
The University Senate

FACULTY · STUDENT · P&A · CIVIL SERVICE

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Campus Safety Committee September 27, 2021 Minutes of the Meeting

These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate; none of the comments, conclusions or actions reported in these minutes represent the views of, nor are they binding on, the senate, the administration or the Board of Regents.

[**In these minutes:** Call to Order and Welcome; University Senate Governance Orientation; Recommendations from the Senate Committee on Committees Regarding the Campus Safety Committee; Updates on the M Safe Implementation Team; Discussion of Campus Safety Committee Charge and Membership]

PRESENT: Edgar Arriaga (chair), Joseph Alf, Sue Bosell, Paul Dellovo, Myron Frans, Jabra Kawas, Kevin Kelley, Jacob Lastovich, JaeLah Lymon, Nathan Mara, Katherine McCormick, Emily McGuire, Adam Negri, Tia Hernandez Petrulo, Linda Pozen, Max Reichelt, Ashok Singh, Barry Standorf, Corinne Teed, Julie Thompson, liz thomson

REGRETS: None

ABSENT: Nathan Phan

GUESTS: Mylene Culbreath, co-chair, M Safe Implementation Team, Ned Patterson, chair, Senate Consultative Committee/Faculty Consultative Committee

OTHERS: Megan Sweet, assistant to the president, Office of the President

1. Call to Order and Welcome

Chair Edgar Arriaga called the first meeting of the Campus Safety Committee to order and welcomed everyone. He invited committee members to add their suggestions for committee ground rules and personal priorities to a [shared document](#) and to add to it as the year progresses.

2. University Senate Governance Orientation

Geanette Poole, senate associate, University Senate Office, provided a brief [committee orientation](#). The orientation was provided in order to describe the responsibilities and charge of the committee, familiarize members with meeting logistics, and outline the function and structure of University Senate governance.

3. Recommendations from the Senate Committee on Committees Regarding the Campus Safety Committee

Ned Patterson, chair, Senate Consultative Committee/Faculty Consultative Committee (SCC/FCC), began by referencing a [letter](#) he wrote to Arriaga expressing support for recommendations made by the Senate Committee on Committees (ConC) in its [report](#) regarding, among other things, the membership and name of the Campus Safety Committee.

Patterson outlined the history of the formation of the Campus Safety Committee, referring to meeting minutes from the June 29, 2020, and November 5, 2020, University Senate meetings at which the creation of the committee was discussed and approved. Because of the unconventional nature of the formation of this committee, Patterson added, it is important for the Campus Safety Committee *itself* to take the necessary time to consider the appropriateness of its membership, name, and charge as written by the authors of the bylaws amendment resolution to form the committee.

Patterson concluded that the SCC is very interested in hearing the Campus Safety Committee's own recommendations to its membership, name, and charge, and looks forward to continued discussions. He then opened the floor for discussion.

The committee had a robust discussion regarding the processes for reviewing its structure, and proposing and making changes. Emily McGuire recommended that committee members review minutes from the University Senate meetings. She said strong arguments were made by students attending those meetings as to why a significant number of student members on the Campus Safety Committee was important. After further discussion and questions, Arriaga said this discussion would continue at future meetings, as it is clearly an important matter to committee members. He then thanked Patterson for joining the meeting and moved to the next topic.

4. Updates on the M Safe Implementation Team

Mylene Culbreath, co-chair of the M Safe Implementation Team, shared a document titled [M Safe Summer Progress](#). She noted the steps the M Safe Team had taken to organize subcommittees to prepare recommendations from the [Dr. Cedric Alexander report](#) for implementation. A final report will be presented by M Safe to President Joan Gabel in mid-December 2021. Culbreath added that the final report will include suggested follow-through roles for the Campus Safety Committee.

Arriaga thanked Culbreath for her presentation and noted that many of Dr. Alexander's recommendations that have informed M Safe's work align with the charge of the Campus Safety Committee. Arriaga said he sees the two groups working together as a good strategy. He then called for questions from committee members.

Sue Bosell asked how the work of both M Safe and the Campus Safety Committee would intersect with safety initiatives already in place on system campuses. Culbreath answered that she sees M Safe's work as only a starting point and added that M Safe's work with the Twin Cities campus could potentially provide a road map for system campuses to implement appropriate recommendations for their communities. Bosell noted that Dr. Alexander provided a review of and recommendations for the Duluth campus as well and recommendations were beginning to be implemented.

Hearing no further questions, Arriaga thanked Culbreath and moved to the last agenda item.

5. Discussion of Campus Safety Committee Charge and Membership

Arriaga invited committee members to begin what he said will undoubtedly be an ongoing conversation regarding the committee's [charge and membership](#). Arriaga asked committee members to consider:

- Who are we (committee name)?
- Who should be appointed to this committee so the voices of all stakeholders are represented (committee membership)?
- What are the aspects of the work that the committee would like to be responsible for (committee charge)?

Arriaga asked that committee members discuss one topic at a time, and recommended starting with membership. The recommendations in the ConC's report were then discussed. Comments included:

- Civil service and P&A staff feel underrepresented on governance committees and their voice should be of equal importance to faculty and student voices.
- Committee size is appropriate as it is; the committee membership number should not increase.
- A larger committee is appropriate so that all voices may be represented.
- Those that are most impacted by campus safety concerns should have a representative voice on the committee.
- System campus representation is important.
- For undergraduate students who not only attend class on campus but live on/near campus, their safety is a 24/7 consideration.
- It's important to have a voice for each different *type* of student (graduate, undergraduate, professional) at the University as their experiences differ substantially.
- The University doesn't exist in a vacuum, it exists within a larger community. Exploring relationships with surrounding communities could be beneficial for the committee.
- A historical perspective on the topic of campus safety and campus climate over the last three to four decades would be helpful in determining the committee's membership and charge.

Arriaga noted that there is currently no representation for postdocs or alumni on the committee and asked committee members to comment. There seemed to be support for postdoc representation dependent on the number of University community members who hold that designation. Committee members felt that representation for alumni would not be placed as a priority above other groups being discussed, especially if limiting the size of the committee is an objective.

Arriaga finished by asking committee members to review recommendations two through five in the Senate ConC [report](#), and recapped what he heard today:

- One postdoc representative rather than two
- Not strong support for alumni representation
- Support for increased P&A presence
- Support for increased civil service presence, perhaps by not filling vacant faculty seat
- Strong support for student representation for all student groups

Arriaga asked committee members to reflect on this information. At the next meeting, he added, the committee could decide to act on these items, continue the discussion, or table the discussion for the time being.

Hearing no further business, Arriaga adjourned the meeting.

Geanette Poole
University Senate Office