Rackham Student Government
Board Meeting: February 26, 2014

Agenda

I. Call To Order

II. Approval of Agenda

III. Approval of Previous Minutes
   a. February 19, 2014

IV. Second Reading and Public Hearings:
   a. Resolution: Inclusion of all faculty in sexual misconduct training
   b. Resolution: Amendment to the non-discrimination policy to include sexual expression

V. Officer Reports
   a. Graduate Student Body President, Phil
   b. Graduate Student Body Vice President, Vacant
   c. Graduate Student Body Treasurer, Chuky

VI. Appointment of Elections Director and Elections Committee

VII. Committee Reports
   a. Academic Affairs
   b. Budgetary
   c. Communications Committee
   d. Legislative Affairs
   e. Student Life
      i. Update on Graduate Student Housing (David)

VIII. Discussion of Resolutions: Scheduled vote

IX. Open Discussion

X. Adjourn

Included in packet:
RSG Board Minutes February 19 (p. 2)
VAWA Resolution Rev (p. 5)
NDP Resolution (p 8)
BC Minutes (p 12)
SLC Minutes Feb 19 (p 22)
I. CALL TO ORDER: 7:16pm
   a. Present: Sidney Ellington, David Malewski, Julian Bahr, Alex Gutierrez, David Barton, Malcolm Tariq, Michael Benson, Ben Sweeney, David Weinreich, Chuky Mbagu, Phillip Saccone
   b. Absent: 
   c. Excused: Chris Tom, Erin Sullivan, Shijun Ma, Adam Duran, Pier Davis

II. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA
    Phil would like to add a non-substantive amendment to the NDP, given that Chris is here/attends. Motion by Julian, seconded by David. Approved unanimously.

III. APPROVAL OF THE PREVIOUS MINUTES
     Motion by Julian, seconded by Ben. Approved with 1 abstention.

IV. OFFICER REPORTS
    a. President Phillip Saccone
       Tomorrow we have our first bar night, karaoke event. Show up and show your support! There will be others, but come tomorrow if you can. RSG Gazette will go out on Friday. Themed around diversity inclusion and social justice. Organizations pertaining to those type of themes were reached out to, to assist in advertisement/exposure etc. We were going to have the open forum, but a slight mixup and moving that to next week. Reintroducing the VAWA resolution and the 2nd reading. Ultimately both the NDP and VAWA are pushed to next week, where we will have the hearing.
       Also, something that we weren't able to do given lots of speakers/visitors earlier in the term was the issues list. A big part of our job is to bring issues that affect and benefit our constituents to the attention of the Board. Please bring your ideas!

    b. Vice President (Vacant)

    c. Treasurer Chuky Mbagwu
       Budget status has not changed. We are still good.

V. VAWA Reintroduction: First Reading
   a. Benson: Made a motion for substitution of the edited VAWA resolution in place of the resolution
included in minutes.

b. Phil: There are two sets of changes, Chris' and David's. Since Chris isn't here, let's take a look at David's changes but still wait till next week for the remainder of 2nd reading proceedings.

c. David: Main changes are to re-add lines 64-68, and re-add the removed final “resolved” clause (not shown).

d. Benson: Friendly amendment to remove the “and/or CSG”. On line 66 add the word “executives”.

e. David W. and Benson: On line 53 through “insists”, be struck from resolve clause.

f. Phil: Recaps all the changes. Any open discussion? None, will send Chris the info.

VI. COMMITTEE UPDATES

a. Academic Affairs Committee

Alex: Lunch w/ the Deans is all set. March 31st, room reserved (central campus). North campus date is April 3rd, however there are imminent Pierpont renovations so other north campus spaces will be looked at (besides Pierpont).

Motion to approve minutes by Alex, seconded by Ben. Approved unanimously.

b. Budgetary Committee

No update, no applications pending.

c. Bylaw Review Committee

d. Communications Committee

Julian: Minutes are forthcoming. Bar night is tomorrow night. RSG Gazette is going out. Shout out to Malcom, thanks for all the FB promotion, etc.

e. Elections Committee

Benson: It's imperative that we set an elections committee either this or next week.

Phil: We can set the date now, and then slate the committee this week.

Benson: CSG elections are March 26th and 27th. I move that we coincide with CSG elections but add Friday as well (March 26-28th).

Phil: I will take care of sending out the elections committee emails.

f. Legislative Affairs Committee

Benson moves that we receive and approve the minutes. Seconded by David. Approved unanimously.

Benson: Shout out to David for his hard work on putting together the State legislative issues. Phil will be slating the SAGE delegation soon. We will be hosting the city forum (?) soon.

g. Student Life Committee

Ben: We have the bar night tomorrow. Red wings game on the 14th. Forthcoming reallocation for
DIA trip.

Phil: Looking into other family friendly social events apart from bar nights. Maybe wine tasting, or casino night without real money. Etcetera.

David M.: At previous institution, did something similar to a casino night with faculty and wide involvement. It was high expense, but it's feasible on a smaller scale.

VII. OPEN DISCUSSION

Benson: The importance of following our rules and bylaws. UMEC's poor succession practices last term has resulted in a law suit against them that has been accepted. Just a word of warning, but we are doing fine.

Phil: Agreed, it's important for us to follow Robert's Rules. There is indeed a consequence for not being true to our bylaws.

Motion to adjour by Benson, seconded by Ben.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT at 8:49pm.
A RESOLUTION FOR THE INCLUSION OF ALL FACULTY IN UNIVERSITY SEXUAL HARASSMENT TRAINING

WHEREAS, Sexual harassment and sexual assault are a major concern in an academic environment, and are prohibited for academic institutions receiving federal funding under Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. § 1681 et seq.; 34 C.F.R. Part 106); AND

WHEREAS, Sexual harassment is similarly prohibited in an employment context under Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, and in both educational and employment contexts under Michigan’s Elliott-Larsen Civil Rights Act of 1976; AND

WHEREAS, University of Michigan’s Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities, states that “Students have the right to be treated fairly and with dignity,”¹ and the University has adopted a Student Sexual Misconduct Policy to that end². The University has also adopted a separate Sexual Harassment Policy³ for university staff, which covers student employees; AND

WHEREAS, When sexual harassment occurs, it can have a serious and detrimental effect on the victim’s mental health, personal life, and career; AND

WHEREAS, According to the University of Michigan Sexual Harassment Policy, “Sexual harassment most often occurs when one person has actual or apparent power over another”³; AND

WHEREAS, As junior colleagues, graduate students are in an intermediate power position, often playing the a subservient role under faculty and a dominant role to undergraduates; AND

¹ http://oscr.umich.edu/statement/
² http://studentsexualmisconductpolicy.umich.edu/policy-coverage
³ http://spg.umich.edu/policy/201.89-0
WHEREAS, Thus graduate students have the potential to be both the perpetrators, and the victims of sexual harassment; AND

WHEREAS, The reauthorized federal Violence Against Women Act of 2013 (S.47) now requires training programs for all incoming staff, faculty, and professional, graduate and undergraduate students by March of 2014; AND

WHEREAS, This is intended to minimize the risk of graduate students as the cause of sexual harassment; AND

WHEREAS, Due to the close relationship and power dynamic between faculty and graduate students, faculty members are the most likely perpetrators of sexual harassment for graduate students; AND

WHEREAS, While Rackham Student Government strongly supports the training of incoming staff and faculty, the student body is concerned that the slow turnover of current faculty positions presents a significant population that will not undergo training, thus diminishing the impact of this legislation, increasing the timeline to achieve the goals, and increasing the risk to potential victims and presenting a substantial liability to the University; AND

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

RESOLVED, That Rackham Student Government will work closely with University administrators and the Sexual Assault Prevention and Awareness Center to assist in educating graduate students on their rights and responsibilities, per the reauthorized Violence Against Women Act of 2013 requirements; AND BE IT

RESOLVED, in order to protect current and future graduate students of the Rackham Graduate School at the University of Michigan, the Rackham Student Government insists that current faculty be included in the training mandated for incoming faculty under the Violence Against Women Act of 2013 (S.47); AND BE IT FINALLY

RESOLVED, the Rackham Student Government will work closely with the University administration, as well as any relevant campus governments such as Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs, to ensure that all existing faculty do participate, through any regulatory means at its disposal.

AUTHORS

______________________________     __________________________
David Weinreich                          Erin Sullivan
Representative, Division 3                          Representative, Division 3
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.

____________________________________
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
RESOLUTION TO EXPAND THE UNIVERSITY NON-DISCRIMINATION POLICY

WHEREAS, the Non-Discrimination Policy within the University of Michigan Standard Practice Guide¹ 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 status¹;” 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 Policy² as an alternative to, and inclusive of, “marital status”; AND

WHEREAS, “gender identity” is generally interpreted to refer to the subject’s self-identity³; “gender expression” is interpreted to the actions of that individual to actualize their gender identity⁴; 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 sexes⁵;” AND

---

¹ University of Michigan Standard Practice Guide (sect. 201.35)
³ Jackie Simpson, Head of the Spectrum Center, adapted from personal communication on Feb 13⁴, 2012.
⁴ Dr. Charlie Glickman, Adult Sex Educator in San Francisco, adapted from personal communication March 31⁵, 2012.
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 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 also intended to refer to “sexual expression that occurs outside of the workplace” and sexual expression that occurs inside the workplace is in violation Sexual Harassment Policy and/or other existing policies promoting a safe and healthy work environment; AND

WHEREAS, “sexual expression” is further intended to refer to “sexual expression that adheres to standards of consent between all participating parties” and behavior that proceeds without obtaining affirmative consent is in violation of the Student Sexual Misconduct Policy and/or other sexual misconduct policies promoting a safe and healthy campus environment; 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

6 University of Michigan Standard Practices Guide (sect. 201-89-0)
7 http://sapac.umich.edu/article/49
8 http://studentsexualmisconductpolicy.umich.edu/content/university-michigan-policy-sexual-misconduct
10 National Coalition for Sexual Freedom, Incident Response Report records
WHEREAS, stigmatization, harassment, and discrimination can have a significant and detrimental impact on the quality life of the individual;\textsuperscript{11} AND

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;\textsuperscript{12} 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;\textsuperscript{13} 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.\textsuperscript{14}

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,\textsuperscript{15} 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;”\textsuperscript{15} 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


\textsuperscript{15} 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.

\textsuperscript{14} Rebecca Stotzer, PhD. Comparison of hate crime rates across protected and unprotected groups. Williams Institute, UCLA School of Law. June 2007.

\textsuperscript{15} Included by decree of Board Resolution W-12-01
policies that reflect the will and intent of this resolution.

AUTHOR

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.

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 ______, 2014.

______________________________
Phillip Saccone
President, Rackham Graduate Student Body
I. CALL TO ORDER:

a. **Present:** Adam Duran, David Malewski, Sidney Ellington, Ryne Peterson, Treasurer Chuky Mbagwu, President Phillip Saccone

b. **Absent:**

c. **Excused:**

**SPhD Seminar Series W14**

**Call To Order:** January 20, 2014.

Chuky: The current funding application is for the SPhD Professional Development Seminar Series. It is a recurring event open to all graduate students, but targeted towards (doctoral) students in the various School of Public Health departments. The seminars will cover a variety of topics relevant to graduate students (funding sources, best research practices, grant writing, etc.) as detailed in the application. There is an expected attendance of approximately 12 students per seminar, with 5 sessions planned for the Winter Term. The requested funds serve to cover speaker honorarium and food.

This is a relatively new event by the SPhD organization - this seminar series was initiated last term (Fall 2013) with RSG support. The general focus and outreach of the seminar series match the funding guidelines in our bylaws.

The application details their plans and requested funds for the current Winter term. Four of the 5 speakers have been confirmed. Last semester RSG awarded them $250 towards speaker honoraria and food, though they only utilized $150 - their event report is also attached for reference.

I think this is a great event and very much in line with what we typically support. RSG has also been instrumental in getting this seminar series off the ground (as the sole sponsor last term), and it would be nice to maintain a good relationship and appropriate support until they figure out better departmental funding. I am in favor of supporting the SPhD Seminar Series around the $200 level.

Adam: I guess i'll get the conversation started. The proposal in general was very clear and well written. The only concern I have is that this even is limited to SPH PhD students and PhD students only. With the bylaws in mind I would have hoped that this event was at the least open to masters students in SPH. I'm sure they can benefit from such an event. This event is well into the future so perhaps we could propose such a suggestion (I am new to the budgetary committee so I do not know if such a request is typical)
David: The university-wide impact of this seminar series seems minimal, at best. Likewise, all of the topics they cover are offered at multiple times over the course of an academic year through CRLT, Rackham, MICHR and other organizations, usually for free.

At the very least they should think about opening up attendance to everyone with university-wide advertising.

Their description of reasons for honorariums is also a bit funky. Part of the justification is that many of the people who are being asked to present have not prepared this sort of presentation before. Seems a bit like putting the cart before the horse.

I'm feeling that unless they revise the even to be less of a department seminar and more of an open seminar series we should think about zero funding this proposal.

Sidney: I'm on this fence with this proposal.

I don't see any big issues with it; and agreeing with Chuky, I believe maintaining good relationships with these guys--essentially helping them out until they find a more solid source of funding--may be in the best interests of RSG (why?). I'm not concerned that this event targets (not necessarily restricted to) PhDs as many of the events RSG funds implicitly targets or is only remotely interesting to some relatively small part of the student body, e.g. look at the last seminar we voted to fund. I agree with David that in principle events we fund should have university-wide advertising splashed with RSG logos. That just makes sense; however, maybe we could restrict a portion of the amount we fund them for precisely that (if I read the bylaws correctly, we'd have to get them to send in a revised proposal). Although they seem to exclude masters students, it could be a sleigh of hand or something intentional; but while masters students may benefit, I'm not sure it's my place to judge. That said, we should reach out to them, ask, and express our disappointment that masters students wouldn't be explicitly encouraged to participate.

David, what's wrong with the honorarium? Although they say the speakers aren't core experts in the topics they're asked to address, all the speakers seem legit. Also, it's a small amount of money per speaker (50), which they say the speakers often turn down. I agree though that this series seems redundant, but I would also argue that a professional development series geared toward PhD students in a particular field with speakers who are experts in that field could be more effective, i.e. be worth our grad student tax dollars, than some catch-all shenanigan put on by CRLT or Rackham.

On that note, I think we should throw them about 150 unrestricted bones since it doesn't look like we really need to fund them completely for this seminar to go on and because it has such a small reach anyway. That would cover half of the speakers if they opt for the lunch money while also giving the organizers the wiggle room they need to get the most of the series with the limited amount of money available to them.

Phil: Thanks for the spirited debate!
Here's what I would add:

1) The bylaws state that we are *more likely* to fund events that have broad student interest. That doesn't mean we cannot or should not fund an event within a particular department. It simply means that the Committee will look more "kindly" (for lack of a better word) on applications that are designed to attract a broad base of students.

2) As far as masters students are concerned, I would remind everyone that most of them are within the School of Public Health and NOT in Rackham. All PhD students, regardless of their college, are housed under Rackham. Also remember, that our fiduciary responsibility is to solely Rackham students (masters or PhD).

3) Lastly, I would suggest that the Committee speak with them about an advertising strategy before we considering funding. For starters, we can ask them to submit an advertisement in the RSG Gazette. Second, they should contact departments, such as Psychology, Social Work, Epidemiology, and the like who might have PhD students with similar interests and ask them to circulate a similar advertisement among their peers.

If those criteria are met, I could support funding this event between $75-$200.

David: I would be fine with funding this event around $75 - $100 given the caveats Phil mentioned about advertising to increase exposure. Other students in the allied health fields etc might want to benefit from these talks.

To play devil's advocate a bit, the College of Pharmacy held a similar lecture series last year organized by students and now they are working on incorporating it into our graduate curriculum, likewise Rackham is also working on providing more of these opportunities. I doubt this is much of a growing trend yet, but we may not want to get in the habit of covering too many seminar type events that particular schools should be covering themselves as part of basic curriculum.

Sidney: I **motion to fund the SPhD Seminar series at the $150** level PENDING further discussions with SPhD concerning their advertising strategy and target audience. I suggest we bring the matter of funding this seminar series up for vote after two weeks, wherein such talks and their proposal may be concluded and amended.

Adam: **Seconded.**

Phil: I **motion we fund at $150** with the stipulation that they advertise the events in the RSG gazette, and that they supply in writing the names of three departments outside of public health that have agreed to advertise their event. *(friendly amendment)*
VOTE

Yes to $150: Ryne, Adam, Phil, Sidney, David
No: 0
Abstentions:

*Motion carries for funding at a level of $150.*

**Blueprint Magazine + Creativity Art Show**

**Call To Order:** January 26, 2014.

Chuky: The attached application is from Blueprint Literary Magazine, a literary journal targeted towards members of the North Campus community, aiming to encourage dialogue and interaction between students, faculty, and staff across fields through creative expression and the arts. Their publication showcases works from members of the across the UM community, and they are organizing the Celebrate Creativity Art Show in which some of the featured contributors to the magazine will present their work. The Art Show takes place in the Duderstadt Gallery on North Campus and the runs for 2 weeks. The majority of the funds for the event, and those requested from RSG, serve to cover printing and publication costs of the magazine.

In previous years, the Creativity Art Show featured works from ~30 artists/contributors, of which 25% were graduate students. The kickoff event saw 60 attendees, and the show attracted 200+ visitors over the course of the installation. The numbers for the visitors/attendees include all members of the North Campus community, not just graduate students.

I think the Art Show is a good event that encourages creative engagement on North Campus. It has high visibility, located in the main corridor of the Duderstadt, and thus has the potential for large impact. Their advertising strategy is strong and far-reaching. Should we decide to fund, I would recommend adding the RSG newsletter as another advertising outlet.

I would be comfortable funding this event up to the $400 level.

Sidney: Diplomacy aside, this seems like a waste of money. 3 Gs on printing? I guarantee that ~99% of those booklets will be trashed--probably not even recycled--within one week of this event. I think art is a beautiful thing, but let's spare our budget and the environment; I think 200 or less (emphasis on less) is appropriate. That should be enough to show support and get some cred for it, but I'm not sure that that even matters considering how little graduate students are involved in Blueprint or this event at any level.

And why do they want 700 from RSG and only 1000 from CSG? CSG's budget is about 5x's RSGs...

Anyway, that's where I'm getting the 200 figure.

Ryne: Do we know what happens with the magazine? Are they sold or given away, who are they given to? Are they placed in waiting rooms around campus? This just seems like a private good that we would be financing. I would like to see that this was somehow disseminated throughout the university.

Phil: I think this is an excellent event. It aims to foster the technical and creative abilities of Rackham students and provides an opportunity for them to nurture their professional and extracurricular interests. I would direct people to read the following excerpt from their application:
"Blueprint intends to positively affect the North Campus Community by building confidence in students with artistic aspirations by affording them public recognition for their creative talents. We also provide an incentive for students to branch out of their traditional academic path, shake loose the conventions of their fields, and embrace true, multidisciplinary collaborations."

This is exactly the type of event that RSG should strive to support; something that is educational, fun, and open to a large portion of the graduate student body. The medium they are choosing to use, a print magazine, is perfectly appropriate for their needs (they have indicated that the magazine will be made available across campus i.e placed in common areas, waiting rooms, etc-- page 4, question 9). I think it's a fair supposition that at some point the magazine will end up being disposed-- however, this is the fate of many periodicals, and in the interim they will be enjoyed by anyone that cares to read it.

I agree with Chuky and would support funding in the range of $400. Also, remember that it is not entirely our place to pass judgment on how the applicants spend the money-- we are most concerned with the applications merit. The committees' goal is to evaluate the applications with respect to the RSG funding guidelines set out in the bylaws. If the application meets funding criteria, the committee is compelled to consider funding.

Good debate all! I look forward to hearing from some other members of the committee.

Adam: I think this event is awesome. It hits all of the check marks (bylaws) and I think it's a great cause. This is the 4th iteration of a magazine that has been successful in the past so why not help them build on it? I agree with Chuky and Phil and support it at the $400 dollar level.

Sidney: I'm not sure it's an issue of support or merit, but how much to support given the merits. I don't see how 400 is appropriate due to the low graduate student participation, which appears to be incidental at best. Blueprint is run and staffed by undergraduates, and their event and art submissions are from a super-majority of them. 400 is more than we've given to any proposal this semester, and yet this proposal has one of the smallest impacts among graduate students. The event sounds nice, but we should be more objective when it comes to doling out grad student tax dollars.

Phil: The impact for graduate student is an important consideration. Is it true that the majority of participants will be undergrads? Chuky, can we follow up on that.

Chuky: This is a great debate all, and I am happy to keep the table open for further discussion upon request.

According to their info from previous years, about 25% of the contributors will be graduate students. All other specific metrics in terms of attendance and participation are indeed incidental and not convincingly quantifiable for, or against, grad students, since it is an open/walk-through event for all of North Campus UM. The channels for drawing participation in the event and distribution of the magazine do reach graduate students, and strongly so, though not exclusively. The nature of the event, and its ease of access, make quite tangible the potential for graduate student impact. The organization itself, according to the application and their website, is a mix of both graduate and undergraduates.

I think the application and event have merit, and I agree that all concerns raised thus far are
justified. $400 is not a hard number, and was intended as an upper limit -- given the discussion, I would actually like to see a range of motions made for the funding level.

As a side note, RSG aims to be diverse in the activities it supports and engage with all segments of the graduate student body. Notwithstanding the current app, it's important that we give fair consideration to all funding requests that satisfy our bylaws, not just the academic and social ones that make up the majority of our applicants.

Phil: **I would like to make a motion to consider funding between the $100-$400 level.** I further move that a vote be taken at increments of $100 until a dollar amount receives a majority of votes.

Adam: I **second** $100-$400 with $100 dollar increments votes.

**VOTE 1**

$100 – Sidney, David, Ryne  
$200 – Phil, Sidney, David, Ryne  
$300 – Phil, Adam, David, Ryne  
$400 – Adam, Ryne  

No Funding: 0  
Abstentions:

**VOTE 2**

$200 – David, Sidney  
$300 – Adam, Phil, Ryne

No Funding: 0  
Abstentions:

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

**ADJOURNMENT** February 2, 2014.
**SISJ Fukushima Awareness (followup)**

**Call To Order:** February 10, 2014.

Chuky: Please provide any further comments on the School of Information/Social Justice Fukushima event. The participant information is now included in the attached application; they are expecting about 40 people in attendance, with ~25 being graduate students.

Our discussion last meeting was generally supportive of the event and the esteemed speaker/film maker, and we were interested in seeing improved outreach and advertisement. Given adequate graduate student participation, support around the $200 level seems appropriate.

David: **Motion to fund at $200 level.**

Adam: **Seconded.**

**VOTE**

Yes to $200: David, Phil, Ryne, Sidney, Adam
No: 0
Abstentions:

*Motion carries for funding at a level of $200.*

**ADJOURNMENT** February 10, 2014.
CSEG Whirly Ball

Call To Order: February 17, 2014.

Chuky: I’ve attached a funding application from the Computer Science and Engineering (CSE) graduate student organization. They are putting together a social event primarily for graduate students within the CSE department, though they might consider opening up participation. The expect about 30 graduate students to attend the event.

As a note on the application, disregard the external funding bodies section that is supplied. Upon further inquiry, the other funding bodies listed were applied to for other events not including Whirly Ball. RSG is the only funding body to which CSEG has requested funding for this event.

I think the application is relatively well done and straightforward. The major considerations are that it is an off-campus event, predominantly exclusive to one organization/department, and has minimal reach for external funding for this event -- all of which are detractors in our guidelines. (However, for the last point, I would guess CSEG has taken the approach of applying to different bodies for different events, etc. - not sure I would fault them too much for using an alternative strategy.)

Additionally, they have set aside a majority of the funds necessary for the event from their own budget ($360 of the $420) and are looking to cover the remainder of the cost and/or subsidize their expenses.

Generally I would be in favor of supporting this event in the range of $60 to $150 level.

Phil: While I am all in favor of encouraging socialization between peers outside of the University, I have reservations about supporting this application under the current RSG funding guidelines. Per the bylaws, the following events are "not likely to be funded": parties, events not open of accessible to the entire UM community, and activities exclusive to members of one organization. Thus, It is difficult for me to envision a clear and convincing path to funding. To the extent that the BC should set and follow precedent, I'm not sure we want to get in the habit of funding recreational events individual grad student organizations. We already sponsor events similar to this, such as bowing, which is open to all of Rackham.

I hope they have great time, but I recommend $0 funding in this instance.

Ryne: This sounds like a good idea, but like Phil I do not think it deserves funding. This is something they can do and pay for themselves. Maybe this would be more likely funded if it crossed programs, but that also seems like something under the purview of the social committee...such as the ice-skating event and so forth. They should be able to do this internally to their program without rackham funding.

I also would recommend 0 funding.

Sidney: I agree wholeheartedly: no funding for this proposal.
David: Opinion, mine, funding, null.

Ryne: I will motion to zero fund this event.

Phil: Second.

VOTE

No funding: Phil, Ryne, Adam, David, Sidney
Abstentions:

Motion carries for no funding of this event.

ADJOURNMENT February 17, 2014.
I. **CALL TO ORDER** 6:51 pm

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

III. **Bar Night:**

   Julian, Phil, Ben, Ryne.
   No food, but we may order.
   Next time Ashley’s.

IV. **Pin Ball Pete’s reallocated**

   Phil: Suggest DIA and costs sharing with Rackham.
   Sid: Asks how much will it cost? Can we do more than one event?
   Phil: I’ll ask.
   David: Let’s see if we can get a discount on the bus – with the Detroit Connector.

V. **Next Event—part of reallocation event**

   St. Patty’s Day will be the next event. Discussed other types of events. Decided the next one will be on March 17th. Ben to research cost at Connor O’Neil’s.
   David and Sid: What about a casino night?
   Dance-a-thon?
   Wine Tasting?

VI. **Open discussion**

   Julian: Clean up Detroit event, can RSG support or sponsor, and/or recruit grad students? Minimum cost.

VII. **ADJOURNMENT:** 7:17 pm