

---

# The University Senate

FACULTY · STUDENT · P&A · CIVIL SERVICE

---

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

## Campus Safety Committee (CSC)

April 21, 2025

### 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 reflect the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate, the administration, or the Board of Regents. The University Senate Office utilized notes taken during the meeting, video recording, and transcript of the meeting, and AI to assist in summarizing substantive parts of the meeting transcript to compose these minutes. Minutes are reviewed by the committee before posting.

[In these minutes: Welcome; Future of CSC Discussion]

**PRESENT:** Joseph D Alf (chair), Kati Auger, Janelle Broesch, Claudia Ellis, Dr. Linda Bane Frizzell, Nicholas Juarez, Abraham Kromah, Donovan Lura, Kevin Malecha, Peter Remiger, Ava Roots, Mikyla Simones, Dayton Steele, Barry Standorf, Liz Thomson, Casidy Anderson

**REGRETS:** None

**ABSENT:** None

**GUESTS:** None

**OTHERS:** None

## **1. Welcome**

Chair Joe Alf welcomed the committee to the last academic year meeting.

## **2. The Future of Campus Safety Discussion**

Joe Alf started the meeting by sharing the [Mission Impact Review 2: the Proposal presentation](#). The presentation was created to review a short history of the Campus Safety Committee and potential direction this committee could take in the future.

Alf explained that the CSC was originally formed in response to heightened campus safety concerns after the social unrest of 2020. However, since its inception, it had struggled to fulfill its charge due to a lack of structured work plans and leadership engagement. Alf shared that efforts to evaluate the committee's effectiveness began in the fall of 2024 through surveys, meetings with university leaders, and whiteboard exercises to gather member input.

Findings indicated minimal engagement from other university committees regarding campus safety and limited progress across the University Senate on safety-related issues. Alf also reached out to peer institutions within the Big Ten, discovering that most had narrower, more focused safety committees that often served as advisory boards to campus law enforcement.

Three paths for the CSC's future were presented: disbanding the committee, merging it into another committee, or reworking the committee's charge and establishing detailed work plans. Alf strongly recommended the third option. He proposed refining the CSC's mission to focus on providing consultation on university safety policies and decisions, creating standardized deliverables, and improving engagement and visibility across all campuses.

Alf suggested a decentralized model where each campus would have its own CSC, with chairs from each meeting periodically coordinating efforts. He emphasized the

importance of including diverse stakeholders, particularly students, and ensuring that work plans were developed and followed even without direct administrative guidance.

Throughout the discussion, members expressed concern about the CSC's broad mandate, lack of clarity, and insufficient visibility. Several agreed that narrowing the focus and increasing structure would improve effectiveness. Alf concluded by indicating a detailed survey would be distributed to gauge member preferences and inform next steps, encouraging broad participation to ensure all voices were heard.

### **3. Adjournment**

With nothing additional, Alf adjourned the meeting.

Deena Barker

University Senate Office