member of our working group and she could have shared this with the Provost. WE are also going before the Senate Advisory Committee on University Relations (double check the committee) our committee isn’t tasked with training for faculty and staff. The folks that will be doing that work are the HR office and the office of Institutional Equity. I expect that they will tap the expertise of Abuse Hurts. I’m a co-chair of Abuse Hurts and if/when we are tapped Ill bring this feedback. In truth, our ability to affect change for the faculty is beyond our charge.

Phil: Great and when does this need ot be in place?

Holly: initially March 2014 was identified. However, the deadline for the rules to be issued is November 2014. It is my expectation for us to be in compliance for the 2015-
2016 school year. I have no interest in dragging anyone through training that doesn’t accomplish something so were out in f

Michael: Implementation timeline and also SAGE assistance?

Encouraging vendors but no one has bit yet.

Student Affairs disconnect with Staff and Faculty policies…..

Phi: Was this helpful?
Holly: Yes, very much so and we’d love ot have a followup session. You’re a the front end of our vetting process. We’re going to be talking to SRAC as well as other groups on campus. We will certainly be coming back to you with our final recommendations as well as for help with our content.

V. Treasurer Appointment

Mentioned by Ben seconded by dave. Approved Unanimously.

VI. Appoint Chris Tom to a Half Term D1 seat
Moved by Juliain seconded by MB. Approved with 2 abstentions.

VII. OFFICER REPORTS
a. President Phil Saccone
   Committees that haven’t met. AAC is on me. Chris will be organizing that ASAP. You’re the only committee that has an excuse for not submitting a budget to Chuky by Friday. We will definitely be helping to take up the cause of sexual assault on the student end.

b. Treasurer Chuky
   Please submit your budget by FRIDAY. We have $33k in the account, we were paid for the account. And were setting with Rackham shortly.

VIII. COMMITTEE UPDATES
a. Academic Affairs Committee

b. Budgetary Committee
   Stuff is pending! If you’re on the committee vote.
c. Communications. Julian fill me in! Web, pictures, and more

d. Elections Committee

e. Legislative Affairs Committee
   Michael talked about LAC.

f. Student Life Committee
   We have a preliminary budget. I will be there. I hope you can join. You are required to attend or help with 2 other events.

IX. OPEN DISCUSSION

X. ADJOURNMENT at 9:11pm.
What is infertility?
Infertility is defined as the inability to achieve successful pregnancy after twelve months of well-timed unprotected intercourse or donor insemination (the latter important to infertility diagnosis of lesbian couples and single women). Difficulties conceiving occur in about 1 out of every 8 cases. The American Society of Reproductive Medicine, the Center for Disease Control, and the World Health Organization each recognize infertility as a disease and acknowledge that it is becoming a public health priority. The University of Michigan currently does not offer any options for health care covering fertility treatments, even the purchase of additional coverage.

Who needs fertility treatment?
The picture of who needs fertility treatment is much more diverse than you might think. Infertility can be the result of a disease or condition of the reproductive system for people of any gender. Survivors of cancer treatments and people who have been injured in their lower extremities (including military veterans) commonly face infertility. Certain health conditions and lack of medical diagnoses place women of color at higher risk of reproductive complications. Queer couples and single individuals wishing to have children commonly rely on reproductive technology and face additional barriers to accessing services even where fertility coverage is available.

Why is this an issue for GEO?
The simple answer is, members experiencing infertility decided to take action! When a member spoke up about her own experiences it became clear that this is an issue likely to affect many of our members. The realities of life in academia commonly mean that precise timing of childbearing is vital to degree completion and postgraduate success. Any barrier to reproduction, such as the inability to access or afford fertility treatments, can dramatically affect our career paths.

Why is this a good idea for the University?
It can affect the University’s competitiveness when recruiting faculty and graduate students. In a recent meeting of SACUA, the faculty senate, faculty members raised concerns that Michigan’s benefits package could prevent the University from recruiting top researchers. In a career that commonly pushes women to delay having children to remain competitive, failure to cover fertility treatments sends the message that women’s labor is not valued and that the University is not committed to a diverse workplace.

For more information visit www.umgeo.org or email womenschair@geo3550.org
What is it you want the University to provide?
We are asking that the University make fertility treatment coverage available to the University community and stop considering it a “cosmetic procedure.” Further, we are asking that the University make the process by which such insurance coverage decisions are made more transparent.

How much does it actually cost?
Fertility issues related to ovulation problems or egg quality can be treated with controlled ovarian stimulation (COS) with costs ranging from $50 to $2000. Some male infertility factors can be overcome simply by introducing the sperm directly into the uterus (IUI) with a cost range from $300 to $2000. However, some infertility diagnoses are more effectively treated by in vitro fertilization (IVF). Without insurance, the total cost for drugs, harvesting and insemination of eggs, and transfer of embryos costs an individual $15,000-$25,000.

Does anyone provide this coverage?
Fifteen states mandate some form of coverage for infertility treatments: Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Hawaii, Illinois, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Montana, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Rhode Island, Texas, and West Virginia.

Selected universities that offer some form of infertility treatment coverage:
- Michigan State University
- MIT
- Duke University
- Harvard
- Carnegie Mellon
- Yale
- Dartmouth
- Columbia
- Emory
- University of Chicago
- Georgetown
- NYU
- University of North Carolina
- Notre Dame
*Bold universities are NOT in states that mandate infertility treatment coverage.

Won’t insurance premiums go up if infertility treatments are covered?
Not likely, and here’s why: In states where full coverage is provided, such as Massachusetts, costs from infertility diagnoses actually decrease. This is a result of patients getting the proper treatments (not just the ones covered by insurance) and having alternatives to the commonly chosen higher risk/higher chance of pregnancy treatments that commonly result in multiple births. Also, the number of people seeking this treatment will be relatively small in proportion to the full number of people insured at the University.

What about the Affordable Care Act?
The ACA does not require coverage of infertility treatments. It does prevent any person from being denied coverage based on a preexisting condition, such as an infertility diagnosis. However, insurance plans for federal employees covers 50% of the costs of COS and IUI, but not IVF.

What are some examples of this type of insurance coverage?
The federal plan mentioned above provides one example. Some plans will pay for 100% of COS and IUI, but cover a certain number of IFV. Yale, for example, allows for four cycles of IVF with more available if it was successful and you want to try for another child. Other plans cover everything at 100% up to a lifetime maximum on infertility benefits coverage, such as with the $50,000 cap at the University of Chicago.

For more information visit www.umgeo.org or email womenschair@geo3550.org
I. CALL TO ORDER: 8:18pm

II. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS

Members: Chris Tom, Phil Saccone, David Barton, Alexander Gutierrez, Malcolm Tariq, Benjamin Sweeney, Shijun Ma

Present: Chris Tom, Phil Saccone, Alexander Gutierrez, Malcolm Tariq, Benjamin Sweeney
Excused: David Barton
Unexcused: Shijun Ma

III. OUTSTANDING ACTION ITEMS
N/A

IV. CHAIR ELECTION & FINAL MEETING TIME
a. Chris Tom and Alexander Gutierrez elected as co-chairs.

V. PROJECTS AND GOALS
a. Debriefing of projects from last semester
   i. Graduate Student Bill of Rights: Approved by board.
   ii. Best Practices Guide: Phil will submit to AAC by next meeting.
   iii. Non-Discrimination Policy: Chris is lead.
   iv. Course Evaluations: Ben volunteered lead.
   v. Lunch with the Deans: Planned for March. Project leads: North Campus – Alex Central Campus – Malcolm
   vi. Machine Shop: Alex is lead. Still need to meet with various people. Also, working on getting some statistics.

b. Upcoming Projects
   i. VAWA compliance: Chris to start some discussion with SACUA
   c. Individual goal-setting: Committee members should think about potential projects to conduct as a part of AAC

VI. BUDGET
a. Lunch with the Deans: $1200 for food and rooms

VII. OPEN DISCUSSION
VIII. ADJOURNMENT: 8:48

IX. ACTION ITEMS
   a. [Chris] Email deans’ secretary for Lwtd
   b. [Chris] Email AAAC Chair regarding VAWA compliance

X. APPENDIX
Resolution to make evaluations ‘semi-mandatory’

Whereas evaluations at the University of Michigan for Graduate Student Instructors (GSI) and faculty are completely voluntary on the students part, and

Whereas evaluation completion rate for paper evaluations used to be >90%, and

Whereas the current digital system has around a 30% completion rate, and

Whereas teaching evaluations for GSIs are a training tool for junior colleagues, and

Whereas teaching evaluations for professors plays a significant role in professional advancement within the University, and

Whereas a smaller sample size becomes less relevant for professional advancement and less useful as a training tool.

Whereas a system of mandatory evaluations would benefit both GSI, junior faculty, and the University as a whole, therefore

Be it resolved that a student who has not filled out the relevant evaluations for a class shall not be able to see their grades for said class within a period of not less than one (1) month from the end of the semester.

Be it resolved that immediately upon completion of the relevant evaluations, a student shall be able to see their grades.

Be it resolved that the President of the Rackham Student Body in conjunction with the RSG Academic Affairs Committee shall work with the Office of the Registrar to set these changes in place.

---

1 In order to become a better teacher, and prepare for future leadership roles

2 including tenure and salary adjustments,
Resolution to create a class-bank system

Whereas classes are a critical, mandatory component of the majority of graduate student education at the University, and

Whereas some upper-level classes are offered once every two or three years

Whereas these classes may prove to be advantageous for advancement

Whereas the current Rackham system for PhD candidates only allows for a single class to be taken free of charge per semester

Whereas a second class can be taken for a substantial fee to the student or the advisor

Whereas fellowships and training grants often require additional classes to be taken; these classes can negate the cost-benefits of candidacy and other training grants, therefore,

Be it resolved to convert the current Rackham system to a class-bank system in which graduate students are allowed (with their advisors permission) to take as many classes as desired, up until the class bank is depleted is met, at which point students are permitted to enroll or audit in one class per semester.

Be it resolved that this bank shall contain X classes/credits

Be it resolved that the President of the Rackham Student Government on behalf of the Rackham Student Body is instructed to work with the Office of the Registrar and Rackham Graduate School to implement these suggestions.
RESOLUTION TO EXPAND THE UNIVERSITY NON-DISCRIMINATION POLICY

WHEREAS, The Non-Discrimination Policy within the University of Michigan Standard Practice Guide 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;” AND

WHEREAS, “gender identity” is interpreted to refer to the self-identity of the individual; “gender expression” is interpreted to the actions of an individual to realize their gender identity; 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;” AND

WHEREAS, sexual orientation refers to the nature of the person or persons that an individual is emotional, romantic, and/or sexual attractions; AND

WHEREAS, University 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 protect the actions between the subject and object that are the primary means to sexual and physical fulfillment; AND

WHEREAS, “sexual expression” would thus refer to the actions of an individual to realize their sexual identity; AND

WHEREAS, “marital status” is defined as “never married, married, widowed

---

5 Michigan Standard Practice Guide (sect. 201.35)
6 Jackie Simpson, Head of the Spectrum Center, adapted from personal communication on Feb 13th, 2012.
7 Dr. Charlie Glickman, Adult Sex Educator in San Francisco, adapted from personal communication March 31st, 2012.
and not remarried, divorced and not remarried, married but legally separated, de facto union\textsuperscript{9}; AND

\textbf{WHEREAS,}

“marital status” does not protect a diverse range of emotional, romantic, and/or sexual relationships that can occur outside of, and coexist with, the institution of marriage; AND

\textbf{WHEREAS,}

it is known that individuals can and have been discriminated against for their methods of sexual expression and non-marital relationship status\textsuperscript{10}; AND

\textbf{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\textsuperscript{11}

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

\textbf{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, \textit{relationship status}, sex, sexual orientation, \textit{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;” \textbf{AND BE IT FINALLY}

\textbf{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.

\textbf{AUTHOR}

Christopher Tuck Mung Baker Tom
Representative (Division 1), Rackham Student Government


\textsuperscript{10} National Coalition for Sexual Freedom, Incident Response Report records

\textsuperscript{11} Rebecca Stotzer, PhD. Comparison of hate crime rates across protected and unprotected groups. Williams Institute, UCLA School of Law. June 2007.
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, Michael Benson, President of the Rackham Student Body, do hereby approve / veto this resolution on this the _______ day of _____, 2012.

____________________________________
Michael L. Benson
President, Rackham Graduate Student Body
I. CALL TO ORDER 7:06 pm

II. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS
   a. Present: Julian, Chuky, Alex, Erin, Phillip, Malcolm
   b. Absent (excused):
   c. Absent (unexcused):

III. Elect Committee Chair
    Phil nominates Julian, seconded by Chuky. Apporoved 4-0-1.

IV. Format for New Newsletter
    Julian: Old format has some issues. Problem in switching to illustrator—hard to embed links.
    Discussion ensues about what the options are for formatting.
    Phil brings up expanding beyond the current concept of RSG Gazette, and looking to make it more Magazine like.
    Julian brings up some concern about making it too newspaper like.
    Erin thinks we should concentrate on event promotion.
    Malcolm suggests better subject lines.

    Alex is going to look into the HTML formatting of the Gazette to try to make it more user friendly.

V. Content in the Gazette
    Sending out email to grad student orgs in order to solicit promotional events.
    Erin will write and edit

VI. Facebook
    Malcolm will work with Julian to handle the Facebook promotions.

VII. Legacy Instruction
    Chuky will begin to compile a list.

VIII. OPEN DISCUSSION

IX. ADJOURNMENT: 7:47 pm
I. CALL TO ORDER 6:51 pm

II. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS
   a. Present: Julian Bahr, Ben Sweeney, Phil Saccone, Adam, Sidney
   b. Absent (excused):
   c. Absent (unexcused):

III. Welcome

IV. Electing a chair
   a. Phil nominates Ben, seconded by Julian
   Vote: 4-0-1 motion carries
   Conversation ensues about what the responsibilities of the Chair will be.
   Julian tells us about how the delegation process works with respect to work.

V. Planning and Budget
   Ice Skating: $1000
   Red Wings: $1200
   3 Bar Nights: $600
   Pin Ball Pete’s: $600
   Discussion of other events, bowling, comedy and gala.

   Motion to approve the budget by Adam seconded by Ben.

   Approved unanimously.

VI. OPEN DISCUSSION

VII. ADJOURNMENT: 7:30 pm
Rackham Student Government Winter 2013
Representative Goal Worksheet

**Academic Issues**

a) GSRA student-employee issues
b) IP issues- informed consent
c) Continued work on the GSBOR
d) Informational packets on IP, conflict resolution, for students
e) Development of guidelines defining the scope of obligated IP assignment from student-employees to the University.
f) Development of "Informed Consent" protocol for cases where students give up their IP to the University.
g) Development of required disclosures for Conflict of Interests from UM faculty and staff.
h) Development of notification and mitigation practices for said Conflicts of Interests.
i) Identification of services to whistle-blowing situations.
j) Dispute Resolution Board to address student issues
k) Ideas for non-traditional and international grad student funding
l) PhD Candidate Courses
m) Building Hours
n) Masters Student Study Space

**Local Issues**

a)Consulting seminar or club, collaborate with office that put the event on last semester
b)Leasing ordinance
c)University Divestment
d)PILOTs
e)Status of Pfizer campus (NCRC)
f)More Political Awareness
g)Tuition Equality

**State/Federal Issues**

a) Consider hosting informational tax seminars for students who pay quarterly taxes (if this is even legal)
b) RTW issues
c) GSRA issues
d) Link division III to Umich internship/alumni resources through the Ford school services
e) Tuition Equality
f) Grant and funding availability
g) Cost of tuition, State bill with tuition coverage for Michigan students
h) Decreased availability of loans
i) Taxing of stipends and loans
j) Support for non-traditional grad students
k) Tuition increases vs undergraduate rates.
**Student Services Issues (non-academic)**

a) water fountains on North campus  
b) graduate student health initiatives (Michael Lang's suggestions)  
c) Housing network and affordability issues  
d) Student legal services-- can they address grad student issues or host a seminar?  
e) Succession from CSG  
f) Host an interdisciplinary faculty panel from LS&A discussing non-academic careers as well as additional projects that university faculty undertake.  
g) Housing: Northwood issues, closing of Lawyer's club, West quad and Baits II  
h) Increasing bussing during peak hours (or longer hours overall)  
i) Peer mentoring program, emphasis on non-traditional or international students

**Social Events**

a) Day at the horse races  
b) Bus trips to Detroit (van trips?), combine with COSAC event?  
c) Bar night combined with COSAC event  
d) Auto show trip (next year likely)  
e) More volunteer projects for COSAC  
f) Running group(s)  
g) host discussion at the UMMA and receptions at the UMMA for graduate students  
h) establish a peer mentorship program for incoming graduate students. This does not need to be program specific but should align with the interests of the incoming students  
i) Grad student formal  
j) Red Wings!  
k) Earth Day Event  
l) Events for Students interested in non-traditional careers
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