



## **Student Relations Advisory Committee (SRAC) Minutes for 3/20/26 Meeting**

### **Meeting information:**

Circulated: 4/15/2026

Approved: 4/17/2026

Members present: Jonathan Brennan, Cindee Giffen, Marita Inglehart (Chair), , Matt Lassiter, Jamie Niehof, Joel Scheuher, Kirsten Herold (SACUA), 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), Sri Likhita Adru, Hayley Bedell, Bruno Giordani, Stephen Ward, David Potter

Members absent: John Kloosterman, Charlie Koopmann, Devin Woodruff, Maxymilian Stefanski

### Guests present:

Erik Wessel, Director, Student Resolution Resources

Maggie Reisdorf, Senior Manager for Conduct Operations and Communications, Student Resolution Resources

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

### **Minutes:**

#### **11:31am: Call to Order, Approval of Agenda and Minutes, Announcements**

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

#### **11:33am: Updates and Current Issues**

Summary: VP Harmon provides the committee with an update.

- Undergraduate application figures are shared. There were over 115,000 applications submitted. This is slightly up from last year. It is noted that there was an increase in applications by prospective international students. Nearly two-thirds of these applications were submitted through the “early decision” program.
- The war in Iran and the impact on affected students is discussed. Support that the university can offer is discussed.
- For festivities related to St. Patrick’s Day, staff from Wolverine Wellness and others worked on harm reduction planning. Programming included several on-campus bagel stations. These stations included information for students on how to celebrate responsibly and safely.
- A reminder is made regarding the Rankin Climate Survey. This survey is related to campus



culture and community and is commissioned by the ECRT. The survey was sent out to a randomly selected sample of the community.

Action: Discussion

### **11:40am: Debrief Meeting with President Grasso**

Summary: As discussed in prior meetings, three SRAC members, David Potter, Marita Inglehart and Stephen Ward met with President Grasso as SRAC representatives to discuss the SSRR. Matt Lassiter was also invited but was unable to attend due to other responsibilities. Derek Peterson, the SACUA chair and Luke McCarthy from the SACUA office as well as VPSL Harmon and a representative of the General Council Office attended as well. This meeting occurred in the last week in February. The purpose of the meeting was for the SRAC members to mention current issues concerning the SSRR, inform President Grasso about ongoing off-cycle amendment activities as well as highlight the need for the process laid out in the SSRR to be educational at its core.

Chair Inglehart offers her perspective on the meeting, summarizing that President Grasso made it clear that he will consider all proposed SSRR changes once VPSL Harmon submits them to him. A positive aspect of the meeting included President Grasso clearly supporting the educational nature of the process.

The committee discusses the steps to successfully achieve an off-cycle amendment process, and which hurdles need to be cleared. The committee discusses the viability of such a process and determines that they will work to complete the process.

The chair informs the committee members that despite emails to the President and Vice President of the Central Student Government (CSG), no student responses and no approval of the off-cycle amendment were received from the CSG President. One of the student representatives on SRAC indicates that they will work on coordinating with the CSG leadership to review the materials and get back to the SRAC chair.

Another member of the committee present at the meeting with President Grasso reiterated the sentiment that they were pleased that President Grasso values the educational aspect of the process. The member discusses issues of timing in the process. Further discussion on the timeline occurs. The committee further discusses the number of priorities that should be put forth, given the truncated timeline. After discussion including differing viewpoints, the committee proceeds to review the proposed amendments.

Action: Discussion

### **11:55am: Off-Cycle Amendments**

Summary: The committee proceeds to review the proposed twenty recommended Student Life-initiated amendments provided by Connie Tingson Gatuz to the SSRR as part of the proposed off-cycle amendment process.

**Proposed amendment 1** seeks to expand the appeals board. Each Appeals Board consists of a three-person panel with one member appointed by three groups: Central Student Government, the

Faculty Senate, and the President. Currently, only two members are in a pool to choose from. The recommended change suggests that each of the three groups has a pool of a minimum of three individuals who could serve on the actual Appeals Panels. This is meant to address scheduling conflicts to allow for expediency in the appeals process.

The **next set of four proposed amendments** focus on integrating an investigative process into the SSRR. The first of these four proposed amendments concerning VI. Procedures. Stage 1 asks to add “fact-gathering” to the title of this section which now reads “Stage 1: Initiating the Resolution Process & Fact-Gathering”. Concerns are raised about the way this “fact gathering” might change the resolution process and its educational nature.

**Proposed amendment 3** is concerned with the investigative fact-gathering process that OSA would conduct (referring to VI. Procedures. Stage 1, Paragraph 3.) Strong concerns are raised because until now it was clear that all information must be changed with Respondent and Complainant. The concerns raised are based on previous experiences of Respondents who were faced with an investigator conducting fact gathering which resulted in including 2 short videos of the event in question and were told to pay nearly \$4,000 if they wanted to see all the video footage from the event that the investigator had access to. SRAC members suggest adding a sentence, making it clear that all information gathered must be made available to Respondent and Complainant

**Proposed amendment 4** of this proposal included a sentence that the Resolution Officer, Student Panel (if applicable), and the Parties may direct questions to each other and/or the OSA Investigator. SRAC members strongly suggest remove “/or” to assure that all parties can ask questions to the OSA investigator.

**Proposed amendment 5** concerning VI. Procedures. Stage2, 3 Hearing, Paragraph 7 reads “The respondent, complainant and RC Investigator may also present written reports to the panel or RO.” SRAC members strongly urged to change this to: “ The respondent, complainant and Investigator may also present written investigative reports to the panel or RO which are produced and shared with all parties ahead of formal meetings.

The **next set of proposed amendments 6 to 18** are summarized under heading “3. Clarify the Resolution coordinator’s facilitative role” and “4. Enhance notice of charges in Stage 2 notifications”.

Recommended amendment 6 under section VI. Procedures state that people who have questions should contact Student Resolution Resources (SRR). The committee raises concerns about how this process works in practice and points out that the previous procedure was clearer when one specific person, namely the RC, was the contact for asking any questions.

**Proposed amendment 7** spells out current practice and is accepted.

**Proposed amendment 8** focuses on “waiving the 6 month-limitation when a late submission is reasonable”. The committee strongly urges to “and provide clear written explanation why this is the case” and point to the SRAC proposed amendment #2 for exact wording.

**Proposed amendment 9** concerning VI. Procedures Stage 1, paragraph 4 concerning the procedure of dismissal of a complaint. The committee urges to clearly outline what the options are to address a complaint “in a different manner.”

**Proposed amendment 10** focuses on VI. Procedures, Stage 2. An overall suggestion is made to never refer to anybody as “the student” but to always clarify if the Complainant of Respondent is considered in any given sentence. This proposed amendment describes the initial meeting with a neutral resolution coordinator. The advisor role in this process is discussed. The strong suggestion is made to keep the previous section starting with “... ask questions and make a statement” and all 9 following lines from the current SSRR.

**Proposed amendment 11** is concerned with VI. Procedures, Stage 2.1. Acceptance of responsibility and entering into an agreement. The committee raises the question “if not the RC,” who will determine the outcome(s). This is unclear and needs to be clarified.

The meeting reaches the end of its scheduled period, and the committee determines a plan of action for the coming weeks with emphasis on expediency. The Chair summarizes the plan of action, and the meeting concludes.

Action: Discussion

**1:05pm: Adjournment**

Respectfully submitted,

Eric Vandenberghe  
Faculty Governance Coordinator  
Faculty Senate Office