

STUDENT RELATIONS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MEMORANDUM

TO: Martino Harmon, Vice President for Student Life

FROM: Marita Inglehart
Chair, Student Relations Advisory Committee (SRAC)

DATE: February 26, 2025

SUBJECT: SRAC Recommendations: 2024-2025 Proposed Amendments to the *Statement*

The Student Relations Advisory Committee (SRAC) is charged with review of all proposed amendments to the *Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities* (“SSRR”) as follows:

The *Statement* is a dynamic document subject to revisions by the community. The *Statement* will be open for amendments every three years. The VPSL, SRAC Chair, and the CSG President may unanimously agree to have an off-cycle amendment period if necessary. The Board of Regents has provided the Student Relations Advisory Committee (SRAC) of the Senate Assembly with primary oversight of the review.

Campus community members are encouraged to participate in the process. Amendments may be proposed by CSG, the Senate Assembly, or any Executive Officer of the University. SRAC will review the proposed amendments and consult with the Office of General Counsel. SRAC will then forward the proposed amendments and their recommendations to the VPSL. The final decision on amending the *Statement* will be the President’s.

The President should communicate the decision to accept or reject each of the proposed amendments in a public and timely manner, at least two weeks before the last day of classes during the winter semester. The President’s communication to the student body should state a rationale for each decision to reject or accept an amendment. (*Statement* at VIII.J)

During the 2024-2025 Amendment cycle, SRAC received and reviewed 28 proposals to amend the SSRR. All submitted proposals were reviewed in relation to each other, and several proposals were combined. SRAC’s final recommendations incorporate all the staff, faculty, and student proposals into 19 recommendations, with some revisions of the proposals (Appendix A). Summaries of the review process and SRAC’s recommendations are provided below.

Summary of the 2024-2025 Amendment Review Process

The beginning of the 2024-2025 amendment process was heavily impacted by an out-of-cycle set of amendments to the SSRR approved on July 18, 2024 by the Board of Regents without consultation with SRAC, causing this year’s amendment process to be especially challenging. SRAC received and

reviewed a total of 28 submissions from staff, faculty, and students (as further detailed below), resulting in SRAC's final recommendations.

Appendix A provides SRAC's approved recommendations, with additional appendices included as a record of the U-M community's submissions to SRAC. Staff, faculty, and student amendment proposals are included as Appendices B (staff), C (faculty), and D (students). Appendices B-D include notations providing the relevant SRAC recommendations incorporating each proposed amendment. In turn, Appendix A notes the relevant staff, faculty, or student proposals that were incorporated into each of the SRAC-approved recommendations.

Below is a timeline of the process undertaken by the SRAC:

- **August 9, 2024:** SRAC met to discuss the July 18th amendments.
- **September 20, 2024 and October 18, 2024:** SRAC met to begin preparations for the 2024-2025 SSRR amendment process. Supported by the Office of Student Conflict Resolution (OSCR) with communications to the UM community, a window for proposals submissions was opened on September 24, 2024 and closed on November 1, 2024.
- **November 15, 2024:** SRAC met to discuss the received staff amendment proposals (Appendix B) shared with SRAC by Dr. Wessel, the Director of OSCR. A discussion followed. A decision was made to wait on approval of the staff proposals until all proposed amendments had been reviewed, due to an expected overlap between faculty, staff, and student proposals.
- **December 13, 2024:** SRAC met and began discussing the faculty proposals (see Appendix C). The faculty submissions had been received by the Faculty Senate on November 7th, and they were reviewed by the Faculty Senate Assembly on November 18th. SACUA Chair Modrak submitted the faculty proposals to SRAC on November 25th with comments provided by Senate Assembly members. SRAC took these comments into consideration when discussing the proposed amendments. On December 13th, Proposals 3, 4 and 5 were discussed, but not voted on. A decision was made to add meetings on January 10, 17, and 31 (in addition to the regularly scheduled meeting on January 24) because of the large number of proposals needing further discussion.
- **January 10, 2025:** SRAC met and discussed outstanding issues for faculty proposals 3, 4 and 5. Faculty proposals related to SSRR Section 6, Stage 1, and Section 6, Stage 2.1-3 were then discussed.
- **January 17, 2025:** SRAC met to review previously discussed proposals and to consider additional faculty proposals concerning SSRR Section 6, Stage 1, Section 6, Stage 2.3, and Section 8. SRAC also began reviewing ten submitted student proposals (Appendix D). The student proposals had been previously submitted to the Central Student Government (CSG) for review. Changes in CSG's leadership impacted the timing of the review and approval of the student proposals, but CSG submitted the student proposals to SRAC in time for SRAC to begin reviewing those proposals on January 17th.



- **January 24, 2025:** SRAC met to conclude reviewing the ten submitted student proposals (Appendix D). SRAC then approved the final 19 proposed amendments (Appendix A), which incorporated proposals from all the staff, faculty, and student submissions.

Summary of the Recommendations

As will be apparent, many of SRAC's recommendations involve revisions of the changes made on July 18th, 2024. The committee's recommendations reflect SRAC's commitment to an SSRR violation resolution process that achieves the following:

- Prioritizes student growth, framing the resolution process as an educational opportunity, rather than prioritizing punishment.
- Completes the process in an orderly, brisk, and efficient manner while still permitting flexibility for reasonable delays due to the individual circumstances of a particular case and the interests of the parties involved.
- Incorporates the reasonable checks and balances necessary for broad community recognition of the results as fair, including by (1) prohibiting third-party contractors from being hired to file complaints against students and (2) reestablishing the Appeals Board that was eliminated by the July 18th amendments and the Student Resolution Panel option that was effectively eliminated by the same amendments.

Sincerely,

Marita Inglehart, SRAC Chair

University Diversity and Social Transformation Professor, Professor of Dentistry, Department of Periodontics and Oral Medicine, School of Dentistry and Faculty Associate, Department of Psychology

CC: SRAC; SACUA

Appendix A: SRAC Recommendations

SRAC Recommendation	Statement Section	Current Language	Proposed Language	SRAC Approval
1	Section IV: A	A. Physically harming and/or directly threatening harm of any other person or group in a manner which would cause a reasonable person to fear for physical safety.	A. Physically harming and/or directly threatening harm of any person, group, or animal in a manner which would cause reasonable fear for physical safety.	Approved unanimously: 10 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain. Approves, with revisions, part of Staff proposal #26-28.
2	Section IV: F	F. Harassing or bullying another person - physically, verbally, or through other means.	F. Harassing, bullying, or doxxing another person - physically, verbally, or through other means. This includes inciting others to harass or bully another person through posting photos, recordings, names, or personal information online. Section IV: F Definition Page: "Doxxing is the gathering and publication of personal or identifying information, such as photos, recordings, addresses, and phone numbers, by hostile parties to try to intimidate, harass, and even direct violence at someone."	Approved unanimously: 10 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain. Approves Faculty proposal #5.
3	Section IV: N	N. Obstructing or disrupting classes, research projects, or other activities or programs of the University; or obstructing access to University facilities, property, or programs (except for behavior that is protected by the University's policy on Freedom of Speech and Artistic Expression).	N. Obstructing or disrupting classes, research projects, or other activities or programs of the University; or obstructing access to University facilities, property, or programs (except for behavior that is political protest or protected by the University's policy on Freedom of Speech and Artistic Expression).	Approved unanimously: 10 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain. Approves part of Faculty proposal #16-25 and Student proposal #1.
4	Section IV: P	P. Assuming another person's identity or role through deception or without proper authorization. Communicating or acting under the guise, name, identification, email address, signature, or indicia of another person without proper authorization, or communicating under the rubric of an organization, entity, or unit that you do not have the authority to represent.	P. Assuming another person's identity or role through deception or without proper authorization. Communicating or acting under the guise, name, identification, email address, signature, or indicia of another person without proper authorization, or communicating under the rubric of an organization, entity, or unit that you do not have the authority to represent. This includes, but is not limited to, the use of generative AI, synthetic media, or "deep fake" technologies to create or knowingly disseminate content that impersonates or misrepresents another individual or organization, without proper authorization.	Approved unanimously: 10 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain. Approves Staff proposal #1

Appendix A: SRAC Recommendations

5	Section IV: S	S. Misusing, failing to comply with, or jeopardizing <i>Statement</i> procedures, sanctions, or mediated agreements, or interfering with participants involved in the resolution process.	S. Misusing, failing to comply with, or jeopardizing <i>Statement</i> procedures, sanctions, or formal agreements with another individual, or interfering with participants involved in the resolution process.	Approved unanimously: 10 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain. Approves with revisions part of Staff proposal #26-28
6	Section V, "4. anywhere ..."	4. anywhere—including remotely or online—if it poses an immediate danger to another person.	4. anywhere—including remotely or online—if it poses an immediate danger to another person or causes a substantial disruption on University property or to University sponsored or affiliated events or programs.	Approved unanimously: 9 Aye, 0 Nay, 1 Abstain. Approves Staff Proposal #2
7	Section VI, first paragraph	The <i>Statement</i> process is designed to move swiftly and without delay.	The <i>statement</i> process is designed to be fair and efficient.	Approved unanimously: 10 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain. Approves, with revisions, part of Faculty proposal #16-25 and Student proposal #5.
8	Section VI: Stage 1, paragraph 1	Any student, faculty member, or staff member may contact an RC to learn about available resolution options, and/or to initiate a resolution process. The University may also initiate or join a resolution process when the University becomes aware of an alleged violation of the <i>Statement</i> .	Any student, faculty member, or staff member may contact an RC to learn about available resolution options, and/or to initiate a resolution process.	Approved unanimously: 10 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain. Approves part of Faculty proposal #3-4 and Student proposal #2.

Appendix A: SRAC Recommendations

9	Section VI: Stage 1, paragraph 3	The University, or any student, faculty member, or staff member may submit a complaint alleging a violation of the <i>Statement</i> . The University, student, faculty member, or staff member may also submit a complaint based upon information reported to that person. All complaints must be submitted to the RC, in writing, within six months after the incident(s) alleged in the complaint. The RC may waive the six-month limitation when a late submission is reasonable. If the RC determines, upon reviewing the information made available to them, that the alleged behavior may be a violation of the Statement, the RC will notify the respondent and schedule a meeting as described below.	Only a student, faculty member, or staff member at the time of the incident may submit a complaint alleging a violation of the <i>Statement</i> . The student, faculty member, or staff member may also submit a complaint based upon information reported to that person. The Complainant must be identified by name. Complainants may not be compensated by the University specifically for their role as complainant, or serve as complainant as the primary responsibility of their employment duties. All complaints must be submitted to the RC, in writing, within six months after the incident(s) alleged in the complaint. The RC may waive the six-month limitation when a late submission is reasonable. If the RC determines, upon reviewing the information made available to them, that the alleged behavior may be a violation of the Statement, the RC will notify the respondent and schedule a meeting as described below.	Approved unanimously: 10 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain. Approves, with revisions, part of Faculty proposals #3-4 and 16-25 and Student proposals #2 and 3.
10	Section VI: Stage 1, last paragraph	NA - New added language	If multiple respondents are the subject of substantially similar complaints, or complaints regarding the same incident, any group or subgroup of them have the right to proceed through the resolution process collectively. Respondents must be informed when this right applies to their process. Additionally, any deadlines will be extended, within reason, accordingly to allow respondents time to coordinate with one another. The Resolution Officer or student panel may differentiate sanctions between individuals dependent on the evidence provided.	Approved unanimously: 10 Aye, 0 Nay, 1 Abstain. Approves, with revisions, part of Faculty proposal #16-25 and Student proposal 4.
11	Section VI: Stage 2, first paragraph	Within five (5) academic calendar days of notifying the respondent, the RC will meet with the respondent to explain the complaint and the resolution process.	The RC will meet with the respondent as soon as practical for all parties to explain the complaint and the resolution process.	Approved unanimously: 10 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain. Approves, with revisions, part of Faculty proposal #16-25 and Student proposal 5.

Appendix A: SRAC Recommendations

12	Section VI: Stage 2, 1. Acceptance of Responsibility and Entering into an Agreement	If the respondent desires to voluntarily accept responsibility for the alleged violation and an assigned sanction(s), the matter can be resolved by a written resolution agreement. Sanction(s) will be determined by the RC with input from the complainant. Once an agreement has been reached, it may not be appealed. If resolution is not achieved through an attempt at an agreement within seven (7) academic calendar days, the parties have the choice of attempting ACR or proceeding to a hearing.	If the respondent is in general agreement with the allegations in the complaint, and is in general agreement with the complainant and/or community (as represented by the RC) about how to resolve the conflict and restore the community, the respondent has the option of entering into an agreement. In resolution by agreement, the respondent accepts responsibility for the alleged violation(s) of the <i>Statement</i> and agrees to fulfill sanctions/interventions that are developed with the input of the respondent, the complainant, and the RC. The respondent has the right to discuss potential sanctions/interventions before entering into an agreement. Once an agreement has been reached, it may not be appealed.	Approved unanimously: 11 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain. Approves part of Faculty proposal #16-25 and Student proposals # 5 and 6.
13	Section VI: Stage 2.2, final paragraph	If resolution is not achieved through an attempt at ACR within seven (7) academic calendar days and the matter involves a pending <i>Statement</i> violation, the respondent has the choice of accepting responsibility and entering into an agreement, or proceeding to a hearing.	If all parties involved have not reached an agreement regarding an ACR resolution pathway within seven (7) academic calendar days, where feasible, and the matter involves a pending <i>Statement</i> violation, the respondent has the choice of accepting responsibility and entering into an agreement, or proceeding to a hearing.	Approved unanimously: 11 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain. Approves, with revisions, part of Staff Proposal #26-28, Faculty proposal # 16-25, and Student proposal # 5
14	Section VI: Stage 2, 3. Hearing, second paragraph	If the alleged violation is not resolved through ACR or a resolution agreement, a hearing will be provided to determine responsibility. The RC will ensure that the hearing is held within ten (10) academic calendar days of either the initial meeting with the Respondent, or if either or both ACR or a resolution agreement was attempted, within ten (10) academic calendar days of the conclusion of those attempt(s).The respondent may choose to have a Resolution Officer (RO) or a Student Resolution Panel arbitrate the dispute. Should the complainant disagree with the respondent's choice, an RO will arbitrate the matter.	If the alleged violation is not resolved through ACR or a resolution agreement, a hearing will be provided to determine responsibility. The respondent may choose to have a Resolution Officer (RO) or a Student Resolution Panel arbitrate the dispute. Should the complainant disagree with the respondent's choice, the RO will determine whether another RO or a panel is most appropriate for the complaint solely based on explanations submitted by the parties. The decision to utilize an RO should not be made on the basis of administrative factors, such as time expediency.	Approved unanimously: 11 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain. Approves, with revisions, part of Faculty proposal #3-4 and #16-25, and Student proposals # 5

Appendix A: SRAC Recommendations

15	Section VI: Stage 2, 1. Hearing, second paragraph	In cases which involve more than one respondent, the students will have the option of choosing whether they have the same or separate hearings. If students cannot agree, the hearings will be separate.	Any group, or subgroup, of respondents may choose to have a collective hearing. In this situation, evidence and witnesses presented at the hearing are presented on behalf of the group, although each individual retains the right to their own advisor. The Resolution Officer or student panel may differentiate sanctions between individuals dependent on the evidence provided.	Approved unanimously: 11 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain. Approves, with revisions, part of Faculty proposal #16-25 and Student proposal # 4
16	Section VI: Stage 2, 1. Hearing, third paragraph	Each party may be accompanied at the hearing by a personal advisor, who may be an attorney; however, the advisor may not participate directly in the proceedings, but may only advise the party. For example, the advisor may not question witnesses or make presentations.	Each party may be accompanied at the hearing by a personal advisor, who may be an attorney; however, the advisor may not participate directly in the proceedings, but may only advise the party. For example, the advisor may not question witnesses or make presentations. Personal advisors may not be employees of the University's Office of the General Counsel. Personal advisors may also not be compensated by the University for their role in the proceedings, regardless of their employment status with the University.	Approved unanimously: 11 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain. Approves part of Faculty proposal #16-25 and Student proposal # 8
17	Section VI: Stage 2, third paragraph	NA - New added language	Each party maintains the right to request the re-assignment of an RO, RC, members of a student panel, or members of the Appeals Board in the event of a conflict of interest. A conflict of interest occurs when the involved individual has had substantial personal interaction with or demonstrated antagonism toward either party that could influence or could provide the appearance of influencing their behavior during the proceedings. An RO must determine whether or not to uphold a challenge after both the parties are able to make an argument regarding the alleged conflict of interest. In the event that the alleged conflict of interest involves the RO, a separate RO with no conflict of interest as defined above must determine whether to uphold a challenge after the party alleging a conflict of interest and any other complainant or respondent are all able to make an argument regarding the alleged conflict of interest.	Approved unanimously: 11 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain. Approves part of Faculty proposal #16-25 and Student proposal # 7

Appendix A: SRAC Recommendations

18	Section VI: Stage 3, first paragraph	<p>All appeals must be submitted in writing to the RC within five (5) academic calendar days after the RO submits its written decision. The RC will determine whether there are grounds for an appeal. If so, the Vice President for Student Life, or their designee, will serve as the Appeals Officer. The Appeals Officer, after reviewing the relevant information to the matter, will issue a written decision within five (5) days of the RC approving grounds to appeal. The written decision may sustain or reverse the finding of responsibility; modify the assigned sanction(s); and/or order a new hearing. This decision is final.</p>	<p>All appeals must be submitted in writing to the RC within ten (10) academic calendar days after the RO submits its written decision unless there are severe extenuating circumstances. The appeal will be reviewed by an Appeals Board composed of one student appointed by the Central Student Government (CSG), one faculty member appointed according to the procedures of the Faculty Senate, and one administrator appointed by the President. CSG, the Faculty Senate, and the President will each appoint one alternate member to the Appeals Board.</p> <p>The Appeals Board will recommend one of the following actions to the VPSL: (a) confirming the decision made through the hearing process, (b) altering the sanctions/interventions, (c) striking the initial finding of responsibility and/or sanctions/interventions and remanding to the original fact-finder for further consideration with corrective instructions from the Appeals Board, or (d) ordering a new hearing before a new fact-finder. If the RO or Student Hearing Panel and the Appeals Board were in agreement, the VPSL must accept the recommendations unless a recommendation is to impose expulsion. When expulsion is recommended, the VPSL may instead suspend the student. If the RO or Student Hearing Panel and the Appeals Board were in agreement, the VPSL must accept the recommendations unless a recommendation is to impose expulsion. When expulsion is recommended, the VPSL may instead suspend the student.</p> <p>The VPSL has to uphold any aspect of the findings or sanctions for which the RO/Student panel and appeals board were in agreement. For any aspect for which the RO/Student Panel and Appeals board were not in agreement, the VPSL may accept or modify the recommendations. The VPSL may not modify sanctions/interventions to include suspension or expulsion.</p>	<p>Approved unanimously: 11 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain.</p> <p>Approves, with revisions, parts of Faculty proposal #3-4 and #16-25 and Student proposal # 5 and 9</p>
19	Section VIII: subsection J	N/A - New Language	<p>All amendments to the Statement must follow the above process. No one can be held responsible for not implementing changes to the statement process which are made without following the above described process.</p>	<p>Approved unanimously: 10 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain.</p> <p>Approves, with revisions, parts of Faculty proposal #16-25 and Student proposal # 10</p>

Appendix B: Staff Proposals

Staff Amendment Proposal #1					
Proposal Summary	Author(s)	Stakeholder Group	Leadership Group (EO, SACUA, CSG)	Current Language	Proposed Language
Adding the use of AI, etc. to violation P.	Amy Tuckfield Ricky LaFosse	Staff - Center for Academic Innovation	Provost	<p>[Section III, IV, P] Assuming another person's identity or role through deception or without proper authorization. Communicating or acting under the guise, name, identification, email address, signature, or indicia of another person without proper authorization, or communicating under the rubric of an organization, entity, or unit that you do not have the authority to represent.</p>	<p>[Section III, IV, P] Assuming another person's identity or role through deception or without proper authorization. Communicating or acting under the guise, name, identification, email address, signature, or indicia of another person without proper authorization, or communicating under the rubric of an organization, entity, or unit that you do not have the authority to represent. This includes the use of generative AI, synthetic media, or “deep fake” technologies to create or knowingly disseminate content that impersonates or misrepresents another individual or organization, without proper authorization.</p>
<p>SRAC Review</p> <p>[Section III, IV, P] Assuming.... Approved as SRAC Recommendation # 4. Approved unanimously: 10 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain.</p>					

Appendix B: Staff Proposals

Staff Amendment Proposal #2					
Proposal Summary	Author(s)	Stakeholder Group	Leadership Group (EO, SACUA, CSG)	Current Language	Proposed Language
Amending section V: Scope of violations to include substantial disruption.	Amy Tuckfield Ricky LaFosse	Staff - Center for Academic Innovation	Provost	<p>[Section V] The <i>Statement</i> applies to students who are currently enrolled or have a continuing student-related relationship at the University of Michigan—Ann Arbor and to student behavior that occurs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. on University owned or controlled property; 2. in the City of Ann Arbor; 3. at University sponsored or affiliated events or programs—including those that are remote or online; <p>or</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. anywhere—including remotely or online—if it poses an immediate danger to another person 	<p>[Section V] The <i>Statement</i> applies to students who are currently enrolled or have a continuing student-related relationship at the University of Michigan—Ann Arbor and to student behavior that occurs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. on University owned or controlled property; 2. in the City of Ann Arbor; 3. at University sponsored or affiliated events or programs—including those that are remote or online; <p>or</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. anywhere—including remotely or online—if it poses an immediate danger to another person or causes a substantial disruption on University property or to University sponsored or affiliated events or programs.
<p>SRAC Review</p> <p>[Section V] The <i>Statement</i>....</p> <p>Approved as SRAC Recommendation #6. Approved unanimously: 9 Aye, 0 Nay, 1 Abstain.</p>					

Appendix B: Staff Proposals

Staff Amendment Proposal #26-28					
Proposal Summary	Author(s)	Stakeholder Group	Leadership Group (EO, SACUA, CSG)	Current Language	Proposed Language
Adding cruelty to animals as a Statement violation	Mike Ryan	Staff - Office of Student Conflict Resolution		[Section III, IV, A] Physically harming and/or directly threatening harm of any other person or group in a manner which would cause a reasonable person to fear for physical safety.	[Section III, IV, A] Physically harming and/or directly threatening harm of any other person, or group, or animal in a manner which would cause a reasonable person to fear for physical safety.
Clarifying which agreements failing to comply with would be a policy violation				[Section III, IV, S] Misusing, failing to comply with, or jeopardizing <i>Statement</i> procedures, sanctions, or mediated agreements, or interfering with participants involved in the resolution process.	[Section III, IV, S] Misusing, failing to comply with, or jeopardizing <i>Statement</i> procedures, sanctions, or mediated formal agreements with another individual , or interfering with participants involved in a resolution process
Clarifying the time available in cases that attempt the ACR process, where an alleged policy violation is substantiated				[Section VI, Stage 2, 2] If resolution is not achieved through an attempt at ACR within seven (7) academic calendar days and the matter involves a pending <i>Statement</i> violation, the respondent has the choice of accepting responsibility and entering into an agreement, or proceeding to a hearing.	[Section VI, Stage 2, 2] If resolution is not achieved through an attempt at ACR all parties involved have not reached an agreement regarding an ACR resolution pathway within seven (7) academic calendar days and the matter involves a pending <i>Statement</i> violation, the respondent has the choice of accepting responsibility and entering into an agreement, or proceeding to a hearing.
SRAC Review					

Appendix B: Staff Proposals

[Section III, IV, A] Physically harming....

Approved with revisions as SRAC Recommendation # 1. Approved unanimously: 10 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain.

[Section III, IV, S] Misusing....

Approved with revisions as SRAC Recommendation #5. Approved unanimously: 10 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain.

[Section VI, Stage 2, 2] If resolution....

Approved with revisions as SRAC Recommendation #13. Approved unanimously: 11 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain.

Appendix C: Faculty Proposals



1120 Ruthven Building
 1109 Geddes Avenue
 Ann Arbor, MI 48109

<p>Amendment Proposal #3-4 Author: Marita Inglehart Stakeholder group: Faculty Leadership Group: SACUA</p>		
Proposal Summary	Current Language	Proposed Language
<p>Remove the right of the University to initiate or join a resolution process.</p>	<p>[Section VI, Stage 1] Any student, faculty member, or staff member may contact an RC to learn about available resolution options, and/or to initiate a resolution process. The University may also initiate or join a resolution process when the University becomes aware of an alleged violation of the <i>Statement</i>...</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 1] The University, or any student, faculty member, or staff member may submit a complaint alleging a violation of the <i>Statement</i>.</p>	<p>[Section VI, Stage 1] Any student, faculty member, or staff member may contact an RC to learn about available resolution options, and/or to initiate a resolution process. The University may also initiate or join a resolution process when the University becomes aware of an alleged violation of the <i>Statement</i>...</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 1] The University, or any student, faculty member, or staff member may submit a complaint alleging a violation of the <i>Statement</i>.</p>
<p>SRAC Review</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 1] Any student, faculty member.... Approved as SRAC Recommendation # 8. Approved unanimously: 10 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain.</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 1] The University, or.... Approved with revisions as SRAC Recommendation # 9. Approved unanimously: 10 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain.</p>		
<p>Amending RO discretion for arbiter process (i.e. student panel or RO)</p>	<p>[Section VI, Stage 2.3] Should the complainant disagree with the respondent's choice, an RO will arbitrate the matter. In cases which involve more than one respondent, the students will have the option of choosing whether they have the same or separate hearings. If students cannot agree, the hearings will be separate.</p>	<p>[Section VI, Stage 2.3] Should the complainant disagree with the respondent's choice, an RO will arbitrate the matter. In cases which involve more than one respondent, the students will have the option of choosing whether they have the same or separate hearings. If students cannot agree, the hearings will be separate. an RO will determine whether an RO or a panel is most appropriate for the complaint based on explanations submitted by the parties.</p>

Appendix C: Faculty Proposals

<p>SRAC Review</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 2.3] Should the complainant....</p> <p>Approved with revisions as SRAC Recommendation # 14. Approved unanimously: 11 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain.</p>		
<p>Amending to restore SSRR 2022 Appeals Process</p>	<p>[Section VI, Stage 3] All appeals must be submitted in writing to the RC within five (5) academic calendar days after the RO submits its written decision. The RC will determine whether there are grounds for an appeal. If so, the Vice President for Student Life, or their designee, will serve as the Appeals Officer. The Appeals Officer, after reviewing the relevant information to the matter, will issue a written decision within five (5) days of the RC approving grounds to appeal. The written decision may sustain or reverse the finding of responsibility; modify the assigned sanction(s); and/or order a new hearing. This decision is final.</p>	<p>[Section VI, Stage 3] All appeals must be submitted in writing to the RC within five (5) ten academic calendar days after the RO submits its written decision. The RC will determine whether there are grounds for an appeal. If so, the Vice President for Student Life, or their designee, will serve as the Appeals Officer. The Appeals Officer, after reviewing the relevant information to the matter, will issue a written decision within five (5) days of the RC approving grounds to appeal. The written decision may sustain or reverse the finding of responsibility; modify the assigned sanction(s); and/or order a new hearing. This decision is final. notification of the Dean of Students' decision to accept or modify the recommendations resulting from the hearing. The Vice President for Student Life (VPSL) may waive the ten-day limitation when a late submission is reasonable. The appeal will be reviewed by an Appeals Board composed of one student appointed by the Central Student Government (CSG), one faculty member appointed by the Faculty Senate, and one administrator appointed by the President. CSG, the Faculty Senate, and the President will each appoint one alternate member to the Appeals Board. The Appeals Board will recommend one of the following actions to the VPSL: (a) confirming the decision made through the hearing process, (b) altering the sanctions/interventions, (c) striking the initial finding of responsibility and/or sanctions/interventions and remanding to the original fact-finder for further consideration with corrective instructions from the Appeals Board, or (d) ordering a new hearing before a new fact-finder. The VPSL may accept or modify the recommendation(s). The VPSL may not modify sanctions/interventions to include suspension or expulsion. However, when expulsion is recommended, the VPSL may instead suspend the student.</p>
<p>SRAC Review</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 3] All appeals must....</p> <p>Approved with revisions as SRAC recommendation #18. Approved unanimously: 11 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain.</p>		

Appendix C: Faculty Proposals

<p>Amendment Proposal #5 Author: Charlotte Karem Albrecht, Bruno Giordani, Charlie Koopman, David Potter, Joel Scheuher, Jamie Niehof, Marna Clowney-Robinson, Myles Durkee, Jonathan Brennan Stakeholder group: Faculty Leadership Group: SACUA</p>		
Proposal Summary	Current Language	Proposed Language
	<p>[Section III, IV, F] Harassing or bullying another person—physically, verbally, or through other means.</p>	<p>[Section III, IV, F] Harassing, or bullying, or doxxing another person—physically, verbally, or through other means. This includes inciting others to harass or bully another person through posting photos, recordings, names, or personal information online.</p> <p>[Section III, IV, F, Definition Page] Doxxing is the gathering and publication of personal or identifying information, such as photos, recordings, addresses, and phone numbers, by hostile parties to try to intimidate, harass, and even direct violence at someone.</p>
<p>SRAC Review</p> <p>[Section III, IV, F] Harassing.... Approved as SRAC Recommendation # 2. Approved unanimously: 10 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain.</p>		

<p>Amendment Proposal #16-25 Author: Stephen Ward Stakeholder group: Faculty Leadership Group: SACUA</p>		
Proposal Summary	Current Language	Proposed Language
<p>Remove the right of the University to initiate or join a resolution process.</p>	<p>[Section VI, Stage 1] The University, or any student, faculty member, or staff member may submit a complaint alleging a violation of the <i>Statement</i>. The University, student, faculty member, or staff member may also submit a complaint based upon information reported to that person.</p>	<p>[Section VI, Stage 1] The University, or Any student, faculty member, or staff member at the time of the alleged incident may submit a complaint alleging a violation of the <i>Statement</i>. The University, student, faculty member, or staff member may also submit a complaint based upon information reported to that person. Neither the University nor individuals unaffiliated with the University may submit or represent a complaint."</p>

Appendix C: Faculty Proposals

<p>SRAC Review</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 1] The University, or...</p> <p>Approved with revisions as SRAC Recommendation #9. Approved unanimously: 10 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain.</p>	
<p>[Section VI, Stage 2.1] If the respondent desires to voluntarily accept responsibility for the alleged violation and an assigned sanction(s), the matter can be resolved by a written resolution agreement. Sanction(s) will be determined by the RC with input from the complainant. Once an agreement has been reached, it may not be appealed. If resolution is not achieved through an attempt at an agreement within seven (7) academic calendar days, the parties have the choice of attempting ACR or proceeding to a hearing.</p>	<p>[Section VI, Stage 2.1] If the respondent desires to voluntarily accept responsibility for the alleged violation and an assigned sanction(s), the matter can be resolved by a written resolution agreement. Sanction(s) will be determined by the RC with input from the complainant is in general agreement with the allegations in the complaint, and is in general agreement with the complainant and/or community (as represented by the RC) about how to resolve the conflict and restore the community, the respondent has the option of entering into an agreement. In resolution by agreement, the respondent accepts responsibility for the alleged violation(s) of the <i>Statement</i> and agrees to fulfill sanctions/interventions that are developed with the input of the respondent, the complainant, and the RC. The respondent has the right to discuss potential sanctions/interventions before entering into an agreement. If resolution is not achieved through an attempt at an agreement within seven (7) academic calendar days, the parties have the choice of attempting ACR or proceeding to a hearing. The respondent also has the option of entering into an agreement by accepting responsibility for the alleged violations of the <i>Statement</i> and requesting a hearing on the sanctions/interventions under the procedures outlined in VI.2.C. "Hearing."</p>
<p>SRAC Review</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 2.1] If the respondent...</p> <p>Approved as SRAC recommendation # 12. Approved unanimously: 11 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain.</p>	
<p>[Section VI] The <i>Statement</i> process is designed to move swiftly and without delay. At any point during the process, the Resolution Coordinator may extend a given deadline due to extenuating circumstances of the requesting party.</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 2] Within five (5) academic calendar days of notifying the respondent, the RC will meet with the</p>	<p>[Section VI] The <i>Statement</i> process is designed to move swiftly and without delay. At any point during the process, the Resolution Coordinator may extend a given deadline due to extenuating circumstances of the requesting party."</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 2] Within five (5) academic calendar days of notifying the respondent, the RC will meet with the respondent to explain the complaint and the resolution process.</p>

Appendix C: Faculty Proposals

<p>respondent to explain the complaint and the resolution process.</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 2.1] If the respondent desires to voluntarily accept responsibility for the alleged violation and an assigned sanction(s), the matter can be resolved by a written resolution agreement. Sanction(s) will be determined by the RC with input from the complainant. Once an agreement has been reached, it may not be appealed. If resolution is not achieved through an attempt at an agreement within seven (7) academic calendar days, the parties have the choice of attempting ACR or proceeding to a hearing.</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 2.2] If resolution is not achieved through an attempt at ACR within seven (7) academic calendar days and the matter involves a pending <i>Statement</i> violation, the respondent has the choice of accepting responsibility and entering into an agreement, or proceeding to a hearing.</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 2.3] If the alleged violation is not resolved through ACR or a resolution agreement, a hearing will be provided to determine responsibility. The RC will ensure that the hearing is held within ten (10) academic calendar days of either the initial meeting with the Respondent, or if either or both ACR or a resolution agreement was attempted, within ten (10) academic calendar days of the conclusion of those attempt(s).</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 2.3] The respondent may choose to have a Resolution Officer (RO) or a Student Resolution Panel arbitrate the dispute. Should the complainant disagree with the respondent's choice, an RO will arbitrate the matter.</p>	<p>[Section VI, Stage 2.1] If the respondent desires to voluntarily accept responsibility for the alleged violation and an assigned sanction(s), the matter can be resolved by a written resolution agreement. Sanction(s) will be determined by the RC with input from the complainant. Once an agreement has been reached, it may not be appealed. If resolution is not achieved through an attempt at an agreement within seven (7) academic calendar days, the parties have the choice of attempting ACR or proceeding to a hearing.</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 2.2] If resolution is not achieved through an attempt at ACR within seven (7) academic calendar days and the matter involves a pending <i>Statement</i> violation, the respondent has the choice of accepting responsibility and entering into an agreement, or proceeding to a hearing.</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 2.3] If the alleged violation is not resolved through ACR or a resolution agreement, a hearing will be provided to determine responsibility. The RC will ensure that the hearing is held within ten (10) academic calendar days of either the initial meeting with the Respondent, or if either or both ACR or a resolution agreement was attempted, within ten (10) academic calendar days of the conclusion of those attempt(s).</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 2.3] The respondent may choose to have a Resolution Officer (RO) or a Student Resolution Panel arbitrate the dispute. Should the complainant disagree with the respondent's choice, an RO will arbitrate the matter an RO will determine whether an RO or a panel is most appropriate for the complaint based on explanations submitted by the parties</p>
--	---

Appendix C: Faculty Proposals

	<p>[Section VI, Stage 3] All appeals must be submitted in writing to the RC within five (5) academic calendar days after the RO submits its written decision.</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 3] The Appeals Officer, after reviewing the relevant information to the matter, will issue a written decision within five (5) days of the RC approving grounds to appeal.</p>	<p>[Section VI, Stage 3] All appeals must be submitted in writing to the RC within five (5)ten (10) academic calendar days after the RO submits its written decision.</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 3] The Appeals Officer, after reviewing the relevant information to the matter, will issue a written decision within five (5)ten (10) days of the RC approving grounds to appeal.</p>
<p>SRAC Review</p> <p>[Section VI] The <i>Statement</i> process.... Approved with revisions as SRAC Recommendation 7. Approved unanimously: 10 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain.</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 2] Within five (5) academic calendar days.... Approved as SRAC recommendation # 11. Approved unanimously: 11 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain.</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 2.1] If the respondent.... Approved as SRAC recommendation # 12. Approved unanimously: 11 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain.</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 2.2] If resolution.... Approved with revisions as SRAC Recommendation # 13. Approved unanimously: 11 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain.</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 2.3] If the alleged violation.... Approved as SRAC Recommendation #14. Approved unanimously: 11 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain.</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 2.3] The respondent may choose.... Approved with revisions as SRAC Recommendation #14. Approved unanimously: 11 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain.</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 3] All appeals.... Approved as SRAC Recommendation #18. Approved unanimously: 11 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain.</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 3] The Appeals Officer.... Approved with revisions as SRAC Recommendation #18. Approved unanimously: 11 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain.</p>		
<p>Amending to restore SSRR 2022 Appeals Process sans initial appeal submission timeline</p>	<p>[Section VI, Stage 3] All appeals must be submitted in writing to the RC within five (5) academic calendar days after the RO submits its written decision. The RC will determine whether there are grounds for an appeal. If so, the Vice President for Student Life, or their designee, will serve as the Appeals Officer. The Appeals Officer, after reviewing the relevant information to the matter, will issue a written decision within five (5) days</p>	<p>[Section VI, Stage 3] All appeals must be submitted in writing to the RC within five (5) academic calendar days after the RO submits its written decision. The RC will determine whether there are grounds for an appeal. If so, the Vice President for Student Life, or their designee, will serve as the Appeals Officer. The Appeals Officer, after reviewing the relevant information to the matter, will issue a written decision within five (5) days of the RC approving grounds to appeal. The written decision may sustain or reverse the finding of responsibility; modify the</p>

Appendix C: Faculty Proposals

	<p>of the RC approving grounds to appeal. The written decision may sustain or reverse the finding of responsibility; modify the assigned sanction(s); and/or order a new hearing. This decision is final.</p>	<p>assigned sanction(s); and/or order a new hearing. This decision is final.</p> <p>The appeal will be reviewed by an Appeals Board composed of one student appointed by the Central Student Government (CSG), one faculty member appointed by the Faculty Senate, and one administrator appointed by the President. CSG, the Faculty Senate, and the President will each appoint one alternate member to the Appeals Board. The Appeals Board will recommend one of the following actions to the VPSL: (a) confirming the decision made through the hearing process, (b) altering the sanctions/interventions, (c) striking the initial finding of responsibility and/or sanctions/interventions and remanding to the original fact-finder for further consideration with corrective instructions from the Appeals Board, or (d) ordering a new hearing before a new fact-finder. The VPSL may accept or modify the recommendation(s). The VPSL may not modify sanctions/interventions to include suspension or expulsion. However, when expulsion is recommended, the VPSL may instead suspend the student</p>
<p>SRAC Review</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 3] All appeals must....</p> <p>Approved with revisions as SRAC Recommendation #18. Approved unanimously: 11 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain.</p>		
<p>Add language in procedures to codify right to joint hearing procedure</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 2.3] In cases which involve more than one respondent, the students will have the option of choosing whether they have the same or separate hearings. If students cannot agree, the hearings will be separate.</p>	<p>[Section VI, Stage 1, insert after third paragraph] If multiple respondents are the subject of substantially similar complaints, or complaints regarding the same incident, any group or subgroup of them have the right to proceed through the resolution process collectively. Respondents must be informed when this right applies to their process. Additionally, any deadlines will be extended accordingly to allow respondents time to coordinate with one another.</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 2.3] In cases which involve more than one respondent, the students will have the option of choosing whether they have the same or separate hearings. If students cannot agree, the hearings will be separate Any group, or subgroup, of respondents may choose to have a collective hearing. In this situation, evidence and witnesses presented at the hearing are presented on behalf of the group, although each individual retains their right to an advisor.</p>

Appendix C: Faculty Proposals

<p>SRAC Review</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 1, insert after third paragraph] Approved with revisions as SRAC Recommendation # 10. Approved unanimously: 10 Aye, 0 Nay, 1 Abstain.</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 2.3] In cases which.... Approved with revisions as SRAC Recommendation # 15. Approved unanimously: 11 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain.</p>		
<p>Adding exception of political protest to violation N.</p>	<p>[Section III, IV, N] Obstructing or disrupting classes, research projects, or other activities or programs of the University; or obstructing access to University facilities, property, or programs (except for behavior that is protected by the University's policy on Freedom of Speech and Artistic Expression).</p>	<p>[Section III, IV, N] Obstructing or disrupting classes, research projects, or other activities or programs of the University; or obstructing access to University facilities, property, or programs (except for behavior that is protected by the University's policy on Freedom of Speech and Artistic Expression) (except for behavior that is political protest or protected by the University's policy on Freedom of Speech and Artistic Expression)</p>
<p>SRAC Review</p> <p>[Section III, IV, N] Obstructing or disrupting classes.... Approved as SRAC Recommendation # 3. Approved unanimously: 10 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain.</p>		
	<p>[Section VI, Stage 1] The University, student, faculty member, or staff member may also submit a complaint based upon information reported to that person.</p>	<p>[Section VI, Stage 1] ...information reported to that person. Complainants must have been a student, staff, or faculty member at the time of the alleged incident. Complainants may not be compensated by the University specifically for their role as complainant, or serve as complainant as the primary responsibility of their employment duties."</p>
<p>SRAC Review</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 1] The University.... Approved with revisions as SRAC Recommendation # 9. Approved unanimously: 10 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain.</p>		
	<p>[Section VI, Stage 2.3] Each party may be accompanied at the hearing by a personal advisor, who may be an attorney; however, the advisor may not participate directly in the proceedings, but may only advise the party. For example, the advisor may not question witnesses or make presentations.</p>	<p>[Section VI, Stage 2.3] Each party may be accompanied at the hearing by a personal advisor, who may be an attorney; however, the advisor may not participate directly in the proceedings, but may only advise the party. For example, the advisor may not question witnesses or make presentations. Personal advisors may not be employees of the University's Office of the General Counsel. Personal advisors may also not be compensated by the University for their role in the proceedings, regardless of their employment status with the University.</p>

Appendix C: Faculty Proposals

<p>SRAC Review</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 2.3] Each party may.... Approved as SRAC Recommendation # 16. Approved unanimously: 11 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain.</p>		
<p>Right to request recusal for conflict of interest</p>	<p>[Section VI, Stage 2.3] The respondent may choose to have a Resolution Officer (RO) or a Student Resolution Panel arbitrate the dispute. Should the complainant disagree with the respondent's choice, an RO will arbitrate the matter.</p>	<p>[Section VI, Stage 2.3] The respondent may choose to have a Resolution Officer (RO) or a Student Resolution Panel arbitrate the dispute. Each party maintains the right to request the re-assignment of an RO, RC, members of a student panel, or members of the Appeals Board in the event of a conflict of interest. An RO must determine whether or not to uphold a challenge after the both parties are able to make an argument regarding the alleged conflict of interest. In the event that the alleged conflict of interest involves the RO, the RC must determine whether to uphold a challenge after the moving party and non-moving party are both able to make an argument regarding the alleged conflict of interest. A conflict of interest occurs when the involved individual has had substantial personal interaction with or demonstrated antagonism toward either party that could influence or could provide the appearance of influencing their behavior during the proceedings. Should the complainant disagree with the respondent's choice, an RO will arbitrate the matter.</p>
<p>SRAC Review</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 2.3] The respondent may.... Approved with revisions as SRAC Recommendation # 17. Approved unanimously: 11 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain.</p>		
	<p>N/A</p>	<p>[Section VIII, J, after third paragraph] All amendments to the <i>Statement</i> must follow the above process. OSCR staff must not implement any changes to the process which are made without the opportunity for input from the student body.</p>
<p>SRAC Review</p> <p>[Section VIII, J, after third paragraph] All amendments.... Approved with revisions as SRAC recommendation 19. Approved unanimously: 10 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain.</p>		

Appendix D: Student Proposals

2025 CSG-Approved Student-Submitted Amendment Proposals

<p>Proposal # 1 Adding exception of political protest to violation N.</p>	<p>[Section III, IV, N] Obstructing or disrupting classes, research projects, or other activities or programs of the University; or obstructing access to University facilities, property, or programs (except for behavior that is protected by the University's policy on Freedom of Speech and Artistic Expression).</p>	<p>[Section III, IV, N] Obstructing or disrupting classes, research projects, or other activities or programs of the University; or obstructing access to University facilities, property, or programs (except for behavior that is protected by the University's policy on Freedom of Speech and Artistic Expression). (except for behavior that is political protest or protected by the University's policy on Freedom of Speech and Artistic Expression)</p>
<p>SRAC Review</p> <p>[Section III, IV, N] Obstructing or disrupting classes.... Approved as SRAC Recommendation #3. SRAC Vote: 10 votes total: 10 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain</p>		

Proposal Summary	Current Language	Proposed Language
<p>Proposal # 2 Remove the right of the University to initiate or join a resolution process.</p>	<p>[Section VI, Stage 1] Any student, faculty member, or staff member may contact an RC to learn about available resolution options, and/or to initiate a resolution process. The University may also initiate or join a resolution process when the University becomes aware of an alleged violation of the <i>Statement</i>.</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 1] The University, or any student, faculty member, or staff member may submit a complaint alleging a violation of the <i>Statement</i>. The University, student, faculty member, or staff member may also submit a complaint based upon information reported to that person. All complaints must be submitted to the RC, in writing, within six months after the incident(s) alleged in the complaint.</p>	<p>[Section VI, Stage 1] Any student, faculty member, or staff member may contact an RC to learn about available resolution options, and/or to initiate a resolution process. The University may also initiate or join a resolution process when the University becomes aware of an alleged violation of the <i>Statement</i>.</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 1] The University, or any A student, faculty member, or staff member may submit a complaint alleging a violation of the <i>Statement</i>. The University, student, faculty member, or staff member may also submit a complaint based upon information reported to that person. Neither the University as an institution nor individuals unaffiliated with the University may submit a Complaint. All complaints must be</p>

Appendix D: Student Proposals

		submitted to the RC, in writing, within six months after the incident(s) alleged in the complaint.
<p>SRAC Review</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 1] Any student.... Approved as SRAC Recommendation #8. Approved unanimously: 10 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain.</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 1] The University..... Approved with revisions as SRAC Recommendation #9. Approved unanimously: 10 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain.</p>		

Proposal Summary	Current Language	Proposed Language
<p>Proposal # 3 Stipulating complainants as student, faculty and staff - in role at time of incident.</p>	<p>[Section VI, Stage 1] The University, student, faculty member, or staff member may also submit a complaint based upon information reported to that person.</p>	<p>[Section VI, Stage 1] ... information reported to that person. Complainants must have been a student, staff, or faculty member at the time of the alleged incident. Complainants may not be compensated by the University specifically for their role as complainant, or serve as complainant as the primary responsibility of their employment duties.</p>
<p>SRAC Review</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 1] The University.... Approved as SRAC Recommendation #9. Approved unanimously: 10 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain.</p>		

Proposal Summary	Current Language	Proposed Language
<p>Proposal # 4. Add language in procedures to codify right to joint hearing procedure; retain individual right to advisor</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>[Section VI, Stage 1, after third paragraph] If multiple respondents are the subject of substantially similar complaints, or complaints regarding the same incident, any group or subgroup of them have the right to proceed through the resolution process collectively. Respondents must be informed when this right applies to their process. Additionally, any deadlines will be extended</p>

Appendix D: Student Proposals

		accordingly to allow respondents time to coordinate with one another.
	[Section VI, Stage 2.3] In cases which involve more than one respondent, the students will have the option of choosing whether they have the same or separate hearings. If students cannot agree, the hearings will be separate.	[Section VI, Stage 2.3] In cases which involve more than one respondent, the students will have the option of choosing whether they have the same or separate hearings. If students cannot agree, the hearings will be separate. Any group, or subgroup, of respondents may choose to have a collective hearing. In this situation, evidence and witnesses presented at the hearing are presented on behalf of the group, although each individual retains their right to an advisor.

SRAC Review

[Section VI, Stage 1, after third paragraph] If multiple respondents....

Approved with revisions as SRAC Recommendation #10. Approved unanimously: 10 Aye, 0 Nay, 1 Abstain.

[Section VI, Stage 2.3] In cases....

Approved as SRAC Recommendation #15. Approved unanimously: 11 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain.

<p>Proposal # 5 Amending RO discretion for arbiter process (i.e. student panel or RO)</p>	<p>[Section VI] The <i>Statement</i> process is designed to move swiftly and without delay. At any point during the process, the Resolution Coordinator may extend a given deadline due to extenuating circumstances of the requesting party.</p>	<p>[Section VI] The <i>Statement</i> process is designed to move swiftly and without delay. At any point during the process, the Resolution Coordinator may extend a given deadline due to extenuating circumstances of the requesting party.</p>
	<p>[Section VI, Stage 2] Within five (5) academic calendar days of notifying the respondent, the RC will meet with the respondent to explain the complaint and the resolution process.</p>	<p>[Section VI, Stage 2] Within five (5) academic calendar days of notifying the respondent, the RC will meet with the respondent to explain the complaint and the resolution process.</p>
	<p>[Section VI, Stage 2.1] Once an agreement has been reached, it may not be appealed. If resolution is not achieved through an attempt at an agreement within seven (7) academic calendar days, the parties have the choice of attempting ACR or proceeding to a hearing.</p>	<p>[Section VI, Stage 2.1] Once an agreement has been reached, it may not be appealed. If resolution is not achieved through an attempt at an agreement within seven (7) academic calendar days, the parties have the choice of attempting ACR or proceeding to a hearing.</p>

Appendix D: Student Proposals

	<p>[Section VI, Stage 2.2] If resolution is not achieved through an attempt at ACR within seven (7) academic calendar days and the matter involves a pending <i>Statement</i> violation, the respondent has the choice of accepting responsibility and entering into an agreement, or proceeding to a hearing.</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 2.3] If the alleged violation is not resolved through ACR or a resolution agreement, a hearing will be provided to determine responsibility. The RC will ensure that the hearing is held within ten (10) academic calendar days of either the initial meeting with the Respondent, or if either or both ACR or a resolution agreement was attempted, within ten (10) academic calendar days of the conclusion of those attempt(s).</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 2.3] Should the complainant disagree with the respondent’s choice, an RO will arbitrate the matter.</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 3] All appeals must be submitted in writing to the RC within five (5) academic calendar days after the RO submits its written decision.</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 3] The Appeals Officer, after reviewing the relevant information to the matter, will issue a written decision within five (5) days of the RC approving grounds to appeal.</p>	<p>[Section VI, Stage 2.2] If resolution is not achieved through an attempt at ACR within seven (7) academic calendar days and the matter involves a pending <i>Statement</i> violation, the respondent has the choice of accepting responsibility and entering into an agreement, or proceeding to a hearing.</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 2.3] If the alleged violation is not resolved through ACR or a resolution agreement, a hearing will be provided to determine responsibility. The RC will ensure that the hearing is held within ten (10) academic calendar days of either the initial meeting with the Respondent, or if either or both ACR or a resolution agreement was attempted, within ten (10) academic calendar days of the conclusion of those attempt(s).</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 2.3] Should the complainant disagree with the respondent’s choice, an RO will arbitrate the matter; an RO will determine whether an RO or a panel is most appropriate for the complaint based on explanations submitted by the parties.</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 3] All appeals must be submitted in writing to the RC within five (5) ten (10) academic calendar days after the RO submits its written decision.</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 3] The Appeals Officer, after reviewing the relevant information to the matter, will issue a written decision within five (5) ten (10) days of the RC approving grounds to appeal.</p>
<p>SRAC Review</p> <p>[Section VI] The <i>Statement</i>.... Approved with revisions as SRAC Recommendation # 7. Approved unanimously: 10 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain.</p>		

Appendix D: Student Proposals

[Section VI, Stage 2] Within five (5) academic calendar days....

Approved as SRAC Recommendation # 11. Approved unanimously: 11 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain.

[Section VI, Stage 2.1] Once an agreement....

Approved as SRAC Recommendation # 12. Approved unanimously: 11 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain.

[Section VI, Stage 2.2] If resolution....

Approved as SRAC Recommendation # 13. Approved unanimously: 11 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain.

[Section VI, Stage 2.3] If the alleged violation....

Approved as SRAC Recommendation # 14. Approved unanimously: 11 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain.

[Section VI, Stage 2.3] Should the complainant....

Approved with revisions as SRAC Recommendation # 14. Approved unanimously: 11 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain.

[Section VI, Stage 3] All appeals....

Approved with revisions as SRAC Recommendation # 18. Approved unanimously: 11 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain.

[Section VI, Stage 3] The Appeals Officer....

Approved with revisions as SRAC Recommendation # 18. Approved unanimously: 11 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain.

Proposal Summary	Current Language	Proposed Language
<p>Proposal # 6 Modification to Resolution by Agreement Process</p>	<p>[Section VI, Stage 2, 1] If the respondent desires to voluntarily accept responsibility for the alleged violation and an assigned sanction(s), the matter can be resolved by a written resolution agreement. Sanction(s) will be determined by the RC with input from the complainant. Once an agreement has been reached, it may not be appealed. If resolution is not achieved through an attempt at an agreement within seven (7) academic calendar days, the parties have the choice of attempting ACR or proceeding to a hearing.</p>	<p>[Section VI, Stage 2, 1] If the respondent desires to voluntarily accept responsibility for the alleged violation and an assigned sanction(s), the matter can be resolved by a written resolution agreement. Sanction(s) will be determined by the RC with input from the complainant. is in general agreement with the allegations in the complaint, and is in general agreement with the complainant and/or community (as represented by the RC) about how to resolve the conflict and restore the community, the respondent has the option of entering into an agreement. In resolution by agreement, the respondent accepts responsibility for the alleged violation(s) of the Statement and agrees to fulfill sanctions/interventions that are developed with the input of the respondent, the complainant, and the RC. The respondent has the right to discuss</p>

Appendix D: Student Proposals

		<p style="color: green;">potential sanctions/interventions before entering into an agreement. Once an agreement has been reached, it may not be appealed. If resolution is not achieved through an attempt at an agreement within seven (7) academic calendar days, the parties have the choice of attempting ACR or proceeding to a hearing. The respondent also has the option of entering into an agreement by accepting responsibility for the alleged violations of the Statement and requesting a hearing on the sanctions/interventions under the procedures outlined in VI.2.C. “Hearing.</p>
--	--	--

SRAC Review

[Section VI, Stage 2, 1] If the respondent....

Approved with revisions as SRAC Recommendation # 12. Approved unanimously: 11 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain.

Proposal Summary	Current Language	Proposed Language
<p>Proposal # 7 Right to request recusal for conflict of interest</p>	N/A	<p>[Section VI, Stage 2.3, after fourth paragraph] Each party maintains the right to request the re-assignment of an RO, RC, members of a student panel, or members of the Appeals Board in the event of a conflict of interest. An RO must determine whether or not to uphold a challenge after the both parties are able to make an argument regarding the alleged conflict of interest. In the event that the alleged conflict of interest involves the RO, the RC must determine whether to uphold a challenge after the moving party and non-moving party are both able to make an argument regarding the alleged conflict of interest. A conflict of interest occurs when the involved individual has had substantial personal interaction with or demonstrated antagonism toward either party that could influence or could provide the appearance of influencing their behavior during the proceedings.</p>

SRAC Review

[Section VI, Stage 2.3, after fourth paragraph] Each party maintains....

Approved with revisions as SRAC Recommendation # 17. Approved unanimously: 11 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain.

Appendix D: Student Proposals

Proposal Summary	Current Language	Proposed Language
<p>Proposal # 8 Amending to further define personal advisor</p>	<p>[Section VI, Stage 2.3] Each party may be accompanied at the hearing by a personal advisor, who may be an attorney; however, the advisor may not participate directly in the proceedings, but may only advise the party. For example, the advisor may not question witnesses or make presentations.</p>	<p>[Section VI, Stage 2.3] "Each party may be accompanied at the hearing by a personal advisor, who may be an attorney; however, the advisor may not participate directly in the proceedings, but may only advise the party. For example, the advisor may not question witnesses or make presentations. Personal advisors may not be employees of the University's Office of the General Counsel. Personal advisors may also not be compensated by the University for their role in the proceedings, regardless of their employment status with the University."</p>
<p>SRAC Review</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 2.3] Each party may.... Approved as SRAC Recommendation # 16. Approved unanimously: 11 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain.</p>		

<p>Proposal # 9 Amending to restore SSRR 2022 Appeals Process</p>	<p>[Section VI, Stage 3] The RC will determine whether there are grounds for an appeal. If so, the Vice President for Student Life, or their designee, will serve as the Appeals Officer. The Appeals Officer, after reviewing the relevant information to the matter, will issue a written decision within five (5) days of the RC approving grounds to appeal. The written decision may sustain or reverse the finding of responsibility; modify the assigned sanction(s); and/or order a new hearing. This decision is final.</p>	<p>[Section VI, Stage 3] The RC will determine whether there are grounds for an appeal. If so, the Vice President for Student Life, or their designee, will serve as the Appeals Officer. The Appeals Officer, after reviewing the relevant information to the matter, will issue a written decision within five (5) days of the RC approving grounds to appeal. The written decision may sustain or reverse the finding of responsibility; modify the assigned sanction(s); and/or order a new hearing. This decision is final. The appeal will be reviewed by an Appeals Board composed of one student appointed by the Central Student Government (CSG), one faculty member appointed by the Faculty Senate, and one administrator appointed by the President. CSG, the Faculty Senate, and the President will each appoint one alternate member to the Appeals Board.</p>
--	---	--

Appendix D: Student Proposals

		<p>The Appeals Board will recommend one of the following actions to the VPSL: (a) confirming the decision made through the hearing process, (b) altering the sanctions/interventions, (c) striking the initial finding of responsibility and/or sanctions/interventions and remanding to the original fact-finder for further consideration with corrective instructions from the Appeals Board, or (d) ordering a new hearing before a new fact-finder. The VPSL may accept or modify the recommendation(s). The VPSL may not modify sanctions/interventions to include suspension or expulsion. However, when expulsion is recommended, the VPSL may instead suspend the student.</p>
<p>SRAC Review</p> <p>[Section VI, Stage 3] The RC will.... Approved with revisions as SRAC Recommendation # 18. Approved unanimously: 11 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain.</p>		

Proposal Summary	Current Language	Proposed Language
Proposal # 10	N/A	[Section VIII, J, after third paragraph] All amendments to the <i>Statement</i> must follow the above process. OSCRC staff must not implement any changes to the process which are made without the opportunity for input from the student body.
<p>SRAC Review</p> <p>[Section VIII, J, after third paragraph] All amendments.... Approved with revisions as SRAC Recommendation #19. Approved unanimously: 10 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain.</p>		