



SRAC Final Committee Report 2025-2026

To: SACUA

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

Subject: Report on Activities of the Student Relations Advisory Committee (SRAC) for 2025/26

Members:

Jonathan Brennan
Cindee Giffen
Bruno Giordani
Marita Inglehart
John Kloosterman
Charlie Koopmann
Matt Lassiter
Jamie Niehof
Joel Scheuher
David Potter
Stephen Ward
Student members:
Sri Likhita Adu
Devin Woodruff
Hayley Bedell
Maxymilian Stefanski

SACUA Liaison: Kirsten Herold

Committee Charge 2025 - 2026

1. During the 2024/25 academic year, SRAC reviewed the Statement on Student Rights and Responsibilities (SSRR) and submitted proposed amendments on February 26, 2025, to VPSL Harmon for ultimate submission to the President. On August 28, 2025, a response from President Grasso was received. This response was discussed and next steps were taken concerning in the following meetings concerning (a) meeting with President Grasso and (b) developing off-cycle amendments.
2. One aspect of the Conflict Resolution Process noted during the review of the SSRR was a need for more faculty input, specifically among Resolution Officers (ROs). Discussing ways to engage faculty more effectively as ROs should be and were considered.



3. Current ongoing OSCR efforts related to students who more than a year ago protested should be and were discussed.
4. During the 2024/25 academic year, SRAC considered factors that challenge students' progression to graduation. One moderating factor, namely how students with diverse abilities and special accommodations encounter their journey to graduation, was not considered in the 2024/25 academic year. This topic is timely and relevant because of the rapidly increasing numbers and types of accommodations that have been appearing. We suggest
 - a. a review of common practices across similar institutions,
 - b. as well as meetings with the leadership of the Student Accessibility and Accommodations Services (SAAS) and with the Services for Students with Disabilities (SSD) office.
 - c. The results of these efforts should be reported back to SACUA as recommendations for future faculty initiatives.
5. A second factor that might challenge students' progression to graduation could be stress caused by intergroup conflict. We suggest consulting with the Intergroup Dialogue Program and other programs focusing on intergroup relations between students concerning efforts to reduce intergroup challenges.
6. Emergent issues or topics brought forward by SRAC committee members or the Vice President for Student Life for discussion should be discussed over the course of the year.

Committee Actions

The first Student Relations Advisory Committee (SRAC) meeting on September 20, 2025, focused on two major university decisions. The first decision was that no gender affirming medical care was any longer provided for anybody under 20 years of age. This decision was announced on the first day of the Fall term classes. Two guests, Dr. Mortensen from Counseling and Psychological Services and Director Beal from the Spectrum Center attended this meeting and provided information and insights into this situation. SRAC members discussed possible next steps, including actions SACUA could take.

The second decision was President Grasso's response from August 28, 2025, (see Appendix 1) to the SRAC proposed amendments to the Statement on Student Rights and Responsibilities (SSRR) submitted by SRAC on February 26, 2025 (see Appendix 2). The President's response was to accept proposed amendments # 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 13, 15, and 19. However, changes to the wording of most of these accepted amendments were narrowing their proposed amendment changes or in the case of proposed amendment 19 even resulted in an opposite amendment. Five amendments (# 8, 9, 11, 12, 14) were rejected because of the Regents' vote in July 2024 giving the university the right to be a complainant in Office of Student Conflict Resolution activities and five proposed amendments (#3, 6, 10, 16, 17) were rejected due to "redundancy" and legal guidance to do so. The decision was made in the October SRAC meeting to contact

President Grasso with a response to these decisions and a request to meet and discuss this matter. A letter was sent on October 26, 2025, (see Appendix 3) and the meeting with the President took place on February 26, 2026.

Appendices 1, 2 and 3 are attached to this report.

In the October meeting, information was provided that at the October Regents meeting, the regents unanimously passed an amendment that restored the appeals board within the SSRR appellate process and provided timeframes to govern the appellate process. This was discussed as a positive step as it was a key point that the SRAC committee advocated for in their recommendations to the President.

In addition, two guests, Tamiko Strickman, a Special Advisor to the President and Executive Director, of the Office for Equity, Civil Rights and Title IX and Kelly Cruz, an Associate General Counsel, attended the October meeting and presented information about the Michigan Interim Policy and Procedures on Discrimination, Harassment, and Retaliation by Students, and the Michigan Policy Against Hazing.

The November meeting focused first on learning more about the Resource Navigators Program. Senior Director Pile, Senior Associate Director Smith, and Manager Preston from the University Unions & Auxiliary Services attended this SRAC meeting and provided information about this program that started in line with UM's commitment to holistic student well-being.

In addition, Mike Ryan, the Associate Director of OSCR, attended this meeting to provide information and answer questions concerning organizational changes in OSCR, specifically concerning the newly established Office of Student Accountability (OSA). During this part of the meeting, several high-profile OSCR cases were discussed. SRAC members raised due process concerns such as that in at least one case the intake officer/resolution coordinator, complainant, and investigator were the same person. The committee members argued strongly that this is an issue of fairness. The lack of transparency concerning OSA was also raised as a major concern. SRAC asked for more information and a discussion of these questions with Erik Wessel, the director of OSCR, in the December meeting.

Dr. Wessel was therefore the guest in the December meeting. He shared the annual case data from the 2023-2024 calendar year and answered questions by SRAC members. The possibility of making an off cycle amendment to the SSRR was discussed.

This discussion continued in the January 2026 meeting when Central Student Government (CSG) President Eric Veal and Vice President Lucas Korn attended the meeting as guests. An off-cycle amendment process of the SSRR would require approval from VP Harmon, as well as CSG, in addition to the SRAC committee. The main areas of focus would be to strengthen and restore due process and to make sure that the language in the SSRR matches the current procedure in OSCR. The guests indicated that they would like to see the proposed amendments and share it

with their leadership team prior to deciding whether to agree to an off-cycle amendment process.

Concerning the SRAC member proposed amendments, it was decided that a survey would be sent to the SRAC members concerning their thoughts about these proposed amendments. This survey was conducted and the results were discussed in the February meeting. The VPSL proposed amendments will also be shared in the February meeting.

During the February meeting, the survey results of the SRAC proposed amendments were shared and discussed. The VPSL shared “High level recommendations for administrative amendments” (see Appendix 4) and the committee discussed them with Maggie Reisdorf, the Senior Manager of Operations and Communications in Student Resolution Resources. She provided helpful information and insights into the processes and the VPSL proposed amendments.

Appendix 4 is attached to this report.

In addition, the upcoming meeting with President Grasso was also discussed and prepared.

In March, the meeting with President Grasso on February 26, 2026, was discussed. Three SRAC members, Marita Inglehart, David Potter and Stephen Ward, as well as VPSL Harmon, SACUA chair Petersen and Luke McCarthy met with President Grasso as SRAC representatives to discuss 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. President Grasso was supportive of the process and agreed that the educational nature of the process is important.

In the March SRAC meeting, the committee also discussed the steps to successfully achieve an off-cycle amendment process, and which hurdles would need to be cleared. One challenge is to get any communication back from the President and Vice President of the Central Student Government (CSG) concerning their involvement in this process. Despite three emails with information about the proposed amendments, no responses and no approval of the off-cycle amendment were received from the CSG President.

In addition, the amendments to the SSRR provided by Connie Tingson Gatz as part of the proposed off-cycle amendment process were discussed with guests Erik Wessel, Director, Student Resolution Resources, and Maggie Reisdorf, Senior Manager for Conduct Operations and Communications, Student Resolution Resources.

This discussion continued in the last SRAC meeting of the 2025-26 academic year in April. This final discussion in collaboration with Maggie Reisdorf, Senior Manager for Conduct Operations and Communications, Student Resolution Resources resulted in the document presented at the end of this report as Appendix 5. This consolidated overview document of all

proposed off cycle amendments with annotations about discussed changes can serve as an excellent foundation for the next needed steps.

Final note: By the time this Yearly SRAC Report was submitted in May 2026, no off cycle amendment has been submitted. However, the relevant points that should be covered are found in Appendix 5.

Information Obtained

SRAC members received extensive information during the 2025-26 academic year. This information was summarized in the minutes of the meetings.

Above all, VPSL Harmon's Report about Student Life developments at the beginning of each SRAC Meeting offered an excellent overview of ongoing and planned SL activities.

Learning from guests was exceptionally helpful.

Recommendations

The first recommendation is concerned with the next steps of the off cycle amendment process. Given that President Grasso continues in his role, it is recommended to pass on the compiled amendment recommendations to VPSL Harmon for review and then submission to President Grasso. One challenge that has to be overcome is to receive support from the CSG for this next step.

The second recommendation is to ensure informing faculty members better about SRAC as well as other committee activities. Would it be possible to have a monthly newsletter with a short paragraph about the committee activities and their newsworthy developments on the SACUA website and also mailed out once a month? The lack of information for all faculty members about the fact that there are 18 committees and what they are working on is not optimal – to put it mildly.

The third recommendation is related to informing all faculty better about SL matters. Of particular interest to faculty colleagues could be the excellent overview of ongoing and planned SL activities that VPSL Harmon's Report about Student Life developments at the beginning of each SRAC Meeting offered. As faculty members, we benefit from knowing more about our students' lives on campus.

The fourth recommendation focuses on how to ensure continuation of SRAC related information by having 4 new SRAC members every year. This way, the three year cycle would not result in a majority of the committee being new members when members have to leave after 3 years.

The final recommendation is to ensure that SRAC should always include at least two undergraduate and one graduate or professional education student. The benefit of having the student perspective presented in discussions cannot be overestimated.

Appendices:

- #1: SRAC proposed amendments to the SSRR submitted on February 26, 2025

- #2: President Grasso's Response to the SRAC proposed amendments to the SSRR from August 28, 2025

- #3: Submitted proposed SSRR amendment letter and proposed changes from October 16, 2025

- #4: High level recommendations for administrative amendments shared by VPSL Harmon

- #5: Consolidated overview document of all proposed off cycle amendments with annotations about discussed changes

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 1: SRAC Proposed Amendments to the SSRR
submitted on February 26, 2026

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	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>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	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>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.
SRAC Review					
<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

		<p>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.</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>

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, 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] 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 2.1] 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>		

Appendix 2: President Grasso's Response to the SRAC
proposed amendments to the SSRR from August 28,
2025

3190 Ruthven Building
1109 Geddes Avenue
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-1079
TEL: 734 764-6270

Memorandum

To: Marita Inglehart, Chair, Student Relations Advisory Committee

CC: Martino Harmon, Vice President for Student Life
Eric Veal Jr., President, Central Student Government
Derek Peterson, Chair, Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs
Connie Tingson Gatuz, Associate Vice President for Student Life
Kelly Cruz, Associate General Counsel, Office of the Vice President and General Counsel
Erik Wessel, Director, Office of Student Conflict Resolution

From: President Domenico Grasso



Date: August 29, 2025

RE: Amendments to the *Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities*

Thank you for your exceptional leadership and the extensive efforts of the committee in guiding the 2024–2025 amendment process for the U-M Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities (the Statement). I have carefully reviewed the proposed amendments, along with the thoughtful input from the Student Relations Advisory Committee (SRAC), the Vice President for Student Life, and the Office of the Vice President and General Counsel. I am pleased to share that I approve the following amendments to the Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities:

Approvals

- Proposal 1 Summary: Include “animals” to the violation for harming or threatening harm.

Approved language:

A: Physically harming and/or directly threatening harm or any person, group, or animal in a manner which would cause reasonable fear for physical safety.

- Proposal 2 Summary: Include “Doxxing” to the violation for harassment/bullying definition.

Approved language:

F: Harassing, bullying, or doxxing another person physically, verbally, or through other means.

Online Definition Change:

Doxxing is the intentional publication of an individual's personally identifiable information with the intent to harass, intimidate, or direct violence at someone (except for speech protected by the first amendment).

- Proposal 4 Summary: Include AI-facilitated impersonation to violation P

Approved language:

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 technologies to create or knowingly disseminate content that impersonates another individual or organization, without proper authorization.

- Proposal 5 Summary: Modification to violation S to align with existing resolution agreement practice.

Approved Language:

S: Misusing, failing to comply with, or jeopardizing Statement procedures, sanctions, or formal agreements with another individual, or interfering with participants involved in the resolution process.

- Proposal 7 Summary: Modification to language regarding timeliness of process

Approved Language:

"The Statement process is designed to move swiftly and as efficiently as possible."

- Proposal 13 Summary: Modification to ACR agreement timelines

Approved Language:

"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 Statement violation, the respondent has the choice of accepting responsibility and entering into an agreement, or proceeding to a hearing."

- Proposal 15 Summary: Modification to Joint Arbitration language

Approved Language:

"Any group, or subgroup, of respondents may request a collective hearing for a matter involving multiple respondents engaged in the same or substantially similar alleged behavior as part of a single incident. The complainant party(s) must also agree to a hearing to be held jointly. 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.”

- Proposal 19 Summary: Modification to amendment process language

Approved Language:

“All amendments to the Statement proposed by the University community must follow the above process. However, necessary administrative modifications to the Statement may be made to ensure compliance with federal and/or state law as well as other university policies. The Board of Regents maintains the right to modify the Statement outside of the traditional amendment process.”

Further Review Requested

The following proposed amendment to the Statement remains under further consideration and will not be immediately included in the revised version of the Statement:

- Proposal 18 Summary: Modification to include the utilization of a community board in the appeals process.

Language under consideration:

“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. Prior to rendering an appeal decision, the Vice President for Student Life may request an appointed appeals board to review and provide a recommendation. If an appeals board is requested they will have five academic calendar days to review and render a recommendation to the VPSL. The VPSL, after reviewing the relevant information to the matter, will issue a written decision within five (5) days of the RC approving grounds to appeal or receiving a recommendation from the Appeals Board. 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.”

Rejected Amendments

The following proposed amendments have been thoroughly reviewed and have been rejected with rationale:

- Proposal 3 Summary: Adding “political protest” to disruptive behavior exemption

Rejection Rationale: As a public institution, the University cannot prefer or protect political expression over other types of speech. Doing so would constitute an impermissible content restriction.

- Proposal 6 Summary: Modifying scope of policy applicability
Rejection Rationale: This amendment is rejected as it is viewed to be redundant to existing policy language.

- Proposal 8 Summary: Modification of language regarding submission of complaints
Rejection Rationale: This amendment is rejected as it would impermissibly overturn a 2024 modification to the statement adopted via regental vote.

- Proposal 9 Summary: Modification of language regarding the right to serve as complainant.
Rejection Rationale: This amendment is rejected as it would impermissibly overturn a 2024 modification to the statement adopted via regental vote.

- Proposal 10 Summary: Modification of language regarding joint arbitrations
Rejection Rationale: This amendment is rejected as it is viewed to be redundant to proposal 15.

- Proposal 11 Summary: Modification to timeline of the notice of allegation.
Rejection Rationale: This amendment is rejected as it would impermissibly overturn a 2024 modification to the statement adopted via regental vote.

- Proposal 12 Summary: Modification to language regarding resolution by voluntary agreement.
Rejection Rationale: This amendment is rejected as it would impermissibly overturn a 2024 modification to the statement adopted via regental vote.

- Proposal 14 Summary: Modification to hearing timeframe & the utilization of a student panel
Rejection Rationale: This amendment is rejected as it would impermissibly overturn a 2024 modification to the statement adopted via regental vote.

- Proposal 16 Summary: Modification to advisor policy language
Rejection Rationale: All parties, including the university, should have equal opportunity to utilize an appropriate advisor of their choosing. The Office of the General Counsel must maintain an ability to provide appropriate counsel throughout institutional accountability processes, including under the Statement.

- Proposal 17 Summary: Modification to conflict-of-interest language
Rejection Rationale: This amendment is rejected based on legal guidance that the problem it seeks to resolve is not substantive and is adequately addressed in existing policy language.

I believe the approved amendments in the *Approvals* section are a true reflection of the community-driven process you skillfully led and represent significant, thoughtful enhancements to the *Statement*. These revisions not only strengthen the *Statement's* foundation but also ensure its continued relevance to

our evolving community. I hereby request that the amendments outlined in *Approvals* section above be incorporated into a revised version of the *Statement*, effective immediately.

Changes to Laws and Policies

In the Fall 2025 term the University will be communicating additional policy changes to ensure compliance with changing federal requirements. These include:

1. A revised Student Sexual and Gender-based Misconduct Policy
2. A new University of Michigan Policy Against Hazing in compliance with the Stop Campus Hazing Act
3. A new University of Michigan Interim Policy and Procedures on Discrimination, Harassment, and Retaliation by Students to comply with Title VI

To maintain consistency and accuracy, any essential updates required by changes to federal, state, or university laws or policies will be implemented and promptly communicated to the University community. Additional organizational changes to support the implementation and administration of such changes may also be made as needed, with timely notifications provided to ensure everyone remains informed.

As you know, the *Statement's* introduction affirms our community's purpose: to promote "intellectual inquiry through vigorous discourse." It also embodies the core values that define us including civility, dignity, diversity, education, equality, equity, freedom, honesty, and safety. The students, faculty, and staff who guided the 2024–2025 amendment cycle are to be commended for demonstrating commitment to this guiding purpose and these core values by encouraging a collaborative and effective approach to this year's amendment process.

On behalf of the University and our entire community, I extend my sincere gratitude to you and to every partner who contributed to this effort. Your extraordinary work has left a lasting impact and strengthened the principles that unite us.

Appendix 3: Submitted proposed SSRR amendment
letter and proposed changes from October 16, 2025



STUDENT RELATIONS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MEMORANDUM

TO: President Domenico Grasso

CC: Martino Harmon, Vice President for Student Life
Eric Veal Jr., President, Central Student Government
Derek Peterson, Chair, Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs
Connie Tingson Gatuz, Associate Vice President for Student Life
Kelly Cruz, Associate General Counsel, Office of the Vice President and General Counsel
Erik Wessel, Director, Office of Student Conflict Resolution
SRAC and SACUA

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

DATE: October 17, 2025

SUBJECT: Response to President Grasso’s Memorandum from August 29, 2025, concerning the SRAC Recommendations: 2024-2025 Proposed Amendments to the *Statement*

The Student Relations Advisory Committee (SRAC) received your Memorandum from August 29, 2025, concerning the SRAC Recommendations for the 2024-2025 Proposed Amendments to *Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities* (“SSRR”) that SRAC submitted in February 2025, as is required by the SSRR.

In addition, we found out through the University Record that during their October Meeting on October 16, 2025, the Regents largely accepted proposed Amendment 18, reinstating the Appeals Board process to how it was before their July 18, 2024, vote. After careful consideration of your Memorandum, we summarized the status quo of the amendment process below and in more detail in the attached Appendix and ask for a follow-up in person meeting with you at your earliest availability and convenience.

Concerning your approvals:

- We appreciate the Regents’ vote in their October 16, 2025, Meeting concerning reestablishing the Appeals Board to the pre-July 18, 2024, SSRR version, because we believe in the value of an independent appeals process with student, staff and faculty input and consider it an essential part of the educational mission of the conflict resolution process. Reestablishing the student panel option would be a next step on this trajectory to maintain the educational nature of this process.
- We appreciate your approval of Proposals 1, 5, 7, and 13 and the word for word acceptance of the proposed amendments.



- We are seeking follow-up communication with you to discuss the wording changes made in your approvals of the following proposals: Note that the words in blue reflect our originally proposed wording (see the Appendix for the complete wording of all proposed amendments).
 - In the wording of the accepted **Proposal 2**:
 - Adding “**This includes inciting others to harass or bully another person through posting photos, recordings, names, or personal information online. Section IV: F**” would strengthen the proposed amendment and clarify it.
 - In the online definition of Proposal 2 to include “Doxxing” to the violation for harassment/bullying definition. We suggest the more precise definition: “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.”
 - Word changes made in **Proposal 4**, by removing the reference to “the use of **generative AI, synthetic media, or “deep fake” technologies**”. We suggest adding this information to be explicitly inclusive of the current use of new technologies.
 - Word change to **Proposal 7**: The meaning of this proposed amendment was changed when excluding the term “**to be fair**” .
 - Word change to **Proposal 15**: This word change restricts the complainant’s rights: “*Any group, or subgroup, of respondents may **request a collective hearing for a matter involving multiple respondents reengaged in the same or substantially similar alleged behavior as part of a single incident. The complainant party(s) must also agree to a hearing to be held jointly.***”
 - Word change to **Proposal 19**: Inserting the following wording “*The Board of Regents maintains the right to modify the Statement outside of the traditional amendment process*” undermines the validity of the amendment process and allows arbitrary changes at any time.

We would like to discuss with you **Proposals 3, 6, 10, 16 and 17**, that were rejected due to either being redundant (which we do not believe they are) and / or for legal reasons because in the originally submitted proposed amendment document we provided rationales that show their value in the conflict resolution process.

Concerning **Proposals 8, 9, 11, 12 and 14** that were rejected because of the July 2024 Regents’ vote, we would like to discuss our rationales for the proposed amendments with you and would like to hear your reasons why they were changed and should be changed. Please note that former President Ono or the Regents never provided any reasons for their changes in July 2024. Once we would understand your reasoning concerning keeping these changes, we will then reach out to the Regents for further communication about these important matters.



In summary, we reach out to you to further discuss the proposed amendment changes and your decisions and hope to achieve the following:

- To prioritize student growth, framing the resolution process as an educational opportunity, rather than prioritizing punishment.
- To complete the conflict resolution 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.
- To incorporate 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 in its original version.

Sincerely,

Marita R. 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 Summary of Proposed SSRR Amendments and Considerations of Response

SRAC Recommendation	Statement section	Current Language	Proposed Language	SRAC Approval	President Grasso's Decision
1	Section 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.	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.	Approved language: <i>A: Physically harming and/or directly threatening harm or any person, group, or animal in a manner which would cause reasonable fear for physical safety.</i>
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.	Approved language: <i>F: Harassing, bullying, or doxxing another person physically, verbally, or through other means.</i> Online Definition Change: <i>Doxxing is the intentional publication of an individual's personally identifiable information with the intent to harass, intimidate,</i>
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.	Rejected. Rejection Rationale: As a public institution, the University cannot prefer or protect political expression over other types of speech. Doing so would constitute an impermissible content restriction.

Appendix A: SRAC Summary of Proposed SSRR Amendments and Considerations of Response

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	Approved language: <i>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,</i>
					<i>entity, or unit that you do not have the authority to represent. This includes, but is not limited to, the use of technologies to create or knowingly disseminate content that impersonates another individual or organization, without proper authorization.</i>
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	Approved Language: S: <i>Misusing, failing to comply with, or jeopardizing Statement procedures, sanctions, or formal agreements with another individual, or interfering with participants involved in the resolution process.</i>
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	Rejected. Rejection Rationale: This amendment is rejected as it is viewed to be redundant to existing policy language.

Appendix A: SRAC Summary of Proposed SSRR Amendments and Considerations of Response

7	Section VI. first paragraph	The Statement process is designed to move swiftly and without delay.	The statement 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.	Approved Language: “The Statement process is designed to move swiftly and as efficiently as possible.”
8	Section VI: Stage I, 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 Statement.	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.	Rejected. Rejection Rationale: This amendment is rejected as it would impermissibly overturn a 2024 modification to the statement adopted via regental vote.
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.	Rejected. Rejection Rationale: This amendment is rejected as it would impermissibly overturn a 2024 modification to the statement adopted via regental vote.

Appendix A: SRAC Summary of Proposed SSRR Amendments and Considerations of Response

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.	Rejected. Rejection Rationale: This amendment is rejected as it is viewed to be redundant to proposal 15.
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.	Rejected. Rejection Rationale: This amendment is rejected as it would impermissibly overturn a 2024 modification to the statement adopted via regental vote.
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.	Rejected. Rejection Rationale: This amendment is rejected as it would impermissibly overturn a 2024 modification to the statement adopted via regental vote.

Appendix A: SRAC Summary of Proposed SSRR Amendments and Considerations of Response

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	Approved Language: “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.”
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) 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	Rejected. Rejection Rationale: This amendment is rejected as it would impermissibly overturn a 2024 modification to the statement adopted via regental vote.
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	Approved Language: “ <i>Any group, or subgroup, of respondents may request a collective hearing for a matter involving multiple respondents reengaged in the same or substantially similar alleged behavior as part of a single incident. The complainant party(s) must also agree to a hearing to be held jointly. 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.</i> ”

Appendix A: SRAC Summary of Proposed SSRR Amendments and Considerations of Response

					<i>The Resolution Officer or student panel may differentiate sanctions between individuals dependent on the evidence provided.”</i>
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	Rejected. Rejection Rationale: All parties, including the university, should have equal opportunity to utilize an appropriate advisor of their choosing. The Office of the General Counsel must maintain an ability to provide appropriate counsel throughout institutional accountability processes, including under the Statement.
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	Rejected. Rejection Rational: This amendment is rejected based on legal guidance that the problem it seeks to resolve is not substantive and is adequately addressed in existing policy language.
18	Section VI: Stage 3, first paragraph	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	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	Approved unanimously: 11 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain. Approves, with revisions, parts of Faculty proposal #3-4 and #16-25 and Student	Language under consideration: <i>“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</i>

		<p>responsibility; modify the assigned sanction(s); and/or order a new hearing. This decision is final.</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>proposal # 5 and 9</p>	<p><i>Vice President for Student Life, or their designee, will serve as the Appeals Officer. Prior to rendering an appeal decision, the Vice President for Student Life may request an appointed appeals board to review and provide a recommendation. If an appeals board is requested they will have five academic calendar days to review and render a recommendation to the VPSL. The VPSL, after reviewing the relevant information to the matter, will issue a written decision within five (5) days of the RC approving grounds to appeal or receiving a recommendation from the Appeals Board. The written decision may sustain or reverse the finding of responsibility; modify the assigned sanction(s); and/or order a new hearing. The decision is final."</i></p>
--	--	---	--	---------------------------	--

19	Section VIII: subsection J	N/A - New Language	All amendments to the Statement must follow the above process. <i>No one can be held responsible for not implementing changes to the statement process which are made without following the above described process.</i>	Approved unanimously: 10 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain. Approves, with revisions, parts of Faculty proposal #16-25 and Student proposal # 10	<i>Approved Language:</i> <i>“All amendments to the Statement proposed by the University community must follow the above process. However, necessary administrative modifications to the Statement may be made to ensure compliance with federal and/or state law as well as other university policies. The Board of Regents maintains the right to modify the Statement outside of the traditional amendment process”</i>
----	-------------------------------	--------------------	--	---	---

Appendix 4: High level recommendation for
administrative amendments shared by VPSL Harmon

High level Recommendations for Administrative Amendments to the Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities (SSRR)

Share with the Student Relations Advisory Committee (SRAC)

- **Expand the Appeals Board**
 - **Recommendation:** Increase the pool of Appeals Board members to at least three faculty, three staff, and three students.
 - **Rationale:** The current pool consists of only two faculty, two staff, and two students, with each Appeals Board limited to one member from each category. Expanding the pool will improve continuity, improve timeliness, and allow for broader representation.

- **Integrate an Investigative Process into SSRR**
 - **Recommendation:** Clearly establish the investigative process within the Statement on Student Rights and Responsibilities.
 - **Rationale:** Explicitly incorporating the investigation phase will strengthen transparency and consistency, ensuring all parties understand how facts are gathered, assessed, and considered in formal resolution cases.

- **Clarify the Resolution Coordinator's Facilitative Role**
 - **Recommendation:** Codify the Resolution Coordinator's responsibilities for process advisement and hearing facilitation under the SSRR, separating this role from the general functions of Student Resolution Resources.
 - **Rationale:** Clearly defining these facilitative functions will support procedural integrity and ensure the Resolution Coordinator's role is understood as neutral and supportive throughout the process.

- **Enhance Notice of Charges in Stage 2 Notifications**
 - **Recommendation:** Specify that notification to the respondent in Stage 2 refers to the notice of charges.
 - **Rationale:** Clarity regarding the notification allows the respondent better understanding of the timeline, enabling more effective preparation and participation in the process.

Appendix 5: Consolidated overview document of all
proposed off cycle amendments with annotations about
discussed changes

SRAC Draft Off-Cycle SSRR Combined SRAC and Student Life Proposals Approved April 17, 2026

Rec. #	Statement Section	Current Language	Proposed Language	Original Rec.	SRAC Approval
1	VI. Procedures	Persons who have questions about the Statement should contact the Resolution Coordinator (RC) who provides support to all participants. At any point during the process, the Resolution Coordinator may extend a given deadline due to extenuating circumstances of the requesting party.	Persons who have questions about the Statement should contact the Resolution Coordinator (RC) the office of Student Resolution Resources (SRR), a unit within Student Life , who provides support to all participants. At any point during the process, the Resolution Coordinator SRR may extend a given deadline due to extenuating circumstances of the requesting party.	SL #6	Approved
2	VI. Procedures	Because some violations of these standards are also violations of law, students may be accountable to both the legal system and the University.	Because some violations of these standards are also violations of law, students may be accountable to both the legal system and the University. However, any complaint that was previously addressed by the University SSRR process cannot be resubmitted a second time.	SRAC #1	Approved
3	VI. Procedures, Stage 1	Stage 1: Initiating the Resolution Process	Stage 1: Initiating the Resolution Process & Information Gathering	SL #2	Approved
4	VI. Procedures, Stage 1, Para. 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.	Any student, faculty member, or staff member may contact an RC SRR to learn about available resolution options, and/or to initiate a resolution process.	SL #7	Approved
5	VI. Procedures, Stage 1, Para. 3	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.	All complaints must be submitted to SRR the RC , in writing, within six months after the incident(s) alleged in the complaint. The RC SRR may waive the six-month limitation when a late submission is reasonable. For any such waiver, the Director of SRR or their designee will provide to the complainant and the respondent a written explanation that includes the reasoning in support of the waiver.	SL #8	Approved

SRAC Draft Off-Cycle SSRR Combined SRAC and Student Life Proposals Approved April 17, 2026

Rec. #	Statement Section	Current Language	Proposed Language	Original Rec.	SRAC Approval
6	VI. Procedures, Stage 1, Para. 3	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.	<u>Prior to initiating the formal resolution process through a notice of charges, the Office of Student Accountability (OSA) may conduct an investigative information-gathering process. The investigator participating in this process shall conduct the investigation in a neutral manner oriented toward gathering the information needed for a subsequent fact-finding determination. The investigator has an affirmative duty to provide exculpatory information when discovered. When participating in an investigative meeting, the parties will have an opportunity to ask questions and make a statement. Parties may also be accompanied by an advisor. The Investigator will inform the parties (1) statements the student makes to the Investigator may be considered at any hearing, (2) that the student does not have to make a statement at the initial meeting, (3) that all SRR records are confidential to the extent permitted by law, (4) that students have a right to know the potential outcomes/interventions they may be facing and (5) that students may consult with an advisor at any point in the resolution process.</u> If the RC <u>OSA</u> 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. All information gathered will be shared with all respondents and complainants free of charge.	SL #3	Approved
7	VI. Procedures, Stage 1, Para. 4	The RC may dismiss the complaint at any stage if the RC reasonably believes that the complaint is baseless or otherwise unsupported by the available evidence, or that the underlying grievance or problem is better resolved in a different manner.	The RC The Director or designee of <u>SRR</u> may dismiss the complaint at any stage if the RC reasonably believes that the complaint is <u>determined through investigation to be</u> baseless or otherwise unsupported by the available evidence, or that the underlying grievance or problem is better resolved in a different manner, such as adaptable conflict resolution.	SL #9	Approved

SRAC Draft Off-Cycle SSRR Combined SRAC and Student Life Proposals Approved April 17, 2026

Rec. #	Statement Section	Current Language	Proposed Language	Original Rec.	SRAC Approval
8	VI. Procedures, 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. This meeting and subsequent stages of the Resolution Process are accessible to participants remotely (virtually).The student may be accompanied by an advisor at any point in the resolution process. The student will have the opportunity to ask questions and make a statement. The RC will inform the respondent (1) that statements the student makes to the RC may be considered at any hearing, (2) that the student does not have to make a statement at the initial meeting, (3) that all Student Resolution Resources (SRR) records are confidential to the extent permitted by law, (4) that students have a right to know the potential outcomes/interventions they may be facing and (5) that students may consult with an advisor at any point in the resolution process.	Within five (5) academic calendar days of notifying the respondent of the charges , the Parties will have the opportunity to meet with a neutral Resolution Coordinator (RC) to discuss the allegations and resolution process. RC will meet with the respondent to explain the complaint and the resolution process. This meeting and subsequent stages of the Resolution Process are accessible to participants remotely (virtually).The parties may be accompanied by an advisor at any point in the resolution process. The parties will have the opportunity to ask questions and make a statement. The RC will inform the respondent (1) that statements the student makes to the RC may be considered at any hearing, (2) that the student does not have to make a statement at the initial meeting, (3) that all Student Resolution Resources (SRR) records are confidential to the extent permitted by law, (4) that students have a right to know the potential outcomes/interventions they may be facing and (5) that students may consult with an advisor at any point in the resolution process.	SL #10	Approved
9	VI. Procedures, Stage 2, 1. Acceptance of Responsibility and Entering into an Agreement	Outcome(s) will be determined by the RC with input from the complainant.	Outcome(s) of the agreement will be determined by the RC by the respondent(s) and the complainant(s) complainant.	SL #11	Approved
10	VI. Procedures, Stage 2, 2. Adaptable Conflict Resolution, Para. 2	If (1) all persons personally and directly affected by the conflict agree to attempt resolution through one of these processes, and (2) the RC believes that the process is an appropriate form of resolution, then the RC will make arrangements for the chosen ACR pathway. The nature of some conflicts, especially those involving violence, may render ACR inappropriate.	If (1) all persons personally and directly affected by the conflict agree to attempt resolution through one of these processes, and (2) the RC SRR believes that the process is an appropriate form of resolution, then the RC Office of Student Conflict Resolution will make arrangements for the chosen ACR pathway. The nature of some conflicts, especially those involving violence, may render ACR inappropriate.	SL #12	Approved
11	VI. Procedures, Stage 2, 3. Hearing, Para. 2	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 RC The Office of Student Accountability will ensure that the hearing is held within ten (10) academic calendar days of either the an initial meeting with the between respondent and RC , 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).	SL #13	Approved

SRAC Draft Off-Cycle SSRR Combined SRAC and Student Life Proposals Approved April 17, 2026

Rec. #	Statement Section	Current Language	Proposed Language	Original Rec.	SRAC Approval
12	VI. Procedures, Stage 2, 3. Hearing, Para. 2	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.	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 <u>will determine whether an RO or a panel is most appropriate for the complaint based on explanations submitted by the parties.</u>	SRAC #4	Approved
13	VI. Procedures, Stage 2, 3. Hearing, Para. 3	Any group, or subgroup, of respondents may request a collective hearing for a matter involving multiple respondents engaged in the same or substantially similar alleged behavior as part of a single incident. The complainant party(s) must also agree for a hearing to be held jointly.	Any group, or subgroup, of respondents may request a collective hearing for a matter involving multiple respondents engaged in the same or substantially similar alleged behavior as part of a single incident. The complainant party(s) must also agree for a hearing to be held jointly <u>be heard regarding their considerations concerning a joint hearing and the RO will then decide if a joint hearing will take place.</u>	SRAC #5	Approved
14	VI. Procedures, Stage 2, 3. Hearing, Para. 5	All parties may have access to all written or other information that will be considered prior to the hearing including the names of witnesses providing information. The RC will prepare and distribute this information prior to the hearing.	All parties will <u>may</u> have access to the <u>written investigative report</u> all-written-or other information <u>and all materials submitted as evidence by the parties</u> all written-or other information that will be considered <u>by the RO or panel</u> prior to the hearing including the names of witnesses providing information. SRR <u>The RC</u> will prepare and distribute this information prior to the hearing. <u>Parties will also be given access to any information presented during the hearing.</u>	SL #21	Approved
15	VI. Procedures, Stage 2, 3. Hearing, Para. 5	The RC will prepare and distribute this information prior to the hearing.	The RC-SRR will prepare and distribute this information prior to the hearing.	SL #14	Approved
16	VI. Procedures, Stage 2, 3. Hearing, Para. 6	During the hearing, the RO, RC, respondent, complainant and student panelists (if applicable) have the right to question the complainant and the RC. These participants may also question (1) the respondent, if the student chooses to participate and (2) any witnesses who have presented information.	During the hearing, the RO, RC, respondent, complainant and student panelists (if applicable) have the right to question the complainant and the RC. These participants may also question (1) the respondent, if the student chooses to participate and (2) any witnesses who have presented information. <u>During the hearing the Resolution Officer, Student Panel (if applicable), and the Parties may direct questions to each other and the OSA Investigator.</u>	SL #4	Approved
17	VI. Procedures, Stage 2, 3. Hearing, Para. 7	The respondent, complainant, and RC may also present written reports to the panel or RO.	The respondent <u>and</u> ; complainant, and RC may also present written reports to the panel or RO, which will be also shared with the respondent and complainant. <u>The investigator will produce a written investigative report which will be provided to the Resolution Officer, panel (if applicable), and the Parties.</u>	SL #5	Approved
18	VI. Procedures, Stage 2, 3. Hearing, Para. 10	All arbitrated resolutions will result in findings of fact.	All arbitrated resolutions <u>hearings</u> will result in <u>findings of fact determinations of responsibility made by the RO or, in the case of a hearing that includes a student panel, the student panel.</u>	SRAC #6	Approved

SRAC Draft Off-Cycle SSRR Combined SRAC and Student Life Proposals Approved April 17, 2026

Rec. #	Statement Section	Current Language	Proposed Language	Original Rec.	SRAC Approval
19	VI. Procedures, Stage 2, 3. Hearing, Para. 10	The fact-finder will also make recommendation(s) regarding outcomes/interventions to the Dean of Students, who may accept or modify the recommendation(s).	The fact-finder panel or RO will also make recommendation(s) regarding outcomes/interventions to the Dean of Students, who may accept or modify the recommendation(s).	SL #19	Approved
20	VI. Procedures, Stage 3	All appeals must be submitted in writing to the RC within five (5) academic calendar days after notification of the Dean of Students' decision to accept or modify the recommendations resulting from the hearing.	All appeals must be submitted in writing to the RC SRR within five (5) academic calendar days after notification of the Dean of Students' decision to accept or modify the recommendations resulting from the hearing.	SL #15	Approved
21	VI. Procedures, Stage 3	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 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 Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs (SACUA) , and one administrator appointed by the President. CSG, the Faculty Senate SACUA , and the President will each appoint one a minimum of three alternate members to the Appeals Board pool .	SRAC #10 & SL #1	Approved
22	VI. Procedures, Stage 3	Within seven (7) academic calendar days, 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.	Within seven (7) academic calendar days, 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 panel or RO for further consideration with corrective instructions from the Appeals Board, or (d) ordering a new hearing before a new fact-finder panel or RO .	SL #20	Approved
23	VII. Outcomes/Interventions	1. Formal Reprimand: A formal notice that the <i>Statement</i> has been violated and that future violations will be dealt with more severely.	1. Formal Reprimand: A formal notice that the <i>Statement</i> has been violated and that future violations will be dealt with more severely. A Formal Reprimand will not appear on a student's transcript or be included in the student's disciplinary file.	SRAC #7	Approved
24	VII. Outcomes/Interventions	4. Restriction from Employment at the University: Prohibition or limitation on University employment.	4. Restriction from Employment at the University: Prohibition or limitation on University employment. Any such restriction shall specify the length of the prohibition or limitation.	SRAC #8	Approved
25	VIII. Related Procedures, B	At any time, the VPSL or RC may consult the Office of the General Counsel about a case or procedures.	At any time, the VPSL or RC SRR may consult the Office of the General Counsel about a case or procedures.	SL #16	Approved
26	VIII. Related Procedures, D. Records..., Para. 1	Records will be maintained by the RC with regard to any and all actions taken under the Statement. Accordingly, records will be maintained by the RC of complaints, agreements, hearings, findings, and outcomes/interventions.	Records will be maintained by the RC SRR with regard to any and all actions taken under the Statement. Accordingly, records will be maintained by the RC SRR of complaints, agreements, hearings, findings, and outcomes/interventions.	SL #17	Approved

Rec. #	Statement Section	Current Language	Proposed Language	Original Rec.	SRAC Approval
27	VIII. Related Procedures. D. Records..., Para. 3	If a student is suspended or expelled, a notation will be made on the student's academic record. The notation of suspension will be removed at the time the student is readmitted to the University.	If a student is suspended or expelled, a notation will be made on the student's academic record. The notation of suspension will be removed at the time the student is readmitted to the University <u>of the completion of the suspension period.</u>	SRAC #9	Approved
28	VIII. Related Procedures, G	In determining whether a request is reasonable, the RC will evaluate the unique circumstances of the case, including the length of the delay and the impact of delay on the complainant and community, in addition to protecting the integrity of the resolution process. In granting a request for a delay, the RC may implement conditions on continued enrollment, as appropriate.	In determining whether a request is reasonable, the RC SRR will evaluate the unique circumstances of the case, including the length of the delay and the impact of delay on the complainant and community, in addition to protecting the integrity of the resolution process. In granting a request for a delay, the RC SRR may implement conditions on continued enrollment, as appropriate.	SRAC #18	Approved