



Student Relations Advisory Committee (SRAC)

Minutes of Meeting: 1/17/25

Circulated: 1/21/25

Approved: 1/24/25

Present: Jonathan Brennan, Marita Rohr Inglehart (Chair), Charlie Koopmann, Jamie Niehof, David Potter, Martino Harmon (VP for Student Life), Connie Tingson Gatuz (Associate Vice President for Student Development, Learning, and Social Change Education), Angelique McCann (Office of Student Life), Kaitlin Karmen, Charlotte Karem Albrecht, Om Shah, Myles Durkee, Anouck Girard, Cindee Giffen

Absent: Marna Clowney-Robinson, Bruno Giordani, Joel Scheuher, Oliver Kozler

Guests: Erik Wessel, Director of OSCR

Faculty Senate Office: Eric Vandenberghe, Luke McCarthy

11:36am-11:37am: Call to Order, Approval of Agenda and Minutes, Announcements

The agenda was approved. The minutes for the 1/10/25 SRAC meeting were approved.

11:37am-11:52am: Updates and Current Issues from VP for Student Life

Summary: VP Harmon offered an update on the work of Student Life.

[Winterfest 2025](#) took place between 1/13 and 1/15. This event was put on by the Center for Campus Involvement. There were 360+ organizations who participated. It is indicated that this is an increase of approximately 65 organizations. This event was a great chance for students to get involved on campus.

The upcoming [UMix](#) event is brought up. The next event celebrates the Lunar New Year, and will take place in Pierpont Commons on Friday, January 24, 2025, from 8 PM to 11 PM.

The Ginsberg Center offers [Alternative Break Grants](#) which provides up to \$1k to student organizations who are planning an immersive service experience.

Monday 1/20 is the [Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Symposium](#). A related event will be hosted by UM Dining that will address [food literacy](#).

[Central Student Government](#) now has new leadership. Mario Thaqi is the President, and Jake Frederick is the Vice President. It is suggested that they be invited to a future SRAC meeting.

The [Difficult Dialogues Meet the Moment Initiative](#) is discussed. Student Life, IGR, and many other collaborators are participating in this initiative. The initiative has been extended into February due to high engagement.

In response to VPSL Harmon's suggestion to invite the new president and vice president of



the CSG to an SRAC meeting, the chair suggests inviting them to the February 2025 meeting.

The pending legal case concerning the Festifall “Die-In” was brought up and VPSL Harmon confirmed that appeals are awaited.

A discussion on the future of DEI at the University of Michigan takes place. VPSL confirmed that services to students is a top priority. Discussion ensues on this and the point is made by a member that there is a need to react and not preemptively capitulate. A member states that the recent treatment of protesters who support Palestine by the administration is a related DEI issue and feels that they have been unfairly treated.

Action: Discussion

11:52am-1:29pm: Review proposals to amend the Statement on Student Rights and Responsibilities (SSRR)- Faculty Proposals

Summary: The Chair reintroduces this topic and turns the meeting over to Director Wessel. Director Wessel provides a refresher on where we are. The faculty proposal review picks up where we left off at the last meeting.

Section 6 Stage 1: This language has been reviewed in other amendment proposals. The committee reviews new aspects that had not been considered until that point. There is agreement among the committee with the overall sentiment of the amendment. An issue of timing is brought up, considering the logistical issues that may come for complaints with many parties. Changes are made to address these concerns appropriately. Issues of hazing are brought up, as an example. This is discussed. A point is brought up regarding the resolution officer or student panel’s discretion to suggest differentiated sanctions to individuals. Language is updated to reflect this point.

Section 6 Stage 2.3: This language is supported, and efforts are made to make the language consistent with the previous amendment’s language. The Senate Assembly comments are discussed and considered.

Section 6 Stage 1: This stage is revisited. This amendment aims to ensure that complainants are not compensated by the University for their role as the complainant. Discussion ensues on this and the language is accepted after revisions.

Section 6 Stage 2.3: The purpose of this amendment would be to not allow the Office of General Counsel to be personal advisors to the University when they are the complainant. This is discussed and clarified. Power imbalance is brought up. A point is brought up about unintended consequences. The committee wishes to make sure that those that need an advisor have the ability to get one.

Further amendment to this stage is considered. This language had been considered extensively in previous amendments. Conflict of interest is a new aspect that is discussed. It needs to be added to this section. The process is discussed regarding the procedures for rectifying similar language in multiple amendments. Language dealing with conflict of interest is shared. New terms are added and defined in the document. A point is made that this document should be understandable to students.



Section 8: This is the concluding language to the SSRR. The suggested language is meant to ensure that the processes and procedures in the SSRR are adhered to. Discussion takes place on the role OSCR has in enforcement of amendments to the SSRR, which is that they follow directives from upper administration. A lengthy discussion on the off-cycle amendment process takes place. A point is made that staff members need to be protected. Language is added to this effect.

Discussion takes place on relations with the Board of Regents and Faculty Governance. Differing opinions are shared.

Action: Discussion and group editing

1:29pm-1:58pm: Review proposals to amend the Statement on Student Rights and Responsibilities (SSRR) - Student Proposals

Summary: The timeline for completing the rest of the amendment process is discussed. The student proposals are introduced. It is noted that there is overlap between some of the student proposals and faculty proposals.

Section III, IV, N: This section discusses adding political protest as an exception to violation N. The FSO Director brings up SPG 601.01 Freedom of Speech and Artistic Expression. It is not clear if this SPG covers political protest in the way that is expressed in this proposed amendment. Further review of this will take place at the next meeting after the committee has a chance to thoroughly review the SPG in question. The FSO Director shares the SPG in question with committee during the meeting via email.

After review, the remaining sections are determined to overlap with previous proposed amendments, and those remaining student proposals are accepted. The review concludes.

Discussion takes place with how the revised document will be shared with the committee and the meeting concludes.

Action: Discussion and group editing

Time: Adjournment

Respectfully submitted,

Eric Vandenberghe
Faculty Governance Coordinator
Faculty Senate Office