

**UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN  
STUDENT RELATIONS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MINUTES**

**Friday, November 9, 2018  
11:30 AM-1:00 PM  
Koessler (3<sup>rd</sup> Floor) – Michigan League**

**Present (eligible voters):** Anton Avancena, Selena Bazzi, Judith Beck, Gina Cervetti, Jill Esau, Mariah Fiumara, Charlie Koopman, Cindy Leung, Yolanda Marti, David Potter, Chitra Subramanian

**Absent:** Amy Chavasse, Royster Harper (Ex-Officio), Kyriaki Marti, Jairam Menon, Maribel Okiye, Olga Virakhovskaya

**Guest(s):** Erik Wessel, Director, and Joe Zichi, Associate Director, Office of Student Conflict Resolution; Jack Bernard, Associate General Counsel, Office of the General Counsel; Nicholas Fadanelli, CSG Representative for the Medical Amnesty amendment proposal

**Ex-Officio:** Simone Himbeault Taylor

---

**1. Call to Order**

Chair Cervetti welcomed the committee and noted that there was a suggested agenda change. David Potter requested 10 minutes to discuss the Michigan Daily's course spotlight. The committee agreed to amend the agenda.

**2. Review / Approval of Minutes**

Chair Cervetti asked the committee to quickly review the minutes and note any suggestions or changes. No changes were suggested so she stated that the minutes were approved as distributed.

**3. New Introductions**

Jack Bernard, Office of the General Counsel, introduced himself to the committee, explaining that his role is to offer advice and counsel as the SRAC deliberates throughout the amendment process.

**4. Amendment Proposal Presentations and Deliberation**

*Proposed Consent Agenda Items:*

- Proposal 1 - Clean up around acronym usage
- Proposal 2 - The concept of "mediators" in the document

**UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN  
STUDENT RELATIONS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MINUTES**

- Proposal 3 - Including the term “conflict coaching”
- Proposal 4 - Adding “reflection” and “meeting” to the Educational Project section

Chair Cervetti suggested that the committee think over the consent agenda items during the next two weeks and contact her directly if there are questions concerning them. If she does not hear from anyone, then the plan will be to vote on the consent agenda “as is” as the December SRAC meeting.

*Proposals for Discussion, Refinement and Vote:*

- **Proposal 5 – Medical Amnesty**
  - Suggested amendments:
    - Change “minors” to “individuals”
    - Include “and/or controlled substance”
  - Comments:
    - Perfectly reasonable and keeping with the spirit of what is already there
  - Motion:
    - Koopmann made a motion to approve this proposal with the suggested amendments and add this to the consent agenda. Bazzi seconded.
  - Vote:
    - All eligible voters unanimously approved this motion.
  
- **Proposal 6 – Value Language**
  - Suggested amendments:
    - Remove equality and add equity
  - Comments:
    - Equity can be unfair
    - Equality is often deemed problematic – ideological tensions
    - Would like to see some version of equality captured – it’s important depending upon the situation
    - Okay to have both – depends on the context
    - From a student perspective, equality was not often referred to on resident advisor documentation
    - (From OSCR) this suggested amendment change was presented to students and the feedback was overwhelmingly supportive – it’s a representation of the student voice at the moment
    - From a historical context, the use of equality was in reference to equal protection under the laws
    - This should reflect a change in the student body and what they feel is more comfortable

**UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN  
STUDENT RELATIONS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MINUTES**

- We are not all equal; equality goes against the fact that we want to be individuals
  - From OSCR point of view, equity should remain whether or not equality persists or fairness is added
- Questions/Considerations:
  - Add “equity” and include “fairness”
  - Consider using both words – equity and equality;
  - Remove “equality” but include “fairness”
  - More debate was requested to understand the wording and difference in meanings
- Outcome:
  - This will be revisited at the December meeting as there was continued debate with no decision made.
- **Proposal 7 – Investigation Language**
  - Suggested amendments:
    - Remove “investigation” as OSCR is not an investigative office; spell out RC – Resolution Coordinator
  - Questions/Considerations:
    - Replace “reviewing” – the word is too casual in place of investigation; this is not a casual review, it is substantive
    - Possibly use “examining” in place of review
  - Motion:
    - Chair Cervetti made a motion to approve the amendment (removing investigative and replacing reviewing with examining) and move this proposal to the consent agenda. Potter seconded.
  - Vote:
    - All eligible voters unanimously approved this motion.
- **Proposal 8 – Eliminating Dated Language in the SSRR in the Education Clause**
  - Suggested amendments:
    - add “will proactively”, as well as “the Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities” – this will maintain responsibility to but include both aspects under the SSRR
  - Motion:
    - Potter proposed to move this proposal under the consent agenda. Koopmann seconded.
  - Vote:
    - All eligible voters unanimously approved this motion.

**UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN  
STUDENT RELATIONS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MINUTES**

- **Proposal 9 – University Official Reasonable Directives**
  - Suggested Amendments:
    - Add designation of University Official to list of individuals who can ask someone to leave a premise with reasonable cause.
  - Questions/Considerations:
    - What does “University Official” (UO) mean? - Someone who is in their official capacity and has authority over that space/place.
    - What is “identified”? - name tag, official clothing, stating who they are
    - The language is ambiguous – need to make known what UO means.
    - What is the impetus for the change? - To set the expectation that people who are not security officers or police officers have authority over their space.
    - Possibly say something related to the space, not just the University Official designation – make the scope clear
    - Real concern that this may embolden University employees
    - Wording suggestion: “Failing to respect reasonable and lawful directives given by an authorized University official when asked to leave University controlled premises.”
  - Outcome:
    - Chair Cervetti proposed that the committee consider the revised language and the group agreed to revisit this proposal at the December meeting.
  
- **Proposal 10 – Threats of Harm**
  - This proposal has been pushed back to the December meeting.

## **5. Michigan Daily’s Course Spotlight**

Professor Potter stated that an email is going around from the Daily asking departments to advertise course/grade date. He feels that this is deceptive as from one year to the next, course information and instructors are different. He is interested in knowing what kind of conversation SRAC can enter into the Daily with. His concern is that not only is this misleading, but it sets up the decision making process so that it’s not based on the integrity of one’s education.

A committee member asked where the grade distribution comes from – Freedom of Information Act.

Two students responded that this information is often good for students to know. It can aid them in making a decision about how much to take on each semester – if they have a heavy course load, they may not take on an additional class, or may find they have room to take on a class based on workload.

**UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN  
STUDENT RELATIONS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MINUTES**

**6. Adjournment**

Bazzi made a motion to adjourn; Subramanian seconded. All in favor of adjourning.