I. Call to Order  
II. Opening Roll Call  
III. Approval of the Agenda  
IV. Approval of the Previous Minutes  
  a. Minutes from 1st meeting on April 14th, 2015 (Sent via email)  
V. Guest Speakers  
VI. Community Concerns  
  a. Kevin Ziegler – SOFC Year End Report  
    i. One of the funding commission chairs. Every year receive an allocated report from CSG about allocation of $$ to student orgs. This past semester: Sofc funding 229 student orgs on campus. $834K. Very competitive process. Total awarded $250K. Reimbursed all the groups. Reimbursed $169K, $860 left over. Operated under 80% assumption, assumed higher this year to be on the safe side b/c increased competition for funding. Large fluctuation in claim rates: 64-91%. No methodology to really predict this. If you want to see the #s please come talk to me after.  
  b. Mekarem – Res. 5-001  
    i. About Michigan’s investment in questionable companies. A lot of problems with this res cause it is very vague. Not specific enough. A lot of amendments needs to address this. Should be a work in progress. There was a lot of stress on consensus with the others res and I don’t see consensus with this resolution. Needs more students for this to be passed  
  c. Sumana Palle – Res  
    i. Involved w/various orgs on campus. Support the spirit of the divestment movement. Need to hold this institution at large.$$ needs to be taken seriously. After reading the res, we have decided that we don’t support this res as it is and recommend that it is not passed. Not specific call to action. Lack of clarity. Does not do enough  
  d. Fatima – Res  
    i. Member of Human Rights for Education and United against sweatshops. Many of the university’s apparel is made through sweatshops. Wondering if this resolution is presenting anything new or anything that’s not already being done. Unsure of the point of it  
  e. Talya Nakash – Res  
    i. Student concerned w/human rights violations globally. Member of the Prison Creative Art project, do a lot of work w/incarcerated people. Calling for the university to investigate companies that profit from prisons. We at Michigan do this, and we need to cut these ties along with companies that violate human rights of Palestinians. This resolution is not
practical and I don’t know how it will be affective. A lot of students also present this concern. This is not the right way to go, needs to be better & more direct. Students who want to investigate endowments should be listened to

f. Moshegan

i. Initially here to talk about American Sniper has not only affected Michigan but also caused problems w/students elsewhere. But after reading this resolution, I want to say some words on it esp. cause this is a new assembly. What has been happening is that many Arab & Muslim students on campus have spearheaded orgs on campus that want the university to divest from companies that infringe on Palestinian rights. These students have been coming to CSG and expressing their concerns. This res seems to be trying to concern these student concerns. Extremely vague & leaves a lot to desire. There is a huge divestment campaign here in Mi. Hundred of Palestinians, Arabs, Jewish, students have supported this campaign & will continue to keep coming to you guys and you should know about it

g. Blain Coleman

i. Also came to spoke about American Sniper. Coach Harbaugh has been defending mass murderer Chris Kyle Want you guys to publicly condemned this mass murder of Arabs. Do you think Harbaugh knows what Arab civilization is like? After I got here, found out about this resolution. This resolution basically says go study 159 countries before talking about Israel. And once you do, we have more hurdles for you to jump. Do you really think this is the way to treat Arab/Muslim students and the Palestinians who were murdered in Gaza? Is this really the way you want to treat Arabs? Can’t ask these students to keep coming back to talk to this assembly, but I hope they do so you can be educated about the value of Muslim, Arab and essentially human rights. You would not pass this resolution once you’re educated about this. Hope that somebody on this assembly will express horror at Harbaugh’s remarks.

VII. Executive Communications

a. Charlton: Want to make point for you guys to know that I would like to reach out to you and meet you. Whether it be through email or phone call, feel free to reach me. Will be gone all of May but will be here June to August. Want this to be a very open door policy to get to know each other. Something you may not know, I am carrying over Wolverine Support Network, I’m exec. Direction. Anyone who wants to know more, we’re have2 group sessions over the summer. If you’re on campus, come out. 2 awards I’d like to draw your attention to. Frank Underwood Award: Bobby Dishell. Anica – Michigan NNCP award
b. Halperin: Want to ask everyone to get to work, summer is a great opportunity to act on their initiatives and I want every initiative that everyone ran on to come to reality. Want you guys to get to know each other more as well

VIII. Report of the Speaker

a. Betman: To address applause, it’s always out of order from the gallery. Generally the assembly will not applaud. Over the summer, think about ideas you’d like to work on. Committee chairs & vice chairs try and meet & talk before the year ends to figure out how you’d like to run the committees. Reach out to former chairs & vice chairs, good resources. Summer assembly, come, more details on that later. Wait until I acknowledge that it is your turn to speak to start speaking. Want to follow the rules & that everyone has right to speak. Committee chairs must submit resolutions as old business rather than authors of the resolution. Check out the back of your placard, terms to use. Point of information is if you’d like to ask a question during the meeting. If you want to give a rep report, which I would like to push, email csg.speakers@umich.edu. Anything you want on the agenda send to that email before 6pm Sunday, otherwise needs to be motioned into the agenda at the meeting

IX. Representative Reports

X. Committee Reports

a. Swathi: Met on Sunday worked on AR 5-0001. Everything I have to say about it is in the packet. Otherwise Hannah is looking someone to take over Resolutions for the summer. Our summer assembly has a smaller budget, but is doable. About the girl’s bathroom in CCLittle building for hand dryers. IF you want to work on a resolution, come talk to me.

XI. Election and Recall of Members

XII. New Business

XIII. Old Business

a. AR 5-001: A Resolution to Request an Audit of the University Endowment for Companies Directly and Uniquely Responsible for Ethical Violations Throughout the World

i. Andy: Core of this res is that last year the assembly saw multiple times where students presented cases where the universities weren’t quite responsible in the way they were investing. Fossil fuel & one regarding Israel & Palestine. Seeing multiple situations and the passion of the students, felt that it was the general consensus that the University should be responsible for its investments. Want an group to look at these cases. There has been a few things changed, some spelling errors, changed date to Nov. 2016. Had a few concerns from community concerns. Want to say that the main point of this res is that we want to tell the university that it needs to be responsible for the investments it makes. Not trying to target
anything. Found out that there was a presidential select meeting that is investigating these things. But this should be a periodically thing, and this res asks this to be done every 3 years. As for lack of clarity, I can’t really see anything that lacks clarity. Just a resolution that asks the university

b. Questions

i. Swathi: How would you address the final steps, what would be done with this info? → We ask that the results from the audit come w/ a report that states the finding of these audits and potential action. Want a statement saying what sort of changes could be made. Not saying that these changes should be done yourself, but suggests

ii. Swathi: Where will this be published and who will be held accountable? → It would be a public report, posted on their website somewhere. First report should be presented at an assembly meeting.

iii. Meisel: Is this a divestment resolution? → Don’t think I used the word divest anywhere in here. Res just says that we want the university to responsible. If this means that some companies need to be divested from, but this isn’t what it’s all about

iv. Jesse: Assuming that the university did some background work before investing these companies, don’t get why they should audit their own work → there’s actually not much about them on the university website, just know they manage the endowment. Had someone from the office of investment come speaks to us, their prime concern is growth of the investment, don’t know if they are considering ethical concerns. Point of clause on line 31, we want to make standards for companies

v. Jesse: Why have the body that initially wasn’t concerned with ethics to invest in these companies, why will they suddenly be concerned with ethics? → Regents control this, if regents didn’t ask them to be ethically minded they won’t be. It wasn’t in their mandate to be concerned about it

vi. Erin: Date was changed for the report, but in changing that date this resolution would have been seen by 3 assemblies so wouldn’t know all the information about it. Is there going to be some type of transition or something for the next assemblies to know the information about this resolution? → This resolution, we did get a first reads. Regarding the date, there wouldn’t be any case necessarily that we tell all the people about this resolution, but there will be a guest speaker who will tell them about it. You will get guest speakers that will just show up and

vii. Swathi: Why did we move the date? → Last week we heard concerns that such an investigation might take a while, and if we are going to have students meet w/ office of investments, considering that academic year is over, didn’t want to have to restrict people to have a meeting so soon
w/final and etc. coming up. Switching it would give about a year to do the audit

viii. David: Mentioned that the goal of the office is to raise investments, so why are you asking this office to do the audit? → Audit is just asking for an audit to be maid

ix. Jesse: Why did the res lose an author: Czeran is not on the assembly anymore, we were both on opposite sides of the debate on the res. Regarding divestment from companies that infringe on Palestinian rights and wanted to discuss both sides. Haven’t been able to talk to him recently about it

x. Can you clarify the steps taken once the ethical violations are determined? → Going to disagree with you, there are about 190 companies, while 2 have been mentioned last semester. There can be companies that are doing awful things that we aren’t considering. Need to have something that looks at everything we put our $ into and have a group review this and come up with a solution to have it come to a better ethical state.

xi. But there are students groups who are fighting for a cause who are probably doing the same thing, but are there any steps to urging universities to divest? → no steps, just public recommendations

xii. Ramone: You’re saying that this res is like a tool that could possibly used in the future? → I think the primary purpose is to express that students are concerned w/the universities lack of self-responsibilities in their endowment, if the finding of the report is to be used as a tool that could be done

xiii. Metzger: hard to define ethics, so if we’re identifying these companies how will this be measured? → resolved clause 31, request a meeting from a rep from the exec. Commission of the assembly & the investment office to consider this ethical measure

xiv. Swathi: would you consider passing that step first so we can have the assembly decide on this code of ethics? → Was thinking the group would be made of 2 or so students from CSG and the investment office, not just a few people. Don’t know if having this code be voted on is something nneeded for this resolution.

xv. Farah: In line 31, wondering why aren’t there any students besides students from CSG when other students were the one who presented this? How are 2 CSG reps going to know what these student groups want? → CSG represents the students. Do mention at least 1 rep, if more students want to attend. CSG has reps from all colleges & orgs. If there are orgs that want to attend, they can speak to reps. Didn’t feel that listing a bunch of student groups was necessary
xvi. Meredith: Have we considered, rather than asking for an audit, creating a separate group of regents/CSG/others to go over the investments rather than the investment office? → No, not been considered

xvii. Meredith: Would you have qualms w/amending that so we create a new group from the investment office, regents, & CSG to look at investments than just the people who made these investments? → Can be done, might have to change wording

xviii. Thomas: Do you think the investment office is qualified to consider the ethics? → Want to tell them to take ethics into account

c. Amendments

i. Farah: 1st resolved clause, changing “deliberately, directly, responsible for egregious ethical violations” → something like “directly profits from or supports violations of internationally recognized legal or human rights ethics...” Should include companies who may not be aware that they are profiting from these violations. Needs to be sort of international standard.

   1. Objection → Debate

   a. Against

      i. Taylor: Feel like you’re saying that deliberately is wrong, but changed a lot.

      ii. Jesse: What this amendment proposes is replacing vague jargon with different vague jargon. Think we’re just opening a dorm to a bunch of problems. There’s not set of principles. We haven’t established what is ethical. Taking the vague nature of the resolution to different vague-ness

   b. For

      i. Farah: This is just an audit so casting a wide net is going to be more effective & give this committee more of an opportunity to pick out companies that are engaging in violations. Putting in “deliberately” gets rid of a lot of companies and so does “directly” These words eliminate a lot companies that we’re investing in. Egregious ethical violations is very vague. Need to define that we’re in favor having some sort of standard. Having this language in there that discusses an international standard will be more effective.

      ii. Allie: Confused about “deliberately”, why removing that word is so important.
1. Farah: Agree that companies that are deliberately doing violations are ones should be targeting, but this word closes the scope

iii. Andy: This resolution is not friendly b/c I don’t think that mentioning “profiting from” is something we should be focusing on.

c. Fails

ii. Meisel: “Uniquely responsible/egregious ethical” → Talk about vagueness & questions of the word egregious, need to create more of a quantifiable unit. “deliberately, directly, and uniquely responsible for violations of corporate social responsibility standards anywhere in the world”

1. Question

a. Swathi: what is corporate social responsibility → social standards, laws, how businesses observe how they’re operating. Ex. sweatshops, falls under bubble of corporate social responsibility. Collective standard created by the corporate world & companies in relationship to the US congress & other gov’ts around the world

b. Swathi: Is this like a uniform standard? → there is no uniform regarding ethics, but it creates as quantifiable standard as you can get to. All of the standards that go into being an ethic business falls under umbrella of corporate social responsibility

c. David: “egregious ethical violations” How would you respond saying that using corporate social responsibility dilutes this. This uses such broad wording that takes away the purpose of this resolution → When the university creates investments, it uses quantifiable screens with data, profits, etc. but ethics is not quantifiable. This res is asking a quantifiable screen for the ethics of the companies we invest in, taking out these words, this takes out the vagueness.

2. Friendly

d. 3rd Reads

i. Andy: Res to request an audit on the endowment fund. Trying to say that the students think university should be responsible for the companies it is divesting in. Liked Ben’s amendment, steers res into more implementable state.

e. Objection to Voting

i. For
1. Jared → Andy: Feel this addresses a problem we have at the university. Students are concerned about what we invest in. Looking at something that examines everything throughout the world will be better received than targeting specific groups.

2. Meisel: Corporate social responsibility fluctuates a lot less than ethical standards in other divestment resolutions. Corporate social responsibility takes in different aspects, doesn’t allow things to be volatile, looks at big picture. It’s the way companies are judged should be the way our university should be judged. Needs to be clear that the investment office is the one making the investments, the office uses quantifiable screens to judge these investments. There’s no screen for these ethics, asking them to make this screen and judge themselves. Shouldn’t be related to students movements. It’s regarding our paid professionals. This is something we’re asking our own university to look at, shouldn’t look at this from the perspective of divesting/not divesting, but that the university makes a report on how it’s doing. Ex. Paige Becker discussing the elections and how to make it better. Need to do this with the ethics of our investments. Call for action from our paid investment, not from divestment, not from student orgs, not from CSG

ii. Against
   1. Swathi: Get where the res is coming from and like the intentions. But with this new amendment, don’t feel comfortable voting on it. Standards keep changing, not enough people deciding these standards. Don’t have nay points of actions after. Don’t like the change to November, pushes it too far back and is irrelevant to this assembly
   2. Agree with its intentions, but don’t think it will be executed well. CSR shouldn’t be used as a standard, each company uses its own standard, very volatile. Too multi-faceted for ethics. Won’t get to the heart of why this res is being put forth. Also concerned with the community dissent with this res. We represent the student body so if they don’t agree with something we’re trying to do, it shouldn’t be something we should be doing. This needs more thought and won’t encapsulate all of the student’s interest and the CSR is not a good standard

f. Move to previous question, end debate and vote → passes

g. Resolution fails
   i. Yes w/rights
1. Aaron: starting off point, it’s not perfect, but saying that we shouldn’t start somewhere is ridiculous. It’s a place to start looking at our ethical investments, it’s a step in building.

2. Lisner: See why a lot of people why this isn’t the best res. But this is why we have resolution committee. Could’ve been a lot better @ committee. Best res that could’ve been presented to us by Andy

3. Ramon: Think this res does what it does really well. Calls for an audit and makes it visible to everyone. Wants some accountability and forced to say publicly. Eventually if students want to do something about it, they can use it as a starting point

4. Meisel: created a unit of measurement and this is an extremely gray area. Asking the university for a unit of measurement nothing more. What we do with it is a different story.

5. Metzger: Not perfect, but things I like that needs to be continued. Vagueness may be a good thing. All it asked for is an audit. Shouldn’t get into telling regents what to do. Better that it just recommends

XIV. Motions and Other Business

XV. Announcements and Matters Arising
   a. Ramon: This week teaching beginner drop in lesson, @ the Union in Pendleton room, east coast swing. Weds. 8-9
   b. Swathi: Res. is meeting for concerns. Something we did last year, with BAM we worked with them for 4 weeks and refined their res. Res. committee is different b/c we have to accommodate authors so won’t always be as scheduled. If you have ideas over the summer you can email me.
   c. Lisner: President of Go Blue Go Pink, have old design clothing so if anyone wants some will gave them away for very little donation
   d. Halperin: Please use summer to get a lot done. Cooper and I will be around most of the summer, use us.

XVI. Closing Roll Call

XVII. Adjournment
   a. 9:08