



July 15, 2025

Students for Justice in Palestine

Sent electronically to [REDACTED]

PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL

Regarding Case Number: 2024299301

Hello,

Please see below the Dean of Students Designee decision.

Kathy Kruse
Associate Dean of Students

Student Conduct and Community Standards

Student Affairs 724 W Johnson St. Madison, Wisconsin 53715
608.263.5701 E-mail: conduct@studentaffairs.wisc.edu conduct.students.wisc.edu

**Recommendation by the Registered Student Organization Hearing Committee
and Dean of Students Designee
Regarding Registered Student Organization Misconduct Charges Brought by Tonya
Schmidt [presented by Ryan Podolak], Investigating Officer, against Student for Justice in
Palestine (SJP) – UW-Madison, Registered Student Organization**

The Registered Student Organization (RSO) Misconduct Hearing Committee held a hearing on July 1, 2025, via video conference on Zoom, to hear the case of Students for Justice in Palestine – UW-Madison (hereafter SJP), an RSO at the University of Wisconsin-Madison that was charged with RSO misconduct during the Spring 2025 semester.

Present at the hearing were:

Hearing Committee: Brandon Thierry and Will Hoffman

Investigating Officer: Tonya Schmidt, with Ryan Podolak presenting

RSO Representatives: [REDACTED]

RSO [Advisor/Support Person]: Rifqa Falaneh from Pali Legal

OSCCS Staff: Jennifer Horace

Witness(es): [REDACTED]

This matter came before the Committee because the sanctions recommended by the investigating officer included suspension or termination.

Initial Recommended Finding

- Rule 5: Failure to comply with UW-Madison, UW System Administrative, or UW System Board of Regents policies including, but not limited to, the use of university facilities and grounds, fleet vehicles, electronic information technology, and facility reservation contracts.
 - IO Finding: Responsible
 - UW-6013 II.B: All conduct on university property, including expressive activity, must comply with university policy, including but not limited to this policy, Facility Use Policies, Wis. Admin. Code UWS § 17, Wis. Admin. Code UWS § 18, and non-discrimination policies, including but not limited to provisions prohibiting harassment.
 - IO Finding: Responsible
 - UW-6013 II.C.1: Expressive activity may not materially and substantially disrupt university activities, events, or operations. This includes, but is not limited to: Disrupting the teaching of classes, study, research, or administration of the university;
 - IO Finding: Not Responsible
 - UW-6013 II.C.2: Impairing passage on university lands and through building corridors, stairways, doorways, building entrances, fire exits, and reception areas leading to offices;
 - IO Finding: Responsible
 - UW-6013 II.C.3: Interfering with university authorized or reserved use of university property, including, but not limited to, disrupting Registered

Student Organizations (RSOs) and university-invited speakers and other authorized talks or events;

- IO Finding: Not Responsible
- UW-6013 II.C.4: Interfering with or infringing on the rights and privileges of others on university property including in outdoor university public areas;
 - IO Finding: Not Responsible
- UW-6013 II.D.1: To mitigate the potential for disruption and facilitate orderly access to university operations, classes, research, events, programming, and other activities, the university prohibits expressive activity within 25 feet of entrances to university owned or controlled buildings and facilities. For this section, the focus is on expressive activity aimed to reach beyond individuals speaking directly to one another. Examples include but are not limited to concerted activity such as: Protests, Chants, Speeches
 - IO Finding: Responsible
- UW-6013 II.F: Obstructing Access to University Lands, Buildings, Events or Impeding the Movement of Others. Conduct on university property and in outdoor public university areas, including expressive activity, must not obstruct or seriously impair the passage of others on university lands and through university facilities, including but not limited to, corridors, stairways, doorways, building entrances, fire exits, and reception areas. See Wis. Admin. Code §§ UWS 18.11(4)(a)1 and 2.b.
 - IO Finding: Responsible
- UW-6013 II.J.1: Sound Amplification. Conduct on university property including outdoor public university areas may not include the use sound amplification equipment unless expressly applied for and authorized by the university. This prohibition extends to expressive activity
 - IO Finding: Responsible
- UW-6013 II.K: Conduct, including expressive activity, must not create, or assist in creating, a noise disturbance. Please note that conduct, including expressive activity may not disrupt university operations, activities, and events in violation of items in the Material and Substantial Disruption to University Activities, Events and Operations section of this policy, even if it does not amount to a noise disturbance.
 - IO Finding: Not Responsible
- UW-6013 II.L.2: University community members and visitors may hold signs and distribute written or printing non-commercial materials, such as flyers, leaflets, and publications on a person-to-person basis, unless otherwise restricted by university building use policies. See G-1 Use of Lobbies in Academic Buildings and inquire with individual building managers for more information. () Signs must be limited to no larger than three feet by three feet. () Signs must be handheld and may not be supported by standards or sticks. () No materials may be distributed in classrooms.
 - IO Finding: Responsible

- UWS 18.08(9)a: No person may erect, post or attach any notices, posters, pictures or any item of a similar nature in or on any building or upon other university lands except on regularly established bulletin boards, or as authorized by the provisions of this code or by the chief administrative officer.
 - IO Finding: Responsible
- UWS 18.11(4)(a)(2)(b): Picketing, rallies, parades, demonstrations and other assemblies. (a) In order to preserve the order which is necessary for the enjoyment of freedom by members of the university community, and in order to prevent activities which physically obstruct access to university lands or buildings and prevent the university from carrying on its instructional, research, public service, or administrative functions, any picketing, rally, parade, demonstration, other assembly, or congregation of spectators to such activity may be declared unlawful if its participants: (2) Intentionally congregate or assemble within any university building in such fashion as to obstruct or seriously impair university-sponsored or university-authorized activities, or in such fashion as to violate any of the following conditions:(b) No group may obstruct or seriously impair passage through corridors, stairways, doorways, building entrances, fire exits, and reception areas leading to offices.
 - IO Finding: Responsible
- Rule 6a: Any act that impairs, interferes with, or obstructs the orderly conduct, processes, and functions of the university or any part thereof or the rights of one or more individuals.
 - IO Finding: Responsible
- Rule 6d: Failure to comply with sanctions following the Registered Student Organization Disciplinary Process or with the terms of interim measures.
 - IO Finding: Responsible
- Rule 6e: Engaging in violent, abusive, indecent, profane, boisterous, unreasonably loud or otherwise disorderly conduct under circumstances in which the conduct tends to cause or provoke a disturbance. This definition shall not be interpreted to abridge the rights of the university community to freedom of expression protected by the First Amendment of the United States Constitution and any other applicable law.
 - IO Finding: Responsible
- Rule 6f: Failure to comply with the directives of university officials (any person employed by the university [e.g., faculty, staff, administration, residence hall staff, university contractor]), or authorized agents, acting within the scope of their duties.
 - IO Finding: Responsible

Initial Recommended Sanctions

Disciplinary Suspension: A temporary loss of an RSO's privileges and benefits until May 12, 2026.

Committee's Recommendation

Summary of Presentation by Investigating Officer

- The investigating officer (Tonya Schmidt) determined that Students for Justice in Palestine (SJP) violated multiple policies during an April 1, 2025, protest at the Memorial Union. Key findings included:

- Flyering violations: Unauthorized distribution inside the Union and placement on cars in Lot 6 (UWS 18.08(9)(a)), despite initial confusion about building policies.
- Entrance obstruction: Crowding within 25 feet of the Park Street doors during a police investigation, impeding access (Expressive Activity Policy II.D.1, II.F, UWS 18.11(4)(a)(2)(b)).
- Amplified sound: Bullhorn use near building entrances (II.J.1).
- Disorderly conduct: Pushing against doors after UWPD directives to disperse (6(e), 6(f)).
- Probation breach: Violating existing disciplinary probation from a prior incident (6(d)).
- The officer noted SJP's co-sponsorship of the rally established jurisdiction for collective accountability. Witness statements, bodycam footage, and social media evidence corroborated attempts to enter restricted areas, block police vehicles, and use profane language toward staff. While acknowledging SJP's efforts to relocate flyering after guidance, the officer emphasized policy noncompliance during the dynamic escalation. She recommended a 1-year suspension due to repeated violations during probation.

Summary of Presentation by the RSO

- SJP leadership [REDACTED] asserted that:
 - Initial compliance: They secured approval for the rally location, adjusted flyering to sidewalks after Union staff guidance, and had no intent to disrupt the event.
 - Unplanned escalation: The rush to the Park Street doors was a spontaneous reaction to shouts about arrests—not orchestrated by SJP. Leadership prioritized safety checks over crowd control.
 - Mitigation attempts: [REDACTED] announced arrest risks via bullhorn; members directed protesters away from doors/roads. Flyers on cars were unsanctioned.
 - External actors: Disruptions inside Shannon Hall and vulgar language originated from non-members/unaffiliated individuals.
 - Contextual challenges: The rapidly evolving situation hindered full control, though they actively discouraged policy violations (e.g., clearing roads for cars).
- SJP's faculty advisor, Samer Alatout, underscored the group's consistent efforts to operate within rules (per hearing packet).

The Committee recommends the following finding:

- **Rule 5: Responsible**
 - UW-6013 II.B: **Responsible**
 - Vote: 2 for, 0 against, 0 abstained
 - UW-6013 II.C.1: **Not Responsible**
 - Vote: 0 for, 2 against, 0 abstained
 - UW-6013 II.C.2: **Not Responsible***
 - Vote: 0 for, 2 against, 0 abstained
 - UW-6013 II.C.3: **Not Responsible**
 - Vote: 0 for, 2 against, 0 abstained
 - UW-6013 II.C.4: **Not Responsible**
 - Vote: 0 for, 2 against, 0 abstained
 - UW-6013 II.D.1: **Responsible**

- Vote: 2 for, 0 against, 0 abstained
- UW-6013 II.F: **Not Responsible***
 - Vote: 0 for, 2 against, 0 abstained
- UW-6013 II.J.1: **Responsible**
 - Vote: 2 for, 0 against, 0 abstained
- UW-6013 II.K: **Not Responsible**
 - Vote: 0 for, 2 against, 0 abstained
- UW-6013 II.L.2: **Responsible**
 - Vote: 2 for, 0 against, 0 abstained
- UWS 18.08(9)(a): **Not Responsible***
 - Vote: 0 for, 2 against, 0 abstained
- UWS 18.11(4)(a)(2)(b): **Not Responsible***
 - Vote: 1 for, 1 against, 0 abstained
- Rule 6a: **Responsible**
 - Vote: 2 for, 0 against, 0 abstained
- Rule 6d: **Responsible**
 - Vote: 2 for, 0 against, 0 abstained
- Rule 6e: **Responsible**
 - Vote: 2 for, 0 against, 0 abstained
- Rule 6f: **Responsible**
 - Vote: 2 for, 0 against, 0 abstained

Note: The findings above, which are followed by an asterisk, denote the findings where the Hearing Committee diverged from the findings of the Investigating Officer.

For the alleged violations of **UW-6013 II.C.1**, **UW-6013 II.C.3**, **UW-6013 II.C.4**, and **UW-6013 II.K**, we agreed with both the conclusions and rationales presented in the hearing packet by the Investigating Officer that the organization was not responsible.

As we considered the alleged violations of **UW-6013 II.B** and **II.L.2**, the Hearing Committee found that the person who was leafleting inside of Memorial Union was acting in an official capacity as a member of the organization. The Hearing Committee therefore agreed that the actions of the RSO member who was leafleting inside of Memorial Union and outside of the designated allowable area constituted a violation of both II.B and II.L.2 of UW-6013. While the committee found it appropriate that the individual requested to see the policy to confirm a violation when learning of the policy from Heidi Lang, the person chose to continue leafleting until Ms. Lang returned with the policy for them to review.

For the alleged violation of **UWS 18.08(9)(a)**, the Investigating Officer alleged that flyers from the RSO's protest event were placed on vehicles parked in Lot 6, and the hearing packet references "Memorial Union staff" as the witness(es). However, no evidence of this incident was found in the materials prepared for the hearing by the Investigating Officer, nor was the designee who presented the materials able to provide any evidence of the incident. In their meeting with Tonya Schmidt and again in the hearing the RSO denied knowledge of the incident. Without any documentary evidence or even an official witness statement that indicates the incident occurred, but they did not choose to document it, the Hearing Committee did not believe there was a

preponderance of evidence presented for the hearing to suggest the incident occurred. Therefore, the RSO could not be found responsible for a violation of UWS 18.08(9)(a).

When reviewing the remaining alleged violations, the Hearing Committee considered first whether the organization should be held accountable for the gathering that occurred following UWPD's removal of individuals from the event in Shannon Hall. While perhaps UWPD's actions removing individuals for arrest bear some form of responsibility for creating the circumstances for the incident at the Park Street cul-de-sac entrance to Memorial Union, the actions of those groups do not absolve the RSO of agency or responsibility. The fact of the matter is that the RSO did have an event that brought people to the vicinity that night and as many attendees of their event, including members of the RSO's leadership team, left the area of the planned RSO event to attend to the disruption occurring following the removal of individuals from Shannon Hall. The Hearing Committee decided that the organization provided the context for the alleged violations and could therefore be held accountable according to the jurisdiction of the Registered Student Organization Code of Conduct as written in UW-2002 I.B.2.

For **UW-6013 II.C.2**, the Hearing Committee focused on the specific language of "impairing passage" in the policy. From the evidence presented by both the Investigating Officer and the RSO, it was university staff who were physically blockading a doorway and the functionality of the entrance was impaired by the decision to lock the doors and close that entrance—decisions again made by university staff and not the RSO. The doors could no longer be used for entry due to those decisions and UWPD was no longer allowing additional people in the area they were processing arrests, no longer allowing for the doors to be used to exit the space. In the hearing packet, the Investigating Officer event states that the group was attempting to enter the building through an "entrance that UWPD instructed them was now closed." The witness statement by Argyle Wade indicated that he told someone they would not be able to get their vehicle from Lot 6. While there is evidence indicating that individuals at the gathering went into the street, no additional evidence indicates that passage was impeded. The materials provided by the Investigating Officer occasionally reference a TikTok video by user @slut4coconuts wherein the user stated "People banded together to stop cop cars from meeting up with one another;" however the video was not downloaded and shared for the hearing, no screenshots from the video provided to document individuals actively acting as such, nor was there a written description of either the visual or audio contents of the video. Without further context or evidence submitted for consideration as part of the hearing, it cannot be affirmed whether the claims of the social media video were based in reality or in hyperbole. The witness statement by Dean Christina Olstad indicates she spoke with RSO leadership to ensure passage was possible, and the statements provided by the RSO and the witness statement by Heidi Lang indicate that, as vehicles were present, the group moved to ensure passage. There is no evidence that the organization failed to provide passage for vehicles. The group sought entry and were not denying entry or exit to any other individuals. Therefore, the Hearing Committee did not find a preponderance of the evidence submitted indicated a finding of responsibility.

For **UW-6013 II.D.1**, the Hearing Committee found that Witness Statements and video evidence from the UWPD bodycam footage provided a preponderance of the evidence that the gathering near the Park Street cul-de-sac occurred within 25 feet of entrances to Memorial Union. As the

Hearing Committee believes the RSO provided context for the group that moved from the planned event to the cul-de-sac, the group is found responsible.

For **UW-6013 II.F**, as noted in our discussion of UW-6013 II.C.2 above, the evidence provided by both sides does not arise to a preponderance of evidence indicating that the group at the cul-de-sac obstructed access to university buildings nor did they impede the movement of others. Rather the evidence indicates a decision by staff to lock the doors, impairing passage through them. Again, no evidence presented at the hearing indicates that the RSO prevented vehicular movement. The statement by Argyle Wade is countered by the statements of both Heidi Lang and the RSO—Dean Christina Olstad’s witness statement indicates speaking with a member of the RSO to ensure the passage of vehicles but provides no further information about the group’s actions thereafter.

For **UW-6013 II.J.1**, the footage from UWPD bodycams indicates that there was at least one bullhorn present less than 25 feet from the entrance(s) to Memorial Union, which aligns with the Witness statement by Argyle Wade that a bullhorn was used within 25 feet from the entrance. The Hearing Committee believes this to be a preponderance of the evidence of the use of amplified sound within an impermissible distance. As the Hearing Committee believes the RSO provided context for the group that moved from the planned event to the cul-de-sac, the group is found responsible.

For **UWS 18.11(4)(a)(2)(b)**, the Hearing Committee split their vote, 1-1 on responsibility, leading to a finding that the organization is not responsible. There was disagreement over the extent to which the gathering at the Park Street cul-de-sac constituted an intentional congregation or assembly on behalf of the group as referenced in the policy.

For **Rule 5**, the Hearing Committee found it more likely than not that the RSO was responsible for violating policies of the institution, as detailed above.

For **Rule 6a**, the Hearing Committee found that a preponderance of the evidence indicated the attempts by those at the gathering to gain access through the entry that university staff had closed impaired the orderly conduct and processes of the university. As the Hearing Committee believes the RSO provided context for the group that moved from the planned event to the cul-de-sac, the group is found responsible.

For **Rule 6d**, as the RSO was on disciplinary probation at the time of the incident in question and the Hearing Committee found the group responsible for violating other Rules of the Registered Student Organization Code of Conduct, the RSO is therefore necessarily found responsible.

For **Rule 6e**, the Hearing Committee considered primarily witness statements and UWPD body cam footage. With the characterization of the gathering at the cul-de-sac by witness statements as loud and chaotic, and the available body cam footage appearing to corroborate these characterizations, the Hearing Committee felt that a preponderance of the evidence indicated that the behavior at the gathering was both profane and boisterous, “under circumstances in which the conduct tends to cause or provoke a disturbance.” As the Hearing Committee believes the RSO provided context for the group that moved from the planned event to the cul-de-sac, the group is found responsible.

For **Rule 6f**, the Hearing Committee focused again on the directives given by university staff, including UWPD. Multiple witness statements and evidence provided by UWPD attest to directives given to the gathering at the cul-de-sac which were not immediately complied with. While members of the RSO indicated some uncertainty about what UWPD and staff were issuing as directives at first, there was no contestation that directives were issued and not complied with. As the Hearing Committee believes the staff were acting within the scope of their duties, a preponderance of the evidence suggests that there was a failure to comply with directives. As the Hearing Committee believes the RSO provided context for the group that moved from the planned event to the cul-de-sac, the group is found responsible.

As a result, the Hearing Committee is recommending the following sanctions:

- A written reprimand for violations of the leafletting policies UW-6013 II.B and II.L.2, as outlined in the sanctioning guidelines for such violations.
- The RSO must submit an updated Risk Management policy to the Office for Student Organizations, Leadership and Involvement (SOLI) for advice and guidance by October 10, 2025; following this process, the policy should be added to the RSO's internal policies. The policy should outline future terms for how the organization should manage interruptions of their planned events by outside actions and plans for how the group will attempt to regain the attention and focus of the attendees of their event, to ensure a more proactive response to future interruptions. Specifically, the policy should cover at least incidents such as a disruption of RSO protest activity when an individual inside the protested event is arrested for disturbing the event.
- A nine-month extension of the RSO's current term of disciplinary probation. The RSO's disciplinary probation term will now run through August 3, 2026.

Additionally, the Hearing Committee recommend that the RSO take this opportunity to create internal documentation about rules around Expressive Activity, particularly leafletting to ensure that future incarnations of the RSO have a firm understanding of the application of the policy and the need to make affirmative contact with the management of campus buildings to learn where and when such activities are permitted. This recommendation is made as the organization is often engaged in protest activities, and it is therefore particularly important for the organization to be well aware of these rules.

As noted above, the sanctions around UW-6013 II.B and II.L.2 are what are outlined as recommendations in the document provided by OSCCS to the Hearing Committee. Additionally, a member of the organization testified to having contacted staff at Memorial Union staff at the event to ensure they were following the rules properly. The individual who violated the rules about leafletting ceased leafletting after they were provided with the policy. The hearing Committee considered both of those as mitigating factors.

As we considered sanctions for the remaining rule violations, the Hearing Committee rejected the yearlong suspension provided by the Investigating Officer. This was a result of the Hearing Committee's perception of the nature of the violations and weighing whether a disciplinary suspension would serve to improve the conditions of the organization. The leafletting rules were the only violations that arose directly out of the planned event—Rule 6d would have technically

been triggered but would not justify a significant sanction in this context. The Hearing Committee discussed at length whether the Registered Student Organization Code of Conduct would have jurisdiction over the alleged violations that were triggered by the conduct of the gathering in the Park Street cul-de-sac and the nearby entrance to Memorial Union. As noted above, the Hearing Committee found jurisdiction by virtue of UW-2002 I.B.1, whereas the Investigating Officer indicated their justification to be under I.B.3.

The only evidence presented for the hearing regarding the devolution of the planned protest into the gathering at the cul-de-sac attributes the attendees moving to the cul-de-sac after an unidentified individual shouted that people were being arrested at the event in Shannon Hall. The evidence from the hearing regarding what transpired next indicates that it was people from outside of the protest group who started moving toward the cul-de-sac and eventually the majority of the group, including some leaders from the RSO, followed. The Hearing Committee does not believe the preponderance of presented evidence suggests that the movement to the cul-de-sac occurred due to the consent of RSO leadership, implied or overt. The Hearing Committee was unable to find a preponderance of evidence provided for the hearing which would indicate that the RSO leadership provided consent, implied or overt, to the actions of the attendees once people gathered at the cul-de-sac.

The Hearing Committee found the violations of UW-6013 II.D.1, II.J.1, and UWS 18.11(4)(a)(2)(b), Rules 6a, 6e, and 6f due to our reading of UW-2002 I.B.1. However, we found multiple mitigating factors as part of our process. First, while we found that the RSO provided conditions for the violations to occur, the incident was due to an altercation at a separate event (the lecture in Shannon Hall), an event (and ensuing incident) over which the RSO had no control in creating. Second, to the extent that the provided evidence demonstrates RSO leadership participating in actions at the cul-de-sac gathering, it is clear that the RSO leadership was involved in deescalating the situation, facilitating the gathering from moving away from the entrance in question, and preventing the gathering from impeding the movement of vehicles. However, the sanctioning guidelines provided to the Hearing Committee do provide some suggestions for handling mitigating factors, but we felt the specific factors of this incident were more significant than those mitigating factors in the sanctioning guide.

For their actual, planned event, the RSO made efforts to ensure that their planned event outside of Memorial Union at the intersection of Langdon Street and Park Street followed the appropriate guidelines and communicated with university staff as part of that process. While the presenting Investigating Officer implied that perhaps the organization could have done more to communicate with campus officials as part of their event planning, the group was under no obligation to do so and the RSO testified to what has become an internal presumption of the presence of campus staff at their events in the form of the Protest Support Team, without the RSO requesting their presence as “they are at all of our events.”

The Hearing Committee’s final suggestion of an additional nine months of disciplinary probation comes as a balance of the recognition of the seriousness of what occurred at the Park Street cul-de-sac and the entryway to Memorial Union, the sudden and reactive nature of that incident, and the documented efforts by the RSO leadership to defuse the situation. The allowable sanctions outlined in UW-2002 provide no options between the escalation from disciplinary probation to

disciplinary suspension. However, the Hearing Committee does not believe that our findings regarding the actions from April 1, 2025, warrant the escalation to disciplinary suspension, even in the context of the RSO's extended term of disciplinary probation.

We felt that the RSO could be given educational sanctions to help mitigate future incidents of this nature from occurring without the additional conditions required by disciplinary suspension. Therefore, we assigned the updated Risk Management policy, as the Hearing Committee found the trigger for this incident more likely than not to occur again. As a group centered on protest actions, we found it reasonable for the organization to develop a plan for how to handle the disruption of their protest activity when an individual inside the protested event is arrested for disturbing the event.

Respectfully submitted to the Dean of Students on July 8, 2025.
Brandon Thierry and Will Hoffman, Hearing Committee

Initial IO Recommended Sanctions

- Disciplinary Suspension: A temporary loss of an RSO's privileges and benefits until May 12, 2026

Committees Recommended Sanctions

- A written reprimand for violations of the leafletting policies UW-6013 II.B and II.L.2, as outlined in the sanctioning guidelines for such violations
- The RSO must submit an updated Risk Management policy to the Office for Student Organizations, Leadership and Involvement (SOLI) for advice and guidance by October 10, 2025; following this process, the policy should be added to the RSO's internal policies. The policy should outline future terms for how the organization should manage interruptions of their planned events by outside actions and plans for how the group will attempt to regain the attention and focus of the attendees of their event, to ensure a more proactive response to future interruptions. Specifically, the policy should cover at least incidents such as a disruption of RSO protest activity when an individual inside the protested event is arrested for disturbing the event
- A nine-month extension of the RSO's current term of disciplinary probation. The RSO's disciplinary probation term will now run through August 3, 2026.

Dean of Students Designee Review and Rationale

After reviewing Registered Student Organization policies, documents provided by both parties, watching the July 1, 2025 hearing, and reviewing the recommendation from the Hearing Committee. The Dean of Students designee decision are the following sanctions:

- Disciplinary Suspension: A temporary loss of an RSO's privileges and benefits until January 15, 2026. Upon returning as an RSO, disciplinary probation from January 15, 2026–May 15, 2026.

Rationale

SJP is a student organization on disciplinary probation, and both the investigating officer and the committee found SJP to be in violation of eight codes. The Registered Student Organization

Hearing Committee is an educational process that uses a progressive sanctioning procedure with learning and the student at the center. SJP was found in violation by several campus community members while being on probation, therefore resulting in the next step of suspension. I have decreased the initial recommended sanction by 6 months. In addition, I am not upholding the additional sanctions that the committee offered for these reasons:

- A written reprimand for violations of the leafletting policies UW-6013 II.B and II.L.2, as outlined in the sanctioning guidelines for such violations—

UWS code of conduct is a progressive and educational process. Since SJP was already on probation, a reprimand does not make sense in this case.

- The RSO must submit an updated Risk Management policy to the Office for Student Organizations, Leadership and Involvement (SOLI) for advice and guidance by October 10, 2025; following this process, the policy should be added to the RSO's internal policies. The policy should outline future terms for how the organization should manage interruptions of their planned events by outside actions and plans for how the group will attempt to regain the attention and focus of the attendees of their event, to ensure a more proactive response to future interruptions. Specifically, the policy should cover at least incidents such as a disruption of RSO protest activity when an individual inside the protested event is arrested for disturbing the event—

This is not a sanction, but rather an expectation to be an RSO at UW-Madison. The assumption is that you will meet the expectation of an RSO when you return in January 2026.

My goal is your success. Therefore, I am adding a sanction to facilitate that success. I am requiring you to meet with an advisor in the Office for Student Organizations, Leadership & Involvement (SOLI) two times during the fall 2025 semester. This will be an opportunity for SJP to discuss and improve upon processes and information gaps mentioned during the hearing (e.g., getting Union polices front-and-center on the website, reviewing the Expressive Activity Policy, etc.) or other issues. This will support SJP making the necessary adjustments to be a recognized student organization in good standing. Please contact Barb Kautz, interim director of SOLI to schedule these meetings.

All disciplinary sanctions assigned by the Dean of Students or designee are enforceable as of the date issued. This decision shall become final within 7 days of the date of this written decision unless the RSO requests an appeal via this form:

https://cm.maxient.com/reportingform.php?UnivofWisconsinMadison&layout_id=51. Additional information regarding the appeal process may be found at <https://conduct.students.wisc.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/274/2024/08/Registered-Student-Organization-Appeal-Process.pdf>.

Respectfully submitted by Dean of Students Designee Kathy Kruse on Tuesday, July 15, 2025.

Kathy Kruse, Associate Dean of Students
Dean of Students Designee