STUDENT RELATIONS COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1994  
MINUTES

PRESENT: Roman Hryciw (Chair), Gerhard Olving, Jane Wilson Coon, Mark DeCamp, Royster Harper, Craig Greenberg, David Karow, Milan Marich, Torrey Smith, Maureen Hartford, Hope Calati (Michigan Daily reporter), Mary Louise Antieau (guest) 

ABSENT: George Estabrook, Ted Hopf, Barbara MacAdam, Louise Stein, Erin Klug

The meeting was called to order by Chair Roman Hryciw at approximately 4:30 PM.

I. The minutes from the January 28 meeting were approved with the following correction: Item IV, 1. should read, "cited examples of apparent mistreatment of students who are applying for a change of resident status."

II. Mary Louise Antieau distributed an update report packet on the Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities and stated that the Regents have postponed (until April of 1995) a vote to move it from an interim policy to an official policy.

III. The Chair invited Royster Harper and Antieau to briefly describe the history of the Statement and the reasoning behind it. They explained that prior to Hartford's arrival an external set of professional consultants were asked to review the Office of Student Affairs and were surprised to find no official statement on what was expected of students. In response to this evaluation, a group of students (including MSA reps and Law students) drafted a set of regulations on student conduct. However, there was concern that these regulations were too narrow in their language. In response to that criticism, Hartford and a selected group of students prepared the first draft of the SSRR with the intent of defining the basic rights of members of the community and complying with Federal Laws. They then distributed the draft and a questionnaire to the student body asking for their input on the Statement. (They was concern, at the time, that the questions on the questionnaire were not sufficiently objective.)

Hartford's office received approximately 3000 responses to the questionnaire, roughly eight percent of the student body. Chief among the concerns of the respondents were the following things:

1. The Amendment Process
2. The reality of being tried twice for the same offense
3. The potential usage of the SSRR to quell freedom of expression

IV: In the discussion that followed, the comments below were made:
1. Craig Greenberg stated MSA's primary objection to the SSRR is that the Statement goes too far beyond what is mandated by state and federal laws.
2. Antieau stated that a "positive" of this policy is the "randomness" of the selection of student panelists.
3. A Committee member stated that the language of the SSRR is too legalistic.

V. Mark Decamp reported attending the Hearing on amendments to the SSRR. He stated that although they did not take any official action because there was no quorum, he was impressed with the orderly discourse. He circulated a rough draft of an amendment he has developed which would create an Oversight Committee for the SSRR. Such a committee would provide a mechanism to permit adequate oversight and insure against any possible abuses. The following other suggestions were brought forward as well.
1. Hartford stated that there is a need to insure the appropriate level of confidentiality regarding the students involved.
2. Hartford also stated that she felt having an oversight committee is not a problem.
3. Gerhard Olving discussed the possibility of simplifying this Statement. Hartford agreed to send a copy of Stanford's policy (which is much less complex) to all members at the request of Milan Marich.
4. David Karow suggested that the Committee concentrate on the amendment process itself.

VI. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 6:15 PM. Members were reminded that the next meeting will be held on March 18, in the Bates room of the Michigan Union, from 12:00-2:00 PM.