U-M PRESIDENT’S ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON
LABOR STANDARDS AND HUMAN RIGHTS

MINUTES
February 10, 2011, 8:30-10:00am
Palmer Boardroom 1

Attendance: Kristen Ablauf, Charles Clark, Siobán Harlow (Chair), Brad Farnsworth, Allen Hicken, Peter Jacobson, Sarah Kanter, Brian Talbot, Nancy Vander Kuyl (staff to committee).
Absent: Jim Gannon, Andre Masnari

1. Chair opened the meeting with an overview of the agenda. Chair is in communication with Nancy Hobbs of Procurement to discuss code of conduct issues. BTalbot added that he is involved in a study with the Graham Institute as a member of a subcommittee on procurement. They may recommend the creation of an advisory board for purchasing, perhaps with an agenda beyond that of green products to include social justice issues.

2. Research and Educational Leadership
   a. Daryl C. Weinert, Executive Director, U-M Business Engagement Center spoke with the committee last month. KAblauf forwarded him the current list of licensees. Strategic Supplier Shows scheduled for 2/22 10-1pm at the Michigan League and March 1, 10-2 at Palmer.
   b. BFarnsworth announced that 8 applications were received for the Bangladesh internship call. There were no business school applications this year. 5 applicants to be interviewed after this morning’s meeting. Almost certain to have 2 WRC positions this year.

4. Operational Leadership
   Heeral Coleman from the FLA joined in by phone at 8:45. Chair asked HColeman to provide updates on the Gildan investigation and to bring the Committee up-to-date on: code revisions; the assessment of C level licensees; and the FLA’s training capacity to monitor non-traditional licensees. HColeman reported that the Gildan report was still a few weeks away from release. More information will likely be provided at the FLA board Meeting which is scheduled for 2/21-22. The Code revisions have involved a licensing categorization review (how and why) which began in 2009 by a university volunteer working group. They are considering adding a Category E for 1 person businesses (personal production license for short term orders). The original code was written in 1998/99, some compliance benchmarks have been updated along with a preamble and glossary of terms. The final recommendations will be discussed at February board meeting.

FLA will be looking at monitoring issues in other industries in the future. Committee inquired about any preliminary discussions on computer hardware manufacturers and other industry codes of conduct (ie computer industry, electronics industry, toy industry). KAblauf stated that athletics has received applications from potential licensees that adhere to the code of conduct for toy manufacturing. HColeman will get back to the committee on whether the FLA is in dialogue with the EICC or other industry monitoring organizations? HColeman closed the conversation by discussing the Questionnaires to Category C licensees and the updating of the FLA platform (expected to launch in March). This platform will give universities a more enhanced level of data regarding licensees and universities will
have access to supply chain information and results of the self studies. Platform will join training and assessment links for licensees.

Committee continued the discussion after conversation with HColeman ended. KAblauf stated that licensing has been receiving questions. At issue is the requirement to join the FLA for products/companies that are already members of other code/monitoring groups. KAblauf affirmed that this is U-M’s decision as the licensor. The addition of the ER6 has not as yet addressed the issue of how to interact with non-apparel licensees and their FLA membership requirement. Navigating the promotional products field to date has not received much attention. Issues include

- Where would a complaint be lodged for a non-apparel company not affiliated with FLA?
- How does U-M assess if other codes/monitoring institutions are in line with ours?
- Is it realistic to expect one organization to do it all?

Committee wondered about the product ratio of apparel/non-apparel? KAblauf: 65-70/30. That split is reflected in the royalty figures.

PJ: Goal would be to establish a code minimum across the board with licenses with a preference for having fewer and more consistent codes. Following evaluation of the acceptability of different codes, the key issue is ability to monitor, implement and enforce codes. BTalbot suggested hiring students to do a review across codes.

Chair outlined thoughts on the meeting room whiteboard:

**Approaches**

- Held to same standards
- Limited number of monitoring organizations but more than one (cost)
- Common standards for licensing/purchasing at U-M
- Establish a minimum requirement across industries/organization no less than our current code
- Have fewer more consistent codes and monitoring/reporting systems
- Harmonization and compliance are key

**Committee needs to know what to look for in a monitoring organization:**

- Ability to address issues specific to industry
- Organizational capacity to monitor the industry
  - Complaint response
  - Internal monitoring
  - External monitoring

5. Monitoring and Compliance
   a. WRC Alta Gracia & Dominican Republic garment factory tour, scheduled for May 12-18. Need to inform WRC of participation by March 21.
   b. No Gildan update

6. No New Business

Meeting adjourned at 9:45 to begin Bangladesh internship interviews