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Approved November 30, 2012

Student Relations Advisory Committee

Minutes of Friday, November 9, 2012
11:30 to 1:30 PM
Bates Room – Michigan Union

Members Present: David Potter (Chair), Beverly Fauman, Donna Hayward, Simone Himbeault Taylor, Charles Koopman, Jean Krisch, Ed Rothman

Absent: Vice President Harper, Nallasivam Palanisamy, Fred Askari, Lisa Low, Stacy Peterson

Guests: Jay Wilgus (Director, OSCR); Aniesha Mitchell (Program Manager, FCR); Katie Fleming (Conflict Resolution Facilitator, OSCR); Louis Mirante (Student, Building a Better Michigan); John Taylor (Director, University Unions)

Materials Distributed:
Agenda
Minutes of October 2012
Proposals to Amend the Statement
  Clerical Amendments (Proposal 1 – 3)
  Substantive Amendments (Proposal 4 – 6)
Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities (handbook)

Meeting commenced at 11:55 AM.

The meeting started with Chair Potter briefly introducing members of the committee.

The committee first heard from Louis Mirante, a student representative for Building a Better Michigan (BBM), who was represented by John Taylor, Director of the University Unions. BBM is a student organization with 20-30 active members that advocate for support to bring attention to improving recreational and Union facilities on campus. Mr. Mirante discussed the need for facilities to reflect the current priorities of student, faculty and staff, by creating open, collaborative spaces that are inviting and adaptable for modern use. Recreational buildings and Union facilities are both a priority for student health, but outdated and too small to adequately meet the needs of the University. The organization toured other Big Ten schools to learn how they renovated their facilities, citing multiple funding sources, phasing/surveys, and student support.

Chair Potter opened the floor to the committee for questions and feedback on Mr. Mirante’s presentation.

The general consensus from the committee was in agreement that the University needs to place a priority on health for students through IM recreational activities and/or student organizations. Health and well-being for students, faculty and staff should focus on building a healthier campus community. The committee discussed the cost to build versus to not build through both a
prevention and treatment analysis, underscoring insurance premiums. While it was agreed that student health and academic performance improves with exercise and campus participation, the committee strongly suggested that BBM separate recreational facilities and Union facilities to increase faculty support. Academic and physical health should be distinguished and funded separately to have a higher priority and reach more support from faculty and staff at the University.

BBM was advised to re-address their coalition organized around improving recreational faculties and Union facilities to further gain support. The committee also noted that upon renovating, the University should build flexibility into the design of recreational buildings and Union facilities to be adaptable. BBM was also recommended to contact other Big Ten schools to learn how they funded their new facilities and gained support from the University community.

The committee thanked Mr. Mirante and Mr. Taylor for their presentation, and they left.

The committee then heard from Jay Wilgus and Aniesha Mitchell from the Office of Student Conflict Resolution (OSCR) at the University. Mr. Wilgus provided an update on the Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities (SSRR) amendment process, reviewing the corresponding proposed milestones and deadlines for the 2012-2013 year. According to Mr. Wilgus, we are currently still in ‘Phase 2- Refinement, Submission, and Review of Proposals’ of the amendment process. He acknowledged that the University community has been given the opportunity to provide input on the SSRR, noting the OSCR deadline for all proposals was November 2, 2012.

Mr. Wilgus then brought attention to Aniesha Mitchell, program manager of the Formal Conflict Resolution (FCR) at OSCR. Ms. Mitchell distributed a ‘Proposals to Amend the Statement’ binder which included the Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities (handbook).

Organized within the binder were the six proposed amendments for the SSRR, categorized as: A) Clerical Amendments with corresponding Proposals 1, 2 and 3; and B) Substantive Amendments with corresponding Proposals 4, 5, and 6. Ms. Mitchell highlighted the layout of the binder, referencing each proposed amendments’ principle, proposer, contributing author, community support, rationale, and an analysis of the proposed amendment relative to the existing language and the new language, if adopted. Each individual proposal was reviewed by the committee through the facilitation of Ms. Mitchell, with appropriate feedback and questions.

Clerical Amendments

Proposal 1 – Amending the Statement to Reflect the Current Title for Central Student Government
Proposal 2 – Amending the Statement to Update the Description of the Proper Use Policy
Proposal 3 – Amending the Statement to Reflect the Proper Affiliation of the Student Relations Advisory Committee

The committee had no concerns or issues with these proposals. Chair Potter noted that both items could possibly be voted on by a consent agenda.
The committee elicted discussion with Section IV ‘Violations’ of the SSRR. SRAC agreed that this section must include the language, “Violation of making false statements and/or allegations of any of these issues”.

SRAC also agreed that the most effective method to submit this language by the next meeting for the consent agenda is through Vice President Harper. SRAC would serve as the ‘sponsor’ of the language submitted, but would be representing the Senate Assembly, not SRAC.

Chair Potter motioned to approve this language for submission for approval on the next consent agenda through Vice President Harper and the Office of Student Affairs; unanimous vote approved.

Substantive Amendments

Proposal 4 – Inclusion of Bullying as a Violation of the Statement

Ms. Mitchell explained that LSA prepared the definitions and research for this proposal. SRAC’s only concern was the need for clarification regarding ‘digital media’, specifically what digital media includes. The committee recommended this proposal include printed media as well as digital, suggesting that printed media promotes digital harassment.

Proposal 5 – Inclusion of Respect for Medical Amnesty in the Statement

Ms. Mitchell noted that this proposal was revised from the Michigan Law, reflecting the exact language to be clear and concise. The committee addressed concerns regarding the protection of minors who consumed alcohol and participated in non-consenting behaviors, such as sexual assault. Chair Potter directed these concerns to the Medical Amnesty and Sexual Misconduct Policies at the University that define incapacitation and consent.

The committee responded with additional concerns that sexual assault victims may not come forward because they were intoxicated. Discussion resulted in the committee agreeing that being a victim may construe guilt under certain aspects of the current policies, evident of the need for clarification with these grey areas for the victim.

The committee agreed that the proposed amendment and language should be placed in the SSRR handbook in Section VIII – Related Procedures, listed as item H: Respect for Medical Amnesty Provisions.

Proposal 6 – Aligning the Statement with the Student Sexual Misconduct Policy

Ms. Mitchell stated that this proposal will be incomplete until the Student Sexual Misconduct Policy is finalized, and that SRAC would discuss the proposal in more detail in January 2013.

Ms. Mitchell explained that domestic violence and physical violence are not covered in the Student Sexual Assault Policy; rather they are included separately in other University Policies.

The committee expressed that item F: Reports of Actions, in Section VII – Related Procedures of the SSRR that was added during the last amendment cycle, should be made clearer about false
reports. SRAC also noted that domestic violence and physical violence are different from physical harm. It was made clear that student sexual misconduct was not included under domestic violence.

The committee again mentioned the submission of a false report. It was noted that submitting a false report is implicitly a violation of an actual violation, that is, the SSRR should include “submission of a false report” in the preamble and not as a procedure and/or item of violation.

Chair Potter motioned to approve the meeting minutes from October 2012; unanimous vote approved.

**Adjournment:** Meeting adjourned at 1:15 PM.

Submitted by:
Kari L. Woloszyk, SACUA Student Support