



## **Student Relations Advisory Committee (SRAC) Minutes for 2/20/26 Meeting**

### **Meeting information:**

Circulated: 3/19/26

Approved: 3/20/26

Members present: Marita Inglehart (Chair), Jonathan Brennan, David Potter, Cindee Giffen, Stephen Ward, Martino Harmon (VP for Student Life), Connie Tingson Gatuz (Associate Vice President for Student Development, Learning, and Social Change Education), Tonya Marion (Office of Student Life), Joel Scheuher, Matt Lassiter, Bruno Giordani, Kirsten Herold (SACUA)

Members absent: John Kloosterman, Charlie Koopmann, Jamie Niehof, Devin Woodruff, Sri Likhita Adru, Hayley Bedell, Maxymilian Stefanski

Guests present: Maggie Reisdorf, Senior Manager of Operations and Communications in Student Resolution Resources

Faculty Senate Office staff present: Luke, McCarthy, Meaghan Blanchard, Eric Vandenberghe

### **Minutes:**

#### **11:30am-11:34am: Call to Order, Approval of Agenda and Minutes, Announcements**

The agenda was approved. The minutes for the January meeting are approved.

#### **11:34am-11:38am: Student Life Updates and Current Issues**

Summary: VP Harmon provides the committee with an update.

UM wrote an amicus brief in support of Harvard in a lawsuit against the Federal Government. The brief voices support for enrolling international students.

The Sexual Assault Prevention and Awareness Center (SAPAC) recently received a grant to allow for programming on alcohol abuse prevention, and sexual violence prevention.

U-M's inaugural Civic Learning Week, presented by the Ginsberg Center, will take place during the week of March 9th. That week "[highlights the many ways campus partners support the development of the civic knowledge, skills and attitudes we all need to be fully engaged members of our communities, on and off campus.](#)"

Action: Discussion

#### **11:38am-12:43pm: Off-Cycle Amendment Survey Results and Next Steps**

Summary: Senior Manager Reisdorf introduces herself and is thanked by the Chair for her attendance. The guest provides an overview of her role, and answers clarifying questions



about the organization of the Office of Student Conflict Resolution.

The Chair discusses the off-cycle amendment process. She discusses the results of the related survey that the committee recently completed. A majority of the committee was in favor of pursuing an off-cycle amendment process. In the wake of this, OVPSL provided four high level recommendations for administrative amendments to the Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities (SSRR).

The committee proceeds to discuss the four recommendations at length and begin to explore how changes would manifest. The Chair provided the committee with accompanying recommendations of changes within the SSRR for committee consideration.

Point one advocates for the expansion of the appeals board. A member voices support to expand the board, as well as increase the frequency and number of trainings. The member indicates that they are not currently occurring frequently enough for members to be adequately prepared for appeals. The member suggests that it would be helpful if the staff members on the appeals board would have a legal background – as was the case in the past.

Point two centers on the integration of an investigative process into the SSRR. A member raises a question about the beginning of the student conflict process. How is it determined if a complaint goes through the OSCR or OSA process? The guest provides an overview of the process.

A member advocates for requiring a complainant to put their name to the charge, and not to allow for the University to stand in as a complainant. Members present at the meeting offer differing opinions on this. The guest clarifies that each complaint is reviewed by the resolution coordinator before proceeding with the disciplinary process.

A member indicates that notice to students involved in the student disciplinary process needs to be presented clearly in an easy-to-understand way. They indicate that an email may not be sufficient.

A member suggests that the procedures outlined are opaque. A worry is expressed about what is accessible to the students. There is a need for the resolution process to be explained on a website in addition to being explained in the SSRR.

Regarding the investigative process, a member indicates a need for separate individuals as complainant and investigator. The guest clarifies that the investigator does not have a role in determining the outcome- they can recommend, however. The Resolution Officer makes the recommendations to the Dean of Students.

Point three advocates for the clarification of the Resolution Coordinator's facilitative role. A member voices their support for this. A member indicates a need to review past missteps in the student disciplinary process to effectively write the new language in a way that most improves the student disciplinary process.

A member indicates their concern about having the complainant and investigator being the same person. This interferes with assuring that the Respondent has all the information that the complainant has. For example, in a previous case, the investigator who was also the



complainant watched body cam footage and selected video clips. When the Respondent wanted to watch the same footage, he was told to pay nearly \$4,000 to do so.

Point four centers on enhancing the Notice of Charges in Stage 2. A member indicates that there needs to be a clear advocate who can help guide parties through the student disciplinary process.

Members offer critiques of how the student disciplinary process operates and offer suggestions on how to best resolve these issues. Key points of concern include making this an educational process for all parties, the need for transparency in the process, as well as the need for due process.

Throughout this portion of the meeting, Senior Manager Reisdorf provides the committee with insights into how student disciplinary proceedings and conflict resolutions are handled.

The committee discusses next steps. The timeline will be tight to complete an off-cycle amendment process prior to the departure of Interim President Grasso. VP Harmon provides insight into the necessary steps of an off-cycle amendment process and lays out some of the factors that the committee should keep in mind.

The committee will work outside of the meeting to craft specific language for the off-cycle amendment process. The members will determine which items are unanimously supported by the committee members and finalize those. For those that are not unanimous, they will be discussed at the next meeting.

Action: Discussion

### **12:43pm-1:00pm: Prepare for meeting with President Grasso**

Summary: As discussed in prior meetings, the Chair, VP Harmon, and several other members will meet with President Grasso and his staff to discuss the SSRR. The committee is asked for their suggestions as to what topics to discuss with the President.

Given the meeting is 30 minutes, members suggest focusing on very high-level concerns. A member suggests talking about the most recent decisions made by the President's Office regarding recent recommendations for changes to the SSRR. A member suggests that highlighting the educational nature of the process is paramount to maintain and that recent changes have caused that mission to stray. A member expresses support for pointing out the need for fairness in the student disciplinary process.

Along with the high-level concerns, a member suggests that a list of detailed concerns be brought and shared with the President for consideration outside of the meeting. A member indicates that recent changes to the SSRR are out of line with how the disciplinary proceedings have operated since the SSRR's inception. It is important that the President is aware that the current procedures have not been the norm.

A member suggests that those in attendance of the meeting highlight the authority of SRAC to recommend improvements to the SSRR as laid out in the Regent's bylaws.



Further discussion takes place on the timeline of a potential off-cycle amendment process and the meeting concludes

Action: Discussion

**1:00pm: Adjournment**

Respectfully submitted,

Eric Vandenberghe  
Faculty Governance Coordinator  
Faculty Senate Office