



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

Minutes of Meeting: 12/5/25

Circulated: 1/8/26

Approved: 1/16/26

Present: Marita Inglehart (Chair), Jonathan Brennan, Charlie Koopmann, Matt Lassiter, Jamie Niehof, Joel Scheuher, Stephen Ward, Hayley Bedell, Maxymilian Stefanski, Martino Harmon (VP for Student Life), Connie Tingson Gatuz (Associate Vice President for Student Development, Learning, and Social Change Education), India Hayes (Student Life), David Potter, Sri Likhita Adru, Cindee Giffen

Absent: Bruno Giordani, John Kloosterman, Kirsten Herold (SACUA), Devin Woodruff

Guests: Erik Wessel, Director of Student Resolution Resources

Faculty Senate Office: Luke McCarthy, Eric Vandenberghe

**11:35am:** Call to Order, Approval of Agenda and Minutes, Announcements

The agenda was approved. The minutes for the November SRAC meeting will be reviewed at the January meeting.

VPSL Harmon did not provide an update because the November meeting had been just two weeks before and he had provided an update at that meeting.

### **11:35am-12:14pm: Office of Student Accountability**

Summary: The Chair of the committee welcomes Director Wessel. He and his team worked quickly to compile data requested by the committee. He shares the annual case data from the 2023-2024 calendar year. The next report will be compiled and finalized in the next few months. He provides statistics. There were 222 cases that year. The cases can range from taking an hour to complete or taking a year-plus to complete.

Director Wessel describes the difference between informal conflict resolution and formal conflict resolution, including the different reasons why a case would go in either direction. Adaptable conflict resolution is also described. Director Wessel describes non-policy conflict resolutions, which are conflict mediations between multiple university parties where no UM policy has been violated.

Statistics regarding formal conflict resolution since the formation of OSA in September 2025 are shared. There have been 21 organizational cases. Of the 21 cases, 17 have been hazing related, and 4 have been related to alcohol distribution. Reasons for creating the Office of Student Accountability are shared. One of the primary drivers includes the Campus Hazing Act.

A member asks who decides if a case goes to OSA or OSCR. Director Wessel explains that each case comes into Student Resolution Resources and then is navigated one way or another based on a myriad of factors. These include whether a policy violation is alleged,

the preference of the parties where applicable, etc.

A member shares their concern that the SSR and OSA are not specifically identified in the SSRR. Director Wessel indicates that, in his opinion, that they are not out of line with the SSRR. Members offer contrasting opinions.

A member shares their concerns regarding due process, particularly with how several cases have been handled in the past year. Director Wessel indicates that specific cases cannot be discussed in detail, but that due process is followed. Due process is discussed. Members reiterate their concerns to Director Wessel and the Office of the Vice President for Student Life.

The committee proceeds to raise several issues that have been reported in the press. The messaging surrounding the work of student discipline at the University is discussed.

Action: Discussion

**12:14pm-1:02pm: Discussion of needed SSRR changes and meeting with President Grasso**

Summary: The committee proceeds to discuss how to proceed. A member indicates that the SSRR needs to be brought into alignment with the current student disciplinary process. They discussed the possibility of amending the SSRR off cycle to address the many concerns they have.

A member describes a need to have a neutral arbiter. The investigative officer cannot be the adjudicator. A member describes ensuring that there is due process moving forward. What is a complaint? This can be a document, and it sometimes refers to a formal process. This needs to be clarified. Improved communications to the community, as well as within the disciplinary process are discussed.

There is a need to increase trust in the process. The current process is not transparent, and it needs to be. A member discusses that the faculty and OVPSL are on the same team, and that all just want to make the student disciplinary process as fair as possible. Political pressures are discussed by members of the committee.

The FSO Director indicates there needs to be a positive definition of the role of a complainant. Student members offer their perspectives and wish to be involved in improving the system. They would like to see updates to the student disciplinary system brought to Central Student Government. OSA Director Mike Ryan will meet with the CSG executive council during the next term. A member suggests utilizing the Daily as a way to get information to the student body.

A member suggests that students should have an advocate who can shepherd them through the student disciplinary process. A member indicates that a transparent admission on past mistakes made as a means of taking accountability by the administration would go a long way towards mending trust.

The FSO Director indicates that the committee could put forth a vision of what they want the student disciplinary process to look like. Further strategy is discussed.



A member suggests that prior to the next meeting the members review the current student disciplinary process and identify areas that require clarification.

The committee Chair and a couple of members will meet with President Grasso to discuss issues with the SSRR. The committee discusses who will accompany her. Further discussion ensues, and the meeting concludes.

Action: Discussion

**1:02pm:** Adjournment

Respectfully submitted,

Eric Vandenberghe  
Faculty Governance Coordinator  
Faculty Senate Office