The University Senate

FACULTY · STUDENT · P&A · CIVIL SERVICE

2025-26 UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Minutes: No. 1

Thursday, September 25, 2025

2:30 - 4:20 p.m.

The first meeting of the University Senate for 2025-26 was convened on September 25, 2025, in Cowles Auditorium in the Humphrey School of Public Affairs on the Twin Cities campus. Crookston, Duluth, Morris, and Rochester, as well as many individuals, were connected by Zoom. The recording has been posted to YouTube.

At the time of this meeting, there were 242 voting members of the University Senate. 160 were present.

1. **University Senate Call to Order**

President Rebecca Cunningham

President Rebecca Cunningham called the meeting to order at 2:33 p.m.

2. **Administrative Responses to University Senate Actions *(Information for the University Senate)***
    - Statement in Support of the Core Mission and Values of Higher Education in the United States of America
        - Response pending

- Resolution to Establish a Mutual Defense Compact for the Universities of the Big Ten Academic Alliance in Defense of Academic Freedom, Institutional Integrity, and the Research Enterprise
    - Response

3. Tribute to Deceased Members of the University Community

Cunningham then introduced Item 3, a list of recent faculty, staff, and student deaths. Before she began to read the names, Emma Molls, faculty senator from the University Libraries, rose and sought recognition on the floor. Molls stated that many senators experienced difficulty obtaining approval for a Zoom link to participate in the senate meetings remotely, arguing that the existing rules were too stringent for robust participation. Molls then requested unanimous consent to amend the University Senate rules by inserting a new clause H after Article 1, Rules of the University Senate, Section 6, Meetings Procedures Clause G. The proposed clause read: “h., The Senate Office shall, upon request of any senator, and without requirement of justification, provide access to participate virtually for all meetings of the University Senate.”

Jennifer Goodnough, Senate Consultative Committee (SCC) representative from Morris, objected to hearing the motion, forcing a vote on considering the motion. A show of hands was taken and the motion to consider the amendment passed by a majority vote.

Molls then moved to amend the University Senate Rules with the previously stated language. Molls spoke to the motion, noting a disconnect between information shared in the orientation and application prior to the first meeting about virtual link distribution. They asserted that ensuring all senators had Zoom access if needed would lead to a more robust senate.

Karen-Sue Taussig, attending as a faculty alternate from the College of Liberal Arts (CLA), spoke in favor of the motion, expressing the need for generosity and grace during difficult times. Taussig explained that she had requested a Zoom link and urged

the meeting be moved online after learning of a death threat against a senate member. She reported being stunned by the denial of her request and others, and accused the Office of the President of breaking its own policy, which stated an identified alternate would be added to the meeting and could access the Zoom link without “further special permission.” Taussig reported that the president’s office responded by stating they would update the Process for Sending an Alternate, and subsequently did so and turned off version history. Taussig viewed this as changing the rules and retroactively enforcing them while “erasing history,” and called it an abuse of power[1]. She urged senators to vote for the motion to extend grace to their colleagues.

Goodnough then explained that her objection was based on process. She noted that the SCC is charged with managing the Constitution, Bylaws, and Rules, and is the body with broad representation that deliberates on such issues. She acknowledged that senators have the right to bring motions, but argued that the constitutional process placed the rules in the hands of the SCC.

Eva von Dassow, faculty senator from CLA, argued that the problem was not the rules themselves but their inconsistent application. Von Dassow believed the proposed amendment would ensure a consistent and fair rule for the future, allowing senators to attend remotely without requirement of justification due to illness, teaching schedules, or any other reason.

[1] Abstractor’s Note: The Process for Sending Alternates did state that alternates would be able to access the Zoom without any further permissions. However, that process was drafted when senate meetings were still fully virtual, and was meant to head off emails asking if alternates, as non-members, needed special *technological* permissions to access the Zoom meeting. Third, the Process for Sending Alternates is a live Google doc that details a logistical process and is revised as needed; it is not meant to be an official statement of policy. It was updated to prevent further confusion about that clause, but no settings were changed. The document is and always has been set to allow Viewer access to anyone with the link; only people with Commenter or Editor access can see version history in Google docs. There was no attempt to deny that the wording in question did exist, nor that the expectations were different than what was previously communicated.

Charles Rank, civil service senator, raised a point of order requesting that the motion be read again for clarification, as several people had arrived late and were confused by the early debate. The motion was read one more time.

Cunningham then moved to the vote on the motion to amend the rules. The motion passed with a clear majority after a show of hands.

Cunningham then returned to the item at hand and proceeded to read the names of recently deceased members of the University community:

Faculty/Staff

Kitty Bell
Health Care Professional
Boynton Health
University of Minnesota Twin Cities
1952-2025

Thomas Bilder
Finance Manager
Boynton Health
University of Minnesota Twin Cities
1950-2025

Manjeet Dhatt
Associate Professor
Labovitz School of Business and Economics
University of Minnesota Duluth
1954-2025

John Foker
Professor

Medical School

University of Minnesota Twin Cities

1937-2025

Berhane Gebre

Building and Grounds Worker

Facilities Management

University of Minnesota Twin Cities

1963-2025

Dan Gibson
Postdoctoral Associate
College of Food, Agriculture and Natural Resource Sciences
University of Minnesota Twin Cities
1982-2025

Nene Gibson

Associate Professor

Labovitz School of Business and Economics

University of Minnesota Duluth

1975-2025

Allen Goldman

Regents Professor

College of Science and Engineering

University of Minnesota Twin Cities

1937-2025

Mark Gunderson

Building and Grounds Worker

Finance and Operations

University of Minnesota Morris
1962-2025

Terri Gustavson
Marketing & Communications Professional
College of Food, Agriculture and Natural Resource Sciences
University of Minnesota Twin Cities
1948-2025

Arnold Johnson
Building and Grounds Worker
Facilities Management
University of Minnesota Twin Cities
1957-2025

Michelle Lekas
Senior Lecturer
College of Liberal Arts
University of Minnesota Twin Cities
1959-2025

Michael Lower
Professor
College of Liberal Arts
University of Minnesota Twin Cities
1971-2025

David Leuthardt
Building and Grounds Worker

Finance and Operations
University of Minnesota Morris
1959-2025

Sara Mack
Senior Lecturer
College of Liberal Arts
University of Minnesota Twin Cities
1972-2025

Barbara Martinson
Professor
College of Design
University of Minnesota Twin Cities
1953-2025

Deborah Pehrson
Executive Office and Administrative Specialist
College of Food, Agriculture and Natural Resource Sciences
University of Minnesota Twin Cities
1952-2025

Jennifer Peterson
Senior Teaching Specialist
College of Liberal Arts
University of Minnesota Twin Cities
1968-2025

Timothy Sachs

Building and Grounds Worker
Facilities Management
University of Minnesota Twin Cities
1962-2025

Bonnie Samletzka
Student Services Professional
College of Continuing and Professional Studies
University of Minnesota Twin Cities
1948-2025

Aubie Shaw
Assistant Professor
Medical School
University of Minnesota Duluth
1975-2025

Steven Swanson
Senior Laboratory Machinist
Swenson College of Science and Engineering
University of Minnesota Duluth
1973-2025

Stanley Thayer
Professor
Medical School
University of Minnesota Twin Cities
1959-2025

Judith Younger

Professor

Law School

University of Minnesota Twin Cities

1933-2025

Students

Easton Kleven
College of Science and Engineering

University of Minnesota Twin Cities

Aaron Lee
College of Design
University of Minnesota Twin Cities

Lon Rosenfield
College of Continuing and Professional Studies
University of Minnesota Twin Cities

Sharikha Seraladane
College of Science and Engineering
University of Minnesota Twin Cities

Ethan Tichelaar
College of Liberal Arts

University of Minnesota Twin Cities

4. Approval of Minutes *(Action by the University Senate)*

Professor Cliff Steer, clerk, University Senate

> **Motion:** To approve the minutes from the regular and special University Senate Meetings on April 24, 2025.

Approved by acclamation.

5. President's Report

President Rebecca Cunningham

Cunningham then gave her report, commencing with a welcome and an expression of gratitude for the work being done to fulfill the University's mission amid a historic array of external pressures. She highlighted the continued excellence in research, the outstanding education provided to a record number of students, and the deepening community partnerships. Cunningham announced the impending rollout of a strategic roadmap and stressed the importance of a strong partnership between faculty governance and University leadership in the face of uncertainty and threats to higher education.

Administrative Updates

Cunningham shared several updates:

- She welcomed Executive Vice President and Provost Gretchen Ritter to her first University Senate meeting, noting Ritter's background in American politics and constitutional rights as critical assets.
- Four new Regents were welcomed in August: Joel Bergstrom, Samuel Hines, Ellen Luger, and Koswar Muhammad.
- Chancellor Charles Nies's inauguration at the Duluth campus occurred earlier in the month.
- Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Education Scott Lanyon agreed to serve as a special advisor to the provost for the St. Paul Campus Initiative for the academic year.
- The University reached agreements with its Teamsters and AFSCME employees.
- The Board of Regents (BOR) approved 3% raises and a 1% set-aside for market adjustments in response to Senate action and advocacy on workforce needs.

- Faculty forums on the Twin Cities campus would continue throughout the year, with plans to expand them to other system campuses.

Budget and Capital Plan

Cunningham provided a budget update, noting the presentation of the University's six-year capital plan and the 2026 state capital budget request to the Board of Regents. The new approach to critical infrastructure funding included using $10 million in recurring Operations and Maintenance (O&M) funds to borrow approximately $150 million. This process will be repeated every two years through 2034, providing $750 million to address deferred maintenance and critical facility issues, rebuilding a capital pipeline with purpose and predictability. She noted that state partnership would still be necessary as needs exceeded these funds.

Enrollment and Strategic Roadmap

Cunningham reported that enrollment was up across the University on every campus in both overall enrollment and degree-seeking enrollment. She noted a new University-wide enrollment planning process was underway to develop coordinated and comprehensive strategies for recruitment, admissions, retention, and academic offerings.

Regarding the strategic roadmap, Cunningham stated that the plan, which will be discussed later by the co-chairs, would help the University chart this course forward and make difficult decisions. She emphasized the plan's foundation in the University's strengths. The roadmap launch event was scheduled for October 9th and would be livestreamed.

6. Questions to the President

President Rebecca Cunningham

Cunningham then responded to the following questions from the floor:

- Von Dassow asked why one month of faculty and staff raises was rescinded, effectively reducing the merit pool, and if faculty and staff would ever receive that money. Cunningham explained that the University delayed merit increases in FY26 by two pay periods due to an unusually tight time frame between the BOR's budget approval and the conclusion of payroll entries, a delay necessitated by this year's unprecedented budget issues. The delay was applied to all employees for consistency. Cunningham noted that the merit increase was provided when many universities were offering no merit increase. She said that the salary increases would not be made retroactive, and there was no identified use for these funds, as the budget was passed in total.
- Michael Gallope, faculty senator from CLA, said that he was the recipient of the aforementioned death threat and spoke about his experience. He acknowledged the responsiveness of some staff, but detailed a process issue concerning a lack of emergency security for his building after the threat. Gallope described receiving an email form to request event security, including the need for a chart string from his department to fund security against a death threat. Cunningham expressed deep sorrow for the threat, noting her own experience with such threats. She assured the community that every threat is taken seriously, with most never being announced because the University has a very good process in place to assess the credibility and actual risk using security professionals and connections with federal agencies. She noted that threats happen very commonly against various individuals and groups. Cunningham committed to taking Gallope's feedback to security to improve the process for connecting threatened faculty/staff with appropriate help. She reiterated that not every threat results in a building lockdown or individual security, as actions depend on the professional threat assessment.
- Elizabeth Ambrose, faculty senator from the College of Pharmacy, asked how strengthening the scientific research enterprise, given funding and support issues, fit into the strategic plan. Cunningham responded that the strategic plan

addresses the full mission set—education, research, and outreach/service. She noted that it is a difficult time for research funding due to shifting federal priorities, but the University's very diverse portfolio and top faculty positioned it well to adapt.

In the interest of time, Cunningham moved on to the next agenda item.

7. Provost's Report

Executive Vice President and Provost Gretchen Ritter

Cunningham formally introduced Executive Vice President and Provost Gretchen Ritter, who then presented her report. Ritter stated she was just shy of eight weeks into her role and had been spending time getting to know the campus, with plans to visit every school and college on the Twin Cities campus and the other campuses this fall.

Ritter shared reflections on the University's strengths, including academic excellence in scholarship and teaching, and a strong, palpable commitment to the state. She also praised the University's engaged, mission-driven leadership culture that values diverse perspectives.

Ritter identified areas of challenge and engagement:

- Enrollment: Despite good enrollment this year, Ritter acknowledged challenges such as the enrollment cliff and international student recruitment pressures. She stressed the need for deeper engagement in enrollment strategies, national recruitment, meeting state communities' needs, and strategic international recruitment.
- Two Trust Problems: Ritter highlighted the need to rebuild internal trust through collaboration, transparency, meeting her promises, and listening. She also addressed the external trust problem, noting public questions about the value of universities, and expressed eagerness for conversations on how to rebuild that trust.

- Long-Term Change: Ritter concluded by emphasizing the need for significant, long-term change to continue the University's work, including developing new models for scholarship and supporting the needs of the state in the face of ongoing challenges.

Cunningham opened up the floor for questions to the provost.

8. Questions to the Provost

Executive Vice President and Provost Gretchen Ritter

- **von Dassow** asked about the $5.5 million that former Executive Vice President and Provost Rachel Croson reportedly stated would be “redirected” from core curriculum revision support after the new core curriculum failed to be approved, as noted in the senate minutes from April 24, 2025. von Dassow asked what was being done with the $5.5 million, arguing it should still be spent on undergraduate curriculum. Ritter thanked Von Dassow for the question and acknowledged the need to continue investing in undergraduate teaching, meet student needs, and consider the impact of Artificial Intelligence (AI). Ritter emphasized commitments to fostering interdisciplinary collaboration in teaching and facilitating the adoption of pedagogies and practices that increase learning and student success.
- Gallope raised a pre-existing issue concerning censored statements that were removed from the University website following the BOR’s resolution on institutional speech. Gallope described the censorship as an unpleasant moment with ongoing legal and academic freedom implications, noting that the Regents were set to reconsider the resolution in October. He stated that the lack of policy or criteria for the takedowns was a significant problem, and that many organizations concerned with academic freedom had raised flags about the practice. Gallope then asked Ritter a directed question: Would she support a process allowing faculty to collectively author associational speech on the Israel-Palestine and the genocide in Gaza, as long as the statements included disclaimers, did not claim to be institutional speech, and reflected the faculty's

expertise? Ritter responded by outlining her understanding of academic freedom, which she said includes freedom for research and teaching within one's discipline, the ability to question and hold the institution accountable, and the opportunity for faculty to speak extramurally on issues. She stated she supported the right of every faculty member to speak extramurally, whether individually or by signing collective statements. Ritter also expressed agreement with the principles behind institutional neutrality, stating that it is not appropriate for a unit, a department, or a program to speak on behalf of the institution using institutional resources. She explained that external parties often fail to distinguish between statements made by a unit and the larger institution. Ritter also acknowledged Gallope's concern that the standards and policies for applying the institutional statement policy were unclear, stating that it was a legitimate concern. She expressed interest in working with representatives of shared governance to address the concern and establish standards and procedures. When pressed to answer the question about whether she would support a process allowing faculty to collectively author associational speech on Israel-Palestine and the genocide in Gaza, as long as the statements included disclaimers, did not claim to be institutional speech, and reflected the faculty's expertise more directly, Ritter said that she supports the right of individuals themselves, or together signing a statement, but that she does not support the idea of a unit, a department, or a program doing that.

9. Senate Consultative Committee Report

Professor Perry Leo, chair, Senate Consultative Committee

Professor Perry Leo, SCC chair, welcomed the senate and stated that a strong, consistent voice for all senate groups would be vital this year, given the challenges facing higher education. Leo reported that he and SCC Vice Chair Tim Johnson had spent the summer meeting with individuals across the University—including the President's Office, Executive Vice President for Finance and Operations Gregg

Goldman, Provost Ritter, AAUP leadership, and Vice President for Strategic Initiatives Ryan Schmiesing—with the goal of rebuilding trust.

Leo noted that much of the early SCC work, as reflected in the day's agenda, focused on providing input on the strategic plan. He also reported that the SCC had discussed proposed changes to the senate Constitution, Bylaws, and Rules, specifically regarding making votes public and rules for extending time. Leo observed that discussions would continue, stressing the need to find a way to be fair and respectful to all groups in the senate, including tenured faculty, non-tenured faculty, civil service and P&A staff, and students.

Leo briefly previewed his Faculty Consultative Committee report, stating that he expected a continued focus on term and non-tenure track faculty and academic freedom, which included the unit statement situation and potentially new challenges. He concluded by emphasizing that a strong, consistent voice was needed to defend the idea that higher education is a common good.

10. Questions to the Senate Consultative Committee Chair

Professor Perry Leo, chair, Senate Consultative Committee

None.

11. Strategic Plan

Chancellor Charles Nies and Dean Andrew Alleyne, co-chairs, Strategic Planning Steering Committee

Chancellor Charles Nies and Dean Andrew Alleyne, co-chairs, Strategic Planning Steering Committee, provided an update on the strategic roadmap. Alleyne began by thanking everyone who provided feedback, emphasizing that the roadmap was developed through collaborative input.

Strategic Planning Process

Alleyne reviewed the extensive process that led to the current roadmap:

- **Initial Stages (December 2024 - January 2025):** Discussions about the planning approach began in December, with team assembly starting in January. The steering committee included representation from all campuses, students, staff, and faculty, with able assistance from external consultants for fact-finding.
- **Engagement and Information Gathering (January - March 2025):** The committee conducted a series of listening tours across all five campuses, engaging University governance leads, academic leaders, alumni, foundation and development staff, facilities, finance leads, and tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty.
- **Surveys and Town Halls:** The Vision 2035 survey was sent to all faculty, staff, and students across the system, yielding approximately 8,000 responses, which the consultants deemed a very good and representative response rate. Town hall toolkits were also created and rolled out across all five campuses for broader engagement.
- **Synthesis and Refinement (March - May 2025):** Information gathering concluded with about 3,600 participants in listening tours and town halls. Data synthesis began in April, using tools to pull out emerging themes. In May, sessions were held with a random sampling of faculty and staff systemwide to validate the initial direction and themes.
- **Drafting and Final Feedback (Summer 2025 - Today):** The team engaged with internal and external groups over the summer, including SCC leadership, the University System Council, the BOR, deans, department heads, and foundation/alumni boards. Drafting of the plan's imperatives, goals, and initiatives began. In August, a draft plan of the core content was shared with governance and leadership groups for feedback. A second survey was sent to all faculty,

staff, and students, resulting in 5,000 responses, which provided late-stage feedback on the direction.

Strategic Focus: Building on Strengths

Alleyne stressed that the plan was designed to build on the University's strengths and areas of excellence, rather than primarily shoring up areas that were not performing well.

The identified strengths of the state and institution that emerged from the data included:

Area of Strength	State of Minnesota Strengths	University of Minnesota Strengths
Natural Resources	Commitment to a sustainable future and natural resources.	Discoveries advancing human, environmental, plant, and animal health, freshwater, and agricultural innovation.
Community & Society	Civic engagement, engagement with the arts, robust partnerships with tribal nations, deep agricultural roots.	Community-engaged teaching and research, excellence in use and development of spatial mapping (GIS).
Health & Economy	Health and healthcare, strong and diversified economy, high quality of life.	Preparing a healthcare workforce for Minnesota (7 out of 10 professionals are U of M system-trained).
Academics & Culture	Known for having an excellent University of Minnesota system.	Interdisciplinary teaching, learning, and research, strong in hands-on learning, strong startup culture, nationally-ranked

		programs, extensive collections, archives, and performances (e.g., the Sherlock Holmes collection).

Strategic Plan Taxonomy

Alleyne outlined the hierarchical structure of the strategic roadmap:

1. **Strategic Imperatives (System Level):** These are the University's “big rocks” and represent what the system needs to achieve to move the University and the state forward. They are intended to be more or less immutable over the life of the plan.
2. **Goals:** These are the objectives that University units will strive to achieve under each imperative. They may vary slightly from campus to campus.
3. **Initiatives (Signature and Evolving):** These are the detailed actions. The plan will start with a set of signature initiatives, which will evolve over the plan's life cycle.

The roadmap provides a vector or direction but is not prescriptive about every single activity across the $5 billion entity. Campuses and colleges will develop or update their own strategic plans to align with the roadmap and identify specific, unit-level initiatives.

Strategic Imperatives and Goals

Nies then took over the presentation, moving on to the five strategic imperatives and their goals. He noted that the themes emerged from the feedback and were designed to provide the direction for the work that follows. He confirmed that they would discuss the Imperatives and Goals but not the Initiatives, as many are still being developed by action teams.

<u>Imperative 1: Future Ready Scholars</u>

This imperative focuses on the University's mission of preparing graduates for their careers and for engagement in a diverse democracy. The four goals under this imperative are:

- Ensure undergraduate and graduate scholars are prepared to engage in the diverse democracy of our state and nation.
- Provide applied and experiential learning opportunities that are immersed within educational programs, making them unavoidable for scholars.
- Support resources and opportunities across all five campuses to promote scholar success and allow students to make choices and lean into system-wide strengths.
- Address the mental health and well-being of scholars, with a primary focus on addressing food scarcity to ensure students are food-secure and can thrive academically.

Imperative 2: Innovating the Future of Learning

This imperative addresses the shifting landscape of higher education and positions the University to lead in learning innovation. The goals presented were:

- Focus on the creation of problem-based academic programs and interdisciplinary learning (citing the work at Rochester).
- Develop a hub to support lifelong learners across Minnesota, looking at different entry points for people to return to their educational goals (e.g., for career changes).

The presenters then invited questions and comments from senators, and responded as follows:

- von Dassow asked why the PowerPoint had not been provided in advance with the senate agenda. She argued that having the slides beforehand would have allowed senators to read the information faster, consult with colleagues, and use

the meeting time for a genuine discussion, instead of watching a presentation. von Dassow also expressed dissatisfaction with the survey method, which she characterized as offering only multiple-choice options that do not accurately capture what participants think. She also challenged the core strategic decision to focus only on strengths while ignoring or not shoring up weaknesses. She used the analogy of a weak left leg, stating that working only on the right leg would not result in effective forward movement. She remained not persuaded that that is a viable strategic choice.

    - Alleyne responded to the question about withholding the presentation, stating that the rationale was based on experience over the last 10 months of walking through the plan with various audiences. He explained that delivering the content without first discussing the process often led to confusion and caused discussions to circle without moving forward. He asserted that walking people through the process first has proven to be the best practice for delivering the material and facilitating discussion. Nies addressed the choice of an asset-based approach to strategic planning. He acknowledged that while the University doesn't stop working on areas for growth and improvement, an asset-based approach is a recognized strategic method for prioritizing focus and building upon existing strengths.

- Deirdre Opp, P&A senator from the Carlson School of Management, raised a concern that many of the identified University strengths—such as preparing the healthcare workforce or hands-on learning—did not feel distinctly unique to the University of Minnesota, suggesting they could apply to almost any land-grant research institution. She agreed with von Dassow that the planning process missed an opportunity to better understand what people view as the institution's weaknesses.
    - Nies responded that the data on weaknesses was not lost and would continue to provide a ground point for future work. He noted that the plan's

distinctiveness comes from the interconnectedness of the University's strengths with the unique and distinctive assets of the state of Minnesota, emphasizing the recurring theme of the University's sense of place in the state. Alleyne agreed with Opp that some internal audiences may not fully realize how strong and unique the University is in certain areas. He highlighted the University's leadership in healthcare technology and med tech, arguing that no other place in the U.S. rivals Minnesota. He also stated that while every institution may claim to do sustainability, Minnesota's commitment is unique, running through faculty, staff, legislators, and citizens, driven by a love for the environment. Opp provided feedback that the current word choices on the slides, such as "preparing the healthcare workforce," may not be conveying the special and unique messages Alleyne and Nies were describing.

    - Cunningham echoed the sentiment that the plan was still a work in progress and not the final version. Cunningham provided further context to the University's strengths, noting that the University is ranked number one and three in the country for sustainability research in freshwater and health, respectively, and is number one in the *Times Higher Ed* for interdisciplinary research and education. Cunningham acknowledged that general terms like education and research are common, but the plan's goal is to make the University's distinctions "sing." Cunningham confirmed that while the general approach is strengths-based, work on known deficits—such as maintenance on the St. Paul campus and AI in education—is included.

- Adebowale Adeyemi, student senator from the College of Pharmacy, noted that while the plan correctly prioritizes students, it uses mental health and food security as measures of quality of life, but fails to include housing. Adeyemi specifically referenced a recent University adjustment to the housing requirement that increased costs for students, requesting that housing be included in the

quality of life measure. Adeyeme also expressed concern that students were not included in the May validation consultation that identified the themes, as only faculty and staff were explicitly listed on the slide.

- Alleyne apologized for the oversight in the slide presentation, clarifying that the survey was indeed sent to all faculty, staff, and students and that there was a substantial student response. He confirmed that students are also on the steering committee. Regarding the inclusion of housing, Alline explained that the strategic approach is to deploy resources against the key needs that are most relevant to constituents based on the feedback. Mental health and food came up as the top-of-mind priorities in the student feedback, especially in the post-survey. He stated that the strategy is to make progress on those key areas first. If those problems are solved, the University can then turn to the number 3 priority on the list, which may be housing, or another issue identified by future data gathering.

Nies and Alleyne thanked the senate for the feedback and departed.

As Cunningham had to leave to attend another meeting, Senate Vice Chair Jerry Cohen took over chairing the meeting at this point.

12. University Senate Old Business

None.

13. University Senate New Business

Von Dassow proposed the following resolution:

> "Whereas, members of the University community have increasingly been targeted with violence, doxing, and assassination, be it resolved that the administration immediately develop, in consultation with shared governance bodies, a protocol for action to assure the safety of the persons targeted and

their family, their classes, and their coworkers, and that this protocol be shared with the University community."

A second senator seconded the motion. Cohen reminded the body that to consider new business immediately, a two-thirds vote of the present members was required, otherwise it would be referred to the SCC. A show of hands was requested to vote on the consideration of the motion. Cohen ruled that the two-thirds majority required for immediate consideration was not reached, and announced that the resolution would be forwarded to the SCC for consideration and follow up.

14. University Senate Adjournment

Hearing no further business, Cohen adjourned the meeting.

Amber Bathke
University Senate Office