



### **Student Relations Advisory Committee (SRAC)**

Minutes of Meeting: 1/10/25

Circulated: 1/14/25

Approved: 1/17/25

Present: Marita Rohr Inglehart (Chair), Angelique McCann (Office of Student Life), David Potter, Joel Scheuher, Jamie Niehof, Martino Harmon (VP for Student Life), Jonathan Brennan, Connie Tingson Gatuz (Associate Vice President for Student Development, Learning, and Social Change Education), Marna Clowney-Robinson, Charlie Koopmann, Charlotte Karem Albrecht, Bruno Giordani, Myles Durkee, Om Shah, Oliver Kozler, Cindee Giffen

Absent: Anouck Girard, Kaitlin Karmen

Guests: Erik Wessel, Director of OSCR

Faculty Senate Office: Eric Vandenberghe, Luke McCarthy

**11:31am-11:33am:** Call to Order, Approval of Agenda and Minutes, Announcements

The agenda was approved. The minutes for the December SRAC meeting were approved.

**11:33am-1:45pm: Review proposals to amend the Statement on Student Rights and Responsibilities (SSRR)**

Summary: Director Wessel indicated that the expected plan is that the Student Government amendment proposals will be shared with the committee next week.

Director Wessel reintroduced the proposals and provided an overview of where the committee left off at the previous meeting.

*Faculty Amendments 3-4*

This proposal had been previously reviewed, with a few details that required attention.

Updates to the proposed language are made. Who is going to arbitrate? The Resolution Officer (RO) will determine whether an RO or student panel will be used. A clarification is offered that one RO will make this decision and another RO will then actually handle the case if the decision was made not to use a student panel. Discussion on this ensues. Specific examples are reviewed and discussed. Timing language is discussed.

Due process time constraints are reviewed. Should specific language be introduced that specifies a timeline? This is discussed from different perspectives and an agreement was made to take out exact number of days.

A member asks if it is too onerous to expect the students to have read the SSRR? Director Wessel indicates that the students have a spelled-out responsibility to read the SSRR. In



practice, that may not happen. Differing opinions are offered. Consensus is reached on this amendment.

#### *Faculty Amendment 5*

This is a proposed amendment that had been previously reviewed, with a few outstanding details to address. There was a desire last time to include more membership in this consideration, particularly regarding the language related to doxxing. After discussion, this language is accepted.

Deepfakes are discussed. This topic is considered in one of the prior staff proposals. It is determined that it is not necessary to address this issue in the proposed amendment.

#### *Faculty Amendments 16-25*

The first section reviewed is in Section 6 Stage 1. It is noted that there is overlap with previously reviewed points. Much of this proposal is reverting the SSRR to its pre-July status. The SRAC was informed that the Regents had explained that the “University” had a right to lodge complaints prior to the July 18, 2024, changes. A point is made that Regents are not considered staff members. Specific hypothetical cases are discussed. This is related to a separate amendment. After reviewing both proposals, the language is reconciled.

The next section reviewed is in Section 6 Stage 2.1. This is putting back the wording previously removed during the July 18, 2024, changes. Support is offered and the previously removed language is returned to the text.

The next section reviewed is in Section 6 Stage 2.2. These are related to timing issues of the process. “Timely” due process is required, with no specific definition. Language is added regarding fairness and efficiency. Consensus is reached on this after discussion.

The next section reviewed is in Section 6 Stage 2.1-2.3. The proposed amendments are supported, as they were already addressed in a prior proposal. Language is updated for consistency. The faculty judicial committee is suggested as the pool from which the faculty member who is appointed is pulled from. Differing opinions on this are discussed. A recommendation is made to provide a recommendation directly to SACUA regarding this choice. A point is made that it is important that faculty are adequately trained in student-based complaints. OSCR provides such training.

Comments left by the Senate Assembly are reviewed. The appeals process is reviewed. Specific examples are shared. Due process is discussed. Changes are made to the language related to the role the Vice President of Student Life handles student panel and appeals panel recommendations.

Further work will continue at the next meeting on Friday, January 17<sup>th</sup>, 2025, on these faculty proposals.

Action: Discussion



**1:45pm:** Adjournment

Respectfully submitted,

Eric Vandenberghe  
Faculty Governance Coordinator  
Faculty Senate Office

1120 Ruthven Building  
1109 Geddes Avenue  
Ann Arbor, MI 48109