



Student Relations Advisory Committee (SRAC)

Minutes of Meeting: 12/13/24

Circulated: 1/3/25

Approved: 1/10/25

Present: Charlotte Karem Albrecht, Jonathan Brennan, Myles Durkee, Cindee Giffen, Bruno Giordani, Marita Rohr Inglehart (Chair), Connie Tingson Gatuz (Associate Vice President for Student Development, Learning, and Social Change Education), India Hayes (Office of Student Life), Angelique McCann (Office of Vice President for Student Life), Joel Scheuher, Kaitlin Karmen, Martino Harmon (VP for Student Life), Charlie Koopmann, David Potter

Absent: Marna Clowney-Robinson, Anouck Girard, Jamie Niehof, Oliver Kozler, Om Shah

Guests: Erik Wessel, Director, Office of Student Conflict Resolution (OSCR)

Faculty Senate Office: Eric Vandenberghe, Luke McCarthy

11:33-11:37am: Call to Order, Approval of Agenda and Minutes, Announcements

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

11:37am-11:42am: Updates and Current Issues from VP for Student Life

Summary: VP Harmon provided brief updates on work done by the Office of Vice President for Student Life since the last SRAC meeting. There was a high amount of activity regarding the November federal election. Community engagement was a priority of the Office, with the [Ginsberg Center](#) and [Turn Up Turnout](#) mentioned. There was a high voter turnout at the polling locations on UM' campus.

The [AY24 Student Life Impact Report](#) was released in November. OVPSL tracked over one million student interactions and outcomes. In addition to data, the report also highlights available services.

Action: Discussion

11:42am-12:58pm: Review proposals to amend the Statement on Student Rights and Responsibilities (SSRR)

Summary:

Director Wessel introduces the proposals for review by the committee for this meeting. It is noted that the student proposals need to be reviewed by Central Student Government and will likely be sent to the SRAC committee in January.

The Chair requests that moving forward the proposals be identified in chronological order. Director Wessel agrees that this will be the case.

It is determined that a thank you note and the November SRAC minutes will be sent to VP



Kinsey as well as to President Ono as a follow up to VP Kinsey's visit at the SRAC meeting in November .

Director Wessel shares his screen for the committee members to be able to view the proposals. Included with the proposals are comments from Senate Assembly members. It is clarified that the comments from the Senate Assembly are from individual members, and that these were not collective thoughts that have been voted on.

Amendment 3-4:

These proposals include language intended to remove the right of the University to initiate or join a resolution process. It also seeks to amend the Resolution officer process. It also seeks to restore the SSRR 2022 Appeals Process.

A committee member voices their support for this proposal. The questions raised by the Senate Assembly are reviewed and addressed. A point is made that UM is a community, and that this proposal supports this.

Discussion ensues on when these proposals will be voted on by the SRAC committee. A suggestion is made to build consensus, and then send a preferential non-binding poll. The committee determines they would like all of the proposals, including the student proposals, prior to voting on any changes, so that they have all of the information.

Discussion ensues on the changes made by the Regents to the SSRR in their July meeting. The Regents added the "University" portion that this amendment seeks to remove.

It is clarified that there needs to be a record of who will be making the complaint. It is clarified that OSCR does not take anonymous complaints.

A member voices concern regarding language initiating the complaint, and the member indicates that they are not concerned with the learning aspect of this section. Director Wessel clarifies that there are several pathways for resolving the complaints, that is the reason for the "learning" language.

A point is made that those who initiate these complaints are and need to be associated with the University as a student, staff or faculty member at the time of the related incident.

Further language is updated to match the changes made in earlier parts of the document.

A member indicates their support for getting the student panel back. A clarification is made that in this part of the process, the student panel still exists.

Another member states their opinion that the RO has too much power. Who makes the decision if an RO or panel is utilized? Before the July 2024 change to the SSRR, it was the RO. A suggestion is made that there should be more than one RO making this decision.

Amendment 5:



This proposal includes language intended to include doxxing as part of the section on harassment and bullying.

The comments left by Senate Assembly members were reviewed. Discussion ensues on how the points should be arranged. A member who is not present at this meeting will be consulted, as they had made points in prior meetings relevant to this proposal.

Doxxing is a different form of bullying. It creates an avenue of harassment from other people online. This is often justified by the offender as seeking accountability. It is not yet punishable but should be spelled out as something that is to be punished.

Deepfakes are discussed, they are in the staff proposals.

Amendment 16-25:

These proposals include language intended to remove the right of the University to initiate or join a resolution process. The proposals also work to alter the time restrictions of this process. The committee provided thoughts on these aspects of the proposal prior to the conclusion of the meeting. The remaining items will be looked at in subsequent meetings.

The July 18 changes are reviewed. A member describes these proposed amendments as primarily aimed at rolling back the July 18 changes to the SSRR.

A discussion takes place on how long the process takes. A suggestion is made to add the following language: “the full scope of the process should be resolved in 45 days”.

Action: Discussion

12:58pm: Adjournment

Respectfully submitted,

Eric Vandenberghe
Faculty Governance Coordinator
Faculty Senate Office