SRAC Meeting Minutes

December 18th 2009

Present: Chair Charles Koopmann, Royster Harper, Donna Hayward, Shake Ketefian, Janine Maddock, Ian Margolis, Richard Nye, Gina Poe, David Potter, Susan Pritzel, Simone Himbeault-Taylor, Mark Tucker, Chris Armstrong, Karin Teske (Student Support)

Meeting called to order at 11:59pm

Chair Remarks

Minutes will be approved at the end of the meeting pending changes made (minutes approved)

The committee won’t vote today, but confusion about proposal 1 would be consent calendar if we got the wording right to match Regental wording.

We’ll go back to proposal 1 for adding “physical features.”

Amendments to the Statement of Student Rights and Responsibility

#2- leave on consent agenda

#3: off consent agenda for the time being

Proposition 7: stay on consent

Proposal 1:

Language should mirror the language of the regents’ bylaws

physical characteristics: height weight, or other “physical features” as an add on- do what the regental bylaws say or add our own wording?

*Height and weight are insurance categories- state of Michigan language
does a student not have protection if they are being discriminated against for the size of their nose?*

Proposal is to leave #1 as is with new language so that it reads “regardless of race, color ..... height weight or veteran status”. This language represents a change in the last code- gender identity.

*Discrimination in general, esp. as it applies to the statement; we want to be in alignment but for the future*

Proposal- fits the regental wording.

Motion to keep proposal 1 on consent calendar: *seconded but opposed*

Proposal 1 pulled off consent calendar.
Proposal 4: Adaptive conflict resolution

*statement about the formal conflict resolution process:* we shifted the framework and pulled most of the amendment out; *guiding principles statement:* what you’re about to read is formal, but the community confirms that adaptable can be used; try to make it more simple.

-Wording problem using noun as adjective: mediation preferences; or preferences with respect to mediator.

There was confusion about why mediation is defined as its own entity, and then as an example of adaptable conflict resolution, when it seems mediation is involved in all processes:

-Difference between mediation and conflict resolution: adaptable conflict resolution: mediation as a subset; odd that mediation is a separate identity when conflict resolution includes mediation; why not the other 7 options listed as their own bullets?

-Statement we’ve been using for the last 3 years has always had a mediation clause: Existed with the title of mediation

-Last 4 years: take from the term Mediation- different kinds- offshoots; from the community, what is meant when they say mediation is to divert from formal to do mediation work.

-We’ve lived with “mediation” because people understand the term; our hope was to vet these adaptable conflict resolution with the community to have that language; we can go back to original language if it is confusing

-The users are students, faculty, and staff.

-Students- are you confused by it?

-Leave it in there- it's an option- new for us- students aren’t aware of it.

-Mediation is a part of conflict resolution

Conflict resolution is a separate paragraph

Why isn’t “B” conflict resolution and within description of conflict resolution is mediation?

Adaptable conflict resolution = B. Suggest it be defined it under the heading.

make C into B, and decide how much of the language in B you want to keep.

-How to tuck in language under mediation into the subheading of adaptive conflict resolution

-Work offline to come up with modification, we will need to bring it back.
Proposal 5: standard of evidence change

MSA has altered its stance: we think that a lot more consideration given during last resolution; vote 14-13; MSA did not support a lowering of the standard of evidence, but the vote was close.

Basis for concerns:

We should not use one standard for faculty for separation of the university and a lower standard for expulsion of students
Clear and convincing should be used in determining falsehood
Preponderance is appropriate in deciding to BRING a complaint, but not in VALIDITY of complaint.

we almost hesitated to put this into the binders because the proposal was withdrawn; seems like a proposal that does not exist; MSA put it forward, has now withdrawn their proposal.

proposal was pulled formally from MSA
proposals comes from administration, faculty, or MSA

MSA put it forward, so if it has been officially withdrawn, the point is mute.

Time table has been published. We’re not going to be extending the time to get this to the President’s desk. If it has been withdrawn officially, in theory we don’t take another amendment- those days are closed. The submission time is over- it comes down to procedure.

Can we(the committee) keep it as our own although the proposers have withdrawn it.
we did refer it to MSA for them to evaluate.

Can the committee refer it back to MSA as we did before, to make sure they want to withdraw it?

What do you want from MSA? They reconsidered and voted; what vote do you want?

Lets not be ignorant about what we are asking; in the future others need the same option; timeline will stay the same: when we vote.

Chair Koopmann: we will not be second guessing MSA: formal vote for MSA was to pull; its pulled. We won’t be considering proposal 5 anymore.

Proposals come from MSA, faculty governance, or administration; faculty did not propose it, administration did not propose it, MSA had official vote and it was withdrawn.

Respect the vote; that’s how the regents set it up.

Proposal 6:

Inclusion of intimate partner violence as a violation:
Terms not in SPG, but in the definition in the guidelines that will be on university website. Both terms domestic and intimate partner, and dating violence, are used.

Advantages of using SPG- code updates itself. As definition grows, so do student guidelines.

In the guidelines it refers to SPG- living document. Clear way to go.

Link to SPG but call domestic/intimate partner (addition)  
SPG says go to our guidelines- guidelines have it – guidelines have intimate partner in it, so SPG covered.

Charlie: put onto consent agenda. In favor- (committee in favor).

Document for consent agenda: which term first: domestic/intimate partner violence?

Reading of proposal with new language:

Remember, if staff don't get the difference, we should be careful that what we think is more common among students. Intimate partner violence- majority of students will not know what you’re talking about.

Defer to students (Proposal came through MSA):

Students want domestic violence/intimate partner violence

Into consent calendar with the wording ordered in this way.

VPSA Remarks:

Thank you for rigorous engagement. We are grateful for students. Conversation around sexual assault is so important; if this is the leverage for this community to have the conversation-that is important. It would not be wise to let this moment pass.

Respectfully Submitted by:

Karin Teske
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