

University Senate Meeting

November 3, 2025

3:15 pm

Hybrid

University Hall, Ruthven, Room 2000

Register for In-Person Attendance:

<https://myumi.ch/z9ydJ>

Zoom:

<https://umich.zoom.us/j/98132244339?pwd=WM9Qrd8W46RUtYa8rbtaO3msbOmlBU.1>

Agenda Items (to be updated to include speakers)

Time	Topic	Action Item
3:15	Come to Order, Overview, Minutes, and Agenda	Approval
3:25	Motion 1: Motion to Make the Collegiate Travel Partners (CTP) Travel Service Optional <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Movant: Mark J. Kushner, William P. Allis Distinguished University Professor, Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Chemical Engineering, Nuclear Engineering and Radiological Sciences ● Additional Scheduled Speaker: Jesse Capecelatro, Associate Professor of Mechanical Engineering and Associate Professor of Aerospace Engineering, College of Engineering 	Electronic Voting Starts at 5:30 pm (Open for 72 hours)
3:35	Motion 2: Resolution to End the “Pause” and Resume Gender Affirming Care, in Alignment with our University’s Values and the Mission of Michigan Medicine <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Movant: Rafael Neis, Jean and Samuel Frankel Professor of Rabbinic Literature, Professor of History and Judaic Studies, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts, Faculty Director of Arts Learning and Teaching, the Arts Initiative ● Additional Scheduled Speakers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Shanna Kattari, Associate Professor of Social Work, School of Social Work and Associate Professor of Women's and Gender Studies, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts 	Electronic Voting Starts at 5:30 pm (Open for 72 hours)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Anna Kirkland, Kim Lane Scheppele Collegiate Professor of Women's and Gender Studies, Arthur F Thurnau Professor, Professor of Women's and Gender Studies, Professor of Sociology, Professor of Political Science, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts, Professor of Health Management and Policy, School of Public Health and Professor of Law, Law School 	
3:45	<p>Motion 3: Resolution to Reject Participation in the “Compact for Academic Excellence in Higher Education”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Movant: Julian Davis Mortenson, James G. Phillipp Professor of Law, UM Law School 	Electronic Voting Starts at 5:30 pm (Open for 72 hours)
3:55	<p>Motion 4: Resolution Demanding a Comprehensive Policy Addressing the Role of Generative Artificial Intelligence at the University of Michigan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Movant: Silke-Maria Weineck, Grace Lee Boggs Professor of Comparative Literature and German Studies, LSA 	Electronic Voting Starts at 5:30 pm (Open for 72 hours)
4:05	<p>Motion 5: Call to Restore Funding for Consulting for Statistics, Computing, and Analytics Research (CSCAR)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Movant: Brady West, Faculty Associate, Population Studies Center, Research Professor, Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, Adjunct Lecturer in Quantitative Methods and Social Sciences Program, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts and Research Professor, Biostatistics, School of Public Health ● Additional Scheduled Speakers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Rachel Best, Associate Professor of Sociology and Director Graduate Studies, Sociology, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts o Abram Wagner, Assistant Professor of Epidemiology and Assistant Professor of Global Public Health, School of Public Health 	Electronic Voting Starts at 5:30 pm (Open for 72 hours)

4:15	Motion 6: A Resolution Asking the University to Invest the Necessary Resources to Make Our Digital Materials Accessible <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Movant: Julie Boland, Professor of Psychology and Linguistics, LSA ● Additional Scheduled Speaker: Jamie L. Wraight, Lecturer IV in Social Sciences, College of Arts, Sciences and Letters, The University of Michigan-Dearborn 	Electronic Voting Starts at 5:30 pm (Open for 72 hours)
4:25	Motion 7: Motion to Restore Fair Rules and Rule of Law to the University <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Movant: Scott Greer, Professor Health Management and Policy, School of Public Health ● Additional Scheduled Speakers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Germine Awad, University Diversity and Social Transformation Professor, Professor of Psychology, Professor of Women's and Gender Studies and Associate Director, Global Islamic Studies, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts ○ Craig Smith, Senior Associate Librarian, University Library 	Electronic Voting Starts at 5:30 pm (Open for 72 hours)
4:35	Motion 8: Resolution Regarding New H-1B Policies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Movant: Johannes von Moltke, Rudolf Arnheim Collegiate Professor of German Studies and Film, Television and Media, Acting Director, International Institute, Professor of Germanic Languages and Literatures and Professor of Film, Television and Media, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts 	Electronic Voting Starts at 5:30 pm (Open for 72 hours)
4:45	Motion 9: Statement Concerning the Presidential Search Committee	Electronic Voting Starts at 5:30 pm (Open for 72 hours)
4:55	Matters Arising	
5:00	Adjourn	

**The University of Michigan
University Senate
Motion #110325-1**

Motion to Make the Collegiate Travel Partners (CTP) Travel Service Optional

Whereas the mandate that University of Michigan faculty, staff, and students use Collegiate Travel Partners (CTP) to book air travel has proven inefficient, costly in terms of lost productivity, and often results in higher fares than personally booked itineraries;

Whereas faculty whose research funds are limited are highly motivated to find the lowest fares available and do not require a service to identify low fares;

Whereas faculty who book their own travel are offering a free service, while the additional 2% fee will decrease funds available for other travel expenditures, research and instruction;

Whereas any purported realized cost savings at the University level must be weighed against the increased faculty burden in terms of time and inconvenience, and the increased travel costs charged to faculty grants, contracts, and discretionary accounts;

Whereas the inability to book a ticket on Basic Economy further depletes available funds while not leading to refundable fares;

Whereas CTP offers no place to include a faculty member's green card or visa during booking, preventing online check-in and adding an additional burden to international faculty's check-in process;

Whereas if faculty cannot book directly through airline websites (and Delta in particular), they lose the ability to have a family member travel with them using a companion voucher;

Whereas CTP does not adequately support faculty who experience travel-related problems such as missed connecting flights;

Whereas restoring the practice of faculty self-booking would improve efficiency, save time that should be dedicated to research, teaching, and governance;

Be it resolved that the use of CTP (or other UM-affiliated travel agents) to book all travel, and air travel in particular, be made optional and that members of the UM community be allowed to book their own travel arrangements and air tickets directly, followed by reimbursement from approved UM accounts;

And be it further resolved that future service agreements affecting faculty research be discussed publicly and widely, through town halls and discussions with school faculty councils before making decisions.

***Movant:** Mark J. Kushner, William P. Allis Distinguished University Professor, Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Chemical Engineering, Nuclear Engineering and Radiological Sciences*

Supporting Members:

Nazanin Andalibi, Associate Professor of Information

Angela Violi, Dennis Assanis Collegiate Professor, Mechanical Engineering, Chemical Engineering, Electrical and Computer Engineering

**The University of Michigan
University Senate
Motion #110325-2**

Resolution to End the “Pause” and Resume Gender Affirming Care, in Alignment with our University’s Values and the Mission of Michigan Medicine

Whereas the University of Michigan [announced on August 25, 2025](#), that the Michigan Medicine system would stop providing gender-affirming care for patients under the age of 19;

Whereas U-M’s Mission is “[to serve the people of Michigan and the world through preeminence in creating, communicating, preserving and applying knowledge, art, and academic values, and in developing leaders and citizens who will challenge the present and enrich the future](#),” and Michigan Medicine serves the people of Michigan by providing them with medically necessary care;

Whereas “[Michigan Medicine is a diverse place that endorses a culture of equity and inclusion](#)” and [Patient Rights and Responsibilities](#) prioritize [patient and family centered care](#) including “[involvement in care decisions](#)”;

Whereas, the patient right of “access to respectful care” asserts that “[y]ou will receive necessary care regardless of your . . . sex, gender identity and gender expression,” which includes medically necessary care for all trans people, and thus trans adults and youth under 19;

Whereas cisgender individuals under 19 years of age continuing to receive various medically necessary forms of care including hormones and hormone blockers, a disparity that renders the decision to withhold those treatments from trans individuals discriminatory;

Whereas the expert research and recommendations of UM Faculty, physicians, and researchers demonstrate that gender affirming care is medically necessary and lifesaving;

Whereas the serious mental health risks when transgender youth do not receive medically necessary care include [depressive symptoms, suicidal ideation, and suicidal behavior](#);

Whereas data-driven research has consistently shown that increasing stigma, exclusion, and inequity has a negative impact on the mental and physical health of members of the stigmatized community and adversely affects student learning, scholarly innovation, and research excellence;

Whereas data-driven research consistently shows that increasing inclusion and providing basic medical care for trans people of all ages improves the mental health of community members directly *and indirectly* affected by said medical care;

Whereas the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP), the American Psychological Association (APA), American Academy of Family Physicians (AAFP), American Medical Association (AMA), the World Professional Association for Transgender Health (WPATH), and the US Professional Association for Transgender Health (USPATH) affirmed evidence-based inclusive care for transgender, gender diverse, and nonbinary individuals;

Whereas University of Michigan demographic data indicate that over 200 transgender or gender nonbinary/expansive undergraduate students aged 18 and under are no longer able to access critical gender affirming care services through University Health & Counseling that they pay for and are entitled to;

Whereas as the August 26th, 2025 [letter of Michigan Attorney General Dana Nessel](#) emphasized, the refusal to provide gender-affirming care for trans people “may constitute discrimination under Michigan law” and that “efforts to withhold or deny healthcare services because an individual is transgender would be discriminatory and risks inflicting irreversible harm on that individual”;

Whereas refusal to provide gender-affirming services for adults and youth under 19 violates Michigan Civil Rights protections against age discrimination;

Whereas the State of Michigan has joined 15 other states and the District of Columbia in [challenging](#) as unlawful the Trump Administration’s efforts to ban gender-affirming care for trans people under age 19;

Whereas U-M’s “pause” on gender affirming care for children and teenagers has led other medical providers to cease care as well, leaving institutions who continue to provide it overwhelmed;

Be it resolved that the University of Michigan Faculty Senate reaffirms its support for transgender, nonbinary, and gender-diverse folks and their right to comprehensive, accessible, and life-saving gender-affirming care;

Be it further resolved that the faculty urges the University of Michigan’s Board of Regents to direct Michigan Medicine to resume medically necessary gender affirming care for youth under the age of 19 without delay;

And be it further resolved that the faculty requests that the University of Michigan commit to support all members of its community in their preferred gender expression in all units of the

University, to respect the rights of trans and non-binary community members, and to oppose and condemn their stigmatization in any form.

***Movant:** Rafael Neis, Jean and Samuel Frankel Professor of Rabbinic Literature, Professor of History and Judaic Studies, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts, Faculty Director of Arts Learning and Teaching, the Arts Initiative*

Supporting Members:

***Sean D. Johnson**, Assistant Professor of Astronomy, LSA Collegiate Fellow, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts*

***Natasha R. Kumar**, Assistant Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Michigan Medicine*

***Melynda J. Price**, Professor of Women's and Gender Studies, College of Literature, Science and Arts, Director of the Institute for Research on Women and Gender*

**The University of Michigan
University Senate
Motion #110325-3**

Resolution to Reject Participation in the “Compact for Academic Excellence in Higher Education”

Whereas on 1 October 2025 the Trump Administration presented ten conditions on federal funding to a group of peer universities as part of a “Compact for Academic Excellence in Higher Education.” These conditions would

impose ham-handed federal government interference in admission decisions;

require systematic surveillance of faculty members’ political views;

mandate perverse changes to university governance structures and the closure of units deemed ideologically suspect;

require suppression of campus protest and enforcement of specific definitions of sex, gender, and gender identity;

limit international student enrollments; and

require the University to screen out students who hold suspect views;

Whereas, as leading constitutional scholars Robert Post and Thomas Ginsburg have [explained](#), the “Compact” “imposes government orthodoxy” by seeking to “supplant intellectual competence with explicitly political criteria, to be determined by a political agency”;

Whereas entering into the “Compact” would [put a university at risk](#) of losing federal benefits to which it is legally entitled, based on the whims of the incumbent federal administration;

Whereas the “Compact” has been condemned by individuals and institutions across the political spectrum, including former Republican Secretary of Education [Lamar Alexander](#), the libertarian Cato Institute’s [Walter Olson](#), the [Foundation for Individual Rights and Expression](#), the [American Association of University Professors](#), and the [American Association of Colleges and Universities](#);

Be it resolved that the University of Michigan faculty opposes any capitulation by University administration to these or similar demands that undermine intellectual rigor, dynamic pedagogy, research excellence, and our proud tradition of intellectual leadership;

And be it further resolved that the University of Michigan faculty opposes any capitulation by University administration to these or similar demands that undermine individual constitutional rights, faculty governance, institutional autonomy, and our firm commitment to academic freedom;

And be it further resolved that the University of Michigan faculty commends the leadership of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Brown University, the University of Pennsylvania, the University of Southern California, the University of Virginia, Dartmouth College, and other institutions that have rejected the compact.

Movant: Julian Davis Mortenson, James G. Phillipp Professor of Law, UM Law School

Supporting Members:

Samuel R. Bagenstos, Frank G. Millard Professor of Law, UM Law School, Arlene Susan Kohn Professor of Social Policy, Ford School of Public Policy

Richard Primus, Theodore J. St. Antoine Collegiate Professor of Law, UM Law School

Endorsed by the Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs (SACUA) on October 20, 2025

**The University of Michigan
University Senate
Motion #110325-4**

Resolution Demanding a Comprehensive Policy Addressing the Role of Generative Artificial Intelligence at the University of Michigan

Whereas new developments in generative Artificial Intelligence (genAI) hold both significant promise and [significant risk](#) for the pursuit of knowledge and the progress and well-being of humankind;

Whereas the University of Michigan (U-M) has pursued a non-transparent and insufficiently critical genAI strategy;

Whereas the University of Michigan has rolled out multiple forms of genAI to the community quickly and pushed their use aggressively with insufficient input from faculty, students, and staff and with few guardrails to help guide appropriate usage;

Whereas genAI policies significantly affect research and teaching, which are under the purview of the faculty, and thus require careful consultation with and guidance from the faculty;

Whereas genAI has significant [deleterious impacts on the environment](#), particularly with regard to [energy and water consumption](#);

Whereas preliminary research suggests that genAI can have [deleterious effects on users' cognitive development and skills](#);

Whereas faculty have reported that student use of genAI [threatens academic integrity](#) in the classroom and can adversely affect learning habits and outcome;

Whereas preliminary research suggests than genAI can have [deleterious effects on users' mental health](#);

Whereas financial experts [warn](#) with [increasing](#) frequency that AI technology may constitute an [economic bubble](#) the collapse of which would [constitute a serious threat](#) to the US economy;

Whereas developers of genAI technologies have violated the intellectual property rights of researchers, leading to at least [one sizeable settlement](#);

Whereas many of the main proponents of genAI technologies pursue ideological goals opposed to the values of U-M and to universities and democratic processes in general and it has been amply [demonstrated](#) that genAI output [can easily be ideologically manipulated](#);

Whereas the American Association of University Professors [has warned](#) that “the uncritical adoption of artificial intelligence (AI) poses a threat to academic professions through potential work intensification and job losses and through its implications for intellectual property, economic security, and the faculty working conditions that affect student learning conditions”;

Be it resolved that U-M formulate a comprehensive genAI strategy in broad consultation with faculty, students, and staff that insures that U-M employ genAI technology responsibly, offers faculty, students, and staff opportunities to learn how to use AI ethically, and addresses a) environmental concerns; b) pedagogic concerns with regard to academic integrity; c) pedagogic concerns with regard to the potential de-skilling of our students; d) concerns about student mental health; e) financial concerns both with regard to U-M's endowment investment in genAI technologies and with regard to U-M's genAI related expenditures; f) concerns about political and ideological interference in all genAI models in use at the University;

Be it further resolved that this strategy will be developed with significant input by faculty in all units, with no unit or discipline being over-represented;

And be it further resolved that this strategy be publicly presented and discussed in a series of town halls open to all members of the community.

Movant: Silke-Maria Weineck, Grace Lee Boggs Professor of Comparative Literature and German Studies, LSA

Supporting Members:

Daniel Andrew Birchok, Associate Professor of Anthropology, College of Arts, Sciences, and Education, UM-Flint

Gretchen Keppel-Aleks, Associate Professor of Climate and Space Sciences and Engineering, College of Engineering

Emily Luxon, Associate Professor of Political Science, Department of Social Sciences, College of Arts, Sciences and Letters, UM-Dearborn

Emmanuelle Marquis, Professor, Materials Science and Engineering, College of Engineering

Will Strobel, Assistant Professor, Departments of Comparative Literature and Classical Studies, LSA

**The University of Michigan
University Senate
Motion #110325-5**

Call to Restore Funding for Consulting for Statistics, Computing, and Analytics Research (CSCAR)

Whereas the University of Michigan's Consulting for Statistics, Computing, and Analytics Research (CSCAR), established in 1946, has for nearly eight decades provided high-quality, no-

or low-cost statistical consulting and software support to students, faculty, and staff across the University, promoting rigorous and reproducible research practices in all disciplines;

Whereas, according to data shared by CSCAR leadership, the unit handled over 2,300 consulting requests between January and November 2024 alone, with users across colleges and schools, including the Medical School, LSA, Public Health, Engineering, Ross School of Business, Information, and others, demonstrating its broad and indispensable reach across the research enterprise;

Whereas CSCAR operates with remarkable efficiency, running on the equivalent of only 3.5 full-time staff positions (as reported in the Michigan Daily on August 28, 2025), representing a minimal investment relative to its vast impact on research quality, grant competitiveness, and educational excellence;

Whereas CSCAR allows faculty and research teams to seek expert statistical and computational support that their departments may lack, helping to ensure methodological soundness and enabling more ambitious and innovative research designs;

Whereas CSCAR contributes to the educational mission of the university by offering students access to free, as-needed statistical assistance that allows them to successfully complete dissertations, honors theses, and other independent research projects;

Whereas CSCAR provides low-cost continuing education opportunities in the form of applied workshops for students, faculty, and staff, enabling ongoing skills development among the campus scientific community, including opportunities to learn new and emerging methodologies and computational tools, enhancing the university's ability to compete for external funding, and contributing to professional satisfaction;

Whereas having unlimited access to CSCAR services is a perk that aids in the recruitment of faculty candidates, providing a competitive advantage over peer universities;

Whereas the work of CSCAR consultants has directly contributed to significant scholarly advances, including co-authorships on publications and methodological innovations that have appeared in top-tier journals;

Whereas consultations with CSCAR staff have frequently led to enduring research collaborations between methodologists and substantive experts, resulting in successful external grant proposals and thereby generating indirect cost recovery and advancing the University's research portfolio;

Whereas CSCAR provides critical training opportunities for statistics graduate students and early-career researchers to gain experience in applied consulting, strengthening the University's teaching and mentorship missions while creating a bridge between methodological and substantive domains;

Whereas the closure of CSCAR, announced by the Office of the Vice President for Research during the summer vacation as part of a restructuring, occurred without adequate faculty

consultation or transparent review, undermining shared governance and the University's stated commitment to research excellence;

Whereas community members, including students, postdoctoral researchers, and faculty, have expressed deep concern that the elimination of CSCAR will erode the quality and integrity of research across the University, and that existing alternatives do not represent the full range of CSCAR services; moreover, they are fee-based and far less accessible;

Whereas the decision to shutter CSCAR is particularly troubling given that it targets a unit central to the University's core mission of supporting high-quality, ethical, and innovative research, at a time when preserving research rigor is more critical than ever;

Whereas attempts to claim that alternatives to CSCAR exist have proven in some cases to be inaccurate;

Whereas, in summary, the pending closure of CSCAR sends a signal that the University, to save a tiny amount of money, is willing to see an erosion of a key part of the institution that has served to enhance quality control and research integrity for large parts of the campus;

Be it resolved that the University Senate calls upon President Domenico Grasso and the University's executive leadership to fund CSCAR at or above its current funding level of 3.5 FTEs, drawing upon discretionary or other institutional funds under their purview, to ensure continued campus-wide access to expert, equitable, and high-quality statistical and computational research support;

And be it further resolved that the Senate affirms that maintaining CSCAR aligns with the University's foundational values of research integrity, collaboration, and shared governance, and that any future structural changes that would serve to decrease the University's support for quality control, research integrity, and overall quality and rigor should involve transparent consultation with affected faculty, students, and staff.

***Movant: Brady West**, Faculty Associate, Population Studies Center, Research Professor, Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, Adjunct Lecturer in Quantitative Methods and Social Sciences Program, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts and Research Professor, Biostatistics, School of Public Health*

Supporting Members:

***Rachel Best**, Associate Professor of Sociology and Director Graduate Studies, Sociology, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts*

***Michael Elliott**, Professor of Biostatistics, School of Public Health and Research Professor, Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research*

Mary Janevic, Research Associate Professor, Health Behavior and Health Equity, School of Public Health and Faculty Associate, Population Studies Center, Institute for Social Research

John Kubale, Research Assistant Professor, Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research, Faculty Associate, Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research and Adjunct Lecturer in Quantitative Methods and Social Sciences Program, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts

Jordan Siegel, Professor of Strategy and Michael R. and Mary K. Hallman Fellow, Stephen M Ross School of Business

Abram Wagner, Assistant Professor of Epidemiology and Assistant Professor of Global Public Health, School of Public Health

**The University of Michigan
University Senate
Motion #110325-6**

A Resolution Asking the University to Invest the Necessary Resources to Make Our Digital Materials Accessible

Whereas faculty strongly support the goal of making all digital course materials fully accessible in the interests of better serving our students;

Whereas Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act requires public entities serving 50,000+ persons to achieve WCAG 2.1 Level AA accessibility for all websites and mobile apps by April 24, 2026;

Whereas non-compliance with federal requirements puts the University at risk for both lawsuits and federal interference;

Whereas SPG 601.20 requires all units, faculty, and staff to comply with the accessibility requirements;

Whereas the University Digital Accessibility Strategy timeline Phase 2 entailed making tools available and communicating with employees during the previous academic year;

Whereas the University has not sufficiently consulted with faculty about our needs and still has not made sufficient tools available to make all of our digital course materials compliant;

Whereas the deadline is less than six months away;

Whereas faculty lack the expertise and time to complete the extremely time-intensive, technically difficult, and possibly impossible tasks required for full digital accessibility of our course materials;

Whereas centralized tools and processes to undertake these tasks would be faster, more compliant, and more cost-effective than thousands of faculty members individually having to learn about and implement the necessary steps;

Be it resolved that the University rapidly deploy sufficient resources toward implementing and making available tools and processes that would relieve the faculty of this additional workload and achieve the goals that we all support.

Movant: Julie Boland, Professor of Psychology and Linguistics, LSA

Supporting Members:

Kentaro Toyama, W. K. Kellogg Professor of Community Information, School of Information

Jon Zelner, Associate Professor of Epidemiology, School of Public Health

**The University of Michigan
University Senate
Motion #110325-7**

Motion to Restore Fair Rules and Rule of Law to the University

Whereas fair rules and the rule of law are under attack in the United States and worldwide;

Whereas unfair rules have historically been used to discriminate against and harm targeted groups at the national level (e.g., Jim Crow laws used to target Black Americans) and at the University of Michigan (e.g., the removal due process in SSRR, to target student human rights protesters);

Whereas the University of Michigan is a public institution with a responsibility to treat all of its faculty, staff, and students as citizens, to commit to shared governance, and to be transparent and democratic in how rules are modified;

Whereas although the Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities (SSRR) has always followed a formal process in which the Regents, the faculty Student Relations Advisory Committee (SRAC), and Central Student Government collaboratively amend the code of conduct, President Grasso recently added language breaking with this tradition. Now, “The Board of Regents maintains the right to modify the Statement outside of the traditional amendment process”;

Whereas University administrators have overturned at least three unanimous decisions by faculty grievance panels in the past year alone;

Whereas the University administration has been disregarding its own stated procedures in cases such as the firing of Director of the Office of Academic Multicultural Initiatives Rachel Dawson;

Whereas the University has amended its SSRR to move away from a fact-finding, due process, and restorative model to one that empowers complainants-for-hire and administrators, discounts “fairness,” and prioritizes “swiftness”;

Be it resolved we call for the university to adopt the SRAC’s proposed amendments to the SSRR, especially those which undo the Regents July 2024 unilateral changes, to ensure that the code is amended by student, faculty, and regents collectively, and provide respondents with a Hearing Board and ensure that the Hearing and Appeals’ Boards findings are respected;

Be it further resolved we call for the administration to publicize the full findings and any dissents of committees convened to discuss policy issues, such as Institutional Neutrality or diversity statements;

And be it further resolved we call for the administration to respect the findings of faculty grievance panels and to ensure that hearing boards made up of faculty, students, and staff play a role in the SSRR process, and to accept their decisions.

Movant: Scott Greer, Professor Health Management and Policy, School of Public Health

Supporting Members:

Germin Awad, Professor of Psychology, LSA

Craig Smith, Librarian, U-M Library

Stefan Szymanski, Professor of Sport Management, School of Kinesiology

**The University of Michigan
University Senate
Motion #110325-8**

Resolution Regarding New H-1B Policies

Whereas [in 2024 there were 773 H-1B visa-holders employed at the University of Michigan](#), in all three campuses and in all of our schools and colleges, meaning that there are more H-1B visa-holders at Michigan than at any public university in the United States;

Whereas Michigan Medicine employs hundreds of H-1B visa-holders, and whereas these highly-qualified colleagues provide specialized health care to the citizens of the State of Michigan and of the United States;

Whereas U-M teaches 67 different foreign languages to its students, and relies extensively on H-1B visa-holders to maintain this ambitious language program;

Whereas the College of Engineering employs at least 305 H-1B, J-1 and other visa-holders, who do the vital work of scientific and technological research;

Whereas on Friday, 19 September, [President Trump issued a Presidential Proclamation titled “Restriction on Entry of Certain Nonimmigrant Workers.”](#) which imposes a fee of \$100,000 on all new holders of H-1B visas;

Whereas [the chaos and confusion that attended this announcement](#) has already created great anxiety among our international colleagues;

Whereas these new fees will make it effectively impossible for U-M to hire most H-1B visa-holders, depriving us of their expertise;

Be it resolved that the faculty of the University of Michigan deplore this new policy, for it runs counter to the interests of our University, the people of the State of Michigan, and the nation;

Be it further resolved that we ask our U-M administration to offer all possible support to international faculty, staff, and students, who are dealing with so much stress and anxiety;

And be it further resolved that we ask our elected representatives at all levels of government to exert their influence to overturn this deleterious policy.

Adopted by the Senate Assembly on September 22, 2025.

Senate Assembly Approval Certified by Derek Peterson, Senate Assembly Chair, Ali Mazrui Collegiate Professor of History and African Studies, Associate Chair, Department of History, Professor of History and Professor of Afroamerican and African Studies, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts.

**The University of Michigan
University Senate
Motion #110325-9**

Statement Concerning the Presidential Search Committee

We, the faculty of the University of Michigan, strongly disapprove of the exclusion of representatives of elected faculty government from [the Presidential Search Committee](#). We are pleased that representatives of undergraduate and graduate student government have been placed on the committee, and we are likewise pleased that a number of distinguished faculty colleagues have been placed on the committee. But hand-picking faculty members differs from choosing duly elected representatives of the faculty. Elected faculty government ought to have a voice in the selection of our next president.

The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) advises that presidential committees must consist of individuals elected by the faculty to represent the faculty and to solicit opinions from the faculty as a whole, “[thereby broadening the mandate](#) for the candidate who is ultimately selected to become president.” At Michigan, faculty government exists precisely to represent the interests of the 7,600 members of the faculty about matters that pertain to institutional governance. The absence of even a single representative from faculty government undermines the committee’s ability to gauge faculty priorities and risks detaching the search process from a wider discussion about the important matters that now press upon our University.

As a matter of principle, executive search committees at UM ought to have among their members representatives of faculty government. By this means, the university’s leadership will, we hope, better reflect the interests and priorities of the teachers, scholars, clinicians, and researchers who sustain the institution.

Adopted by the Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs on September 8, 2025.

Adopted by the Senate Assembly on September 22, 2025.

SACUA and Senate Assembly Approval Certified by Derek Peterson, SACUA/Senate Assembly Chair, Ali Mazrui Collegiate Professor of History and African Studies, Associate Chair, Department of History, Professor of History and Professor of Afroamerican and African Studies, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts.

Minutes

Minutes November 4, 2024
Circulated October 24, 2025
Approved DATE

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Faculty Senate

Monday, November 4, 2024, 3:15

The Hybrid meeting was held at University Hall, Ruthven, Room 2000

<https://umich.zoom.us/j/92193399745?pwd=SAakx6HhXMSqB4ThVgCyi87a2DnQUb.1>

Attendance: Total in attendance 496: 62 in-person attendees, 434 virtual attendees

Agenda Items

3:15 Come to Order, Minutes, and Announcements The minutes were approved by consent. The chair outlined the courtesy and protocol of the meeting. Our meetings are open to the public, but discussion is limited to Senate members only and they are the only ones allowed to speak.

In order for the chair to acknowledge speakers, in-person attendees should raise their hands, and virtual attendees should use the ‘raised hand’ function, to be acknowledged by the chair to speak. The online chat is disabled so that we are all engaged with the same discussion.

The agenda consists of four motions, and they will be addressed one at a time. The sponsor of the motion will have the floor first and will have 3 minutes to speak. Any faculty member who signed up to speak for or against a motion will have 2 minutes to speak. Afterwards, the discussion will be open to all faculty. There will be 11 minutes allotted per motion for general discussion.

The chair reminded everyone to be respectful of time and limit comments to 30 seconds.

Members may only respond once to a motion in order to give others a chance to respond to the same motion.

Those chosen for comments will alternate between in person and remote attendees. Written comments as well as audio and video responses to the motions will be accepted until tomorrow at 5:00pm.

In order to submit remarks, go to the Faculty Senate website at faculty senate.umich.edu. Click on the top of page to navigate to the Senate meeting events page, which provides the link to offer written remarks.

Voting will begin at the end of today’s meeting and will be available for the next 72 hours.

The chair indicated that some faculty are afraid to vote due to fear of reprisal. Voting is anonymous. No one will know how you vote. Simply Voting comes from a reputable third-party platform in Canada.

3:20 Senate Secretary and Senate Parliamentarian

Before discussing the motions, the chair addressed the election of the Senate Parliamentarian and Secretary.

Before voting for Parliamentarian, the Chair thanked Prof. Paul Folsom from the UM Dearborn School of Education for his past three years of service as Parliamentarian. She also thanked the outgoing Secretary, Deirdre Spencer Librarian, for History of Art, University Library.

The Chair called for nominations from the floor, but despite the open calls for Secretary candidates, there were none. In light of no candidates to run for Secretary, the Chair asked if there was any objection to a Faculty Senate staff member temporarily filling the position of Secretary. There were no objections.

The Chair stated that at the beginning of winter term 2025, there would be an email inviting nominees and self-nominees for the position of Secretary. The election would occur during

winter term. The Chair asked if there were any objections to having an election in winter term for Secretary. There were no objections.

The Chair stated that the Secretary attends the meetings and asked if there were any objections for reopening the Secretary search again for a term to begin in May of 2025. There were no objections.

Electronic voting begins today at 5:00 pm and will remain open for 72 hours.

3:25 Motions

The Chair stated that all four motions can be read on the Faculty Senate website, and they were included in your email packet.

Motion 1: Call to Pause Implementation of the Revised Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities

SACUA approved this motion and the Senate Assembly approved it also. Now it is time for this body to vote on it. The question is pending in the University Senate pursuant to the Senate Assembly's action to place the matter before the University Senate.

A professor of History and African Studies in LSA sponsored the motion and spoke on its behalf. He moved for adoption of Motion 1. The Motion was seconded. In his three-minute presentation, Prof. Peterson asserted that the adoption of the changes to the Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities (SSRR) should be paused because the statement was amended by the Regents without input from elected faculty government. It is disadvantageous to the students, making the regents and the administration judge and jury. It also has a chilling effect on student speech. Prof. Peterson provided historical context saying this version replaced the 1992 policy, which was to be enforced by students. There were twelve drafts in 1992. The policy was finally drafted and approved in November of 1992. Amendments are many from February 1999.

More recently, hasty rules were adopted this summer due to the war in Gaza. The university was seen as not being sufficiently hard on antisemitism. The SSRR revision was hasty and deputized "the university" as separate from students, faculty, and staff. Consultants were contracted to squash student protests. Armed guards and cameras appeared on the diag. Students and faculty who support Palestinians are villainized. Students come to the university to work with the faculty, not the regents. Vote Yes on Motion 1.

A Professor from the School of Dentistry serves as chair of SRAC and spoke on behalf of the motion. The revisions were made with no input from faculty or SRAC. SRAC reviews SSRR and evaluates it every three years. It was a last-minute regents' meeting action where this decision took place. A single staff person will now hear appeals. "The university" can bring complaints against students. Faculty no longer have any input in the process. Please consider this a wake-up call. Vote Yes on Motion 1

A Professor of the History Department said that our students are deeply engaged in the learning process in and outside the classroom. They are committed to principled disputation. In their

activism they have shown themselves to be what UM has asked them to be, quote “leaders and citizens who will challenge the present and enrich the future.” Rather than lifting them up in showing them how to protest, how to contest, and how to disagree, by telling them not to protest, the university is lashing out at them and seeks to codify the most punitive responses to them in the current SSRR, as exemplified by the situation of one of her honor students. Vote Yes on Motion 1

A Professor from the School of Public Health spoke against the motion. They believe in shared governance at UM, and is disappointed that changes were made to SSRR without going through established procedures. They respect the portion of the document which asks to respect the collaborative role of faculty prior to making changes to the statement. The statement is realistic and should be supported. However, they disagree with the rest of the wording calling for a pause in implementing the revised statement. The revision by the regents, even with the input of SRAC, our governing committee, were welcomed by many, many faculty members and that’s what brings them here today. The statement comes from SACUA and not from a single member outside faculty governance, has been passed by Senate Assembly and the resolution came to no meaningful results. Why would we as faculty be asked to weigh in again, to no avail? Vote No to Motion 1

The chair opened the floor to comments and discussion:

An Associate Professor in LSA who is a member of SRAC, and of the Senate Assembly. She is acting out of her deep regard that the Regents are not including faculty in their decision making, but only listening to a few faculty and students. We have also invited Regent White and President Ono to our next SRAC meeting to discuss and clarify why they made these amendments. They have received no response as yet. Vote Yes on Motion 1

An Associate professor of Political Science. He is here because the way the statement was revised didn’t sit right with him. When policies are changed, they should be changed in ways that are inclusive, consultative, and follow the procedures governing those very policies, as we have heard. It sets a really troubling precedent to quietly re-write the rules, especially troubling at a time when we know that our institutions are eroding. Saying lets not try it again is not pragmatism. It is giving up your voice. We need to amplify that voice, not silence it. The previous rules did not aim to be punitive, but rather to encourage accountability and learning. They assured that a small group could not wield the university’s resources and rules as weapons to punish and silence those who hold those dissenting ideas. So we need to vote yes for two reasons: 1. the voice of the faculty, the autonomy of the university, and the accountability of the institution. 2. The draconian nature of the changes has adverse effects on students and will have a chilling effect when the power is held by such a small group who engage in punitive behavior in the name of accountability, but are no longer engaged in accountability. Vote Yes on Motion 1

(There was a request to end discussion and a second. There were no objections.)

Electronic voting will begin now and be available for 72 hours.

Motion 2: The Motion on the Creation of a Committee and Review of SPGs – was moved and seconded.

Remarks will proceed for 3 minutes in favor of Motion 2.

A Professor of Material Science and Engineering speaks in favor of Motion 2.

The SPG is the repository of university wide standards and procedures. This motion urges the formation of a new committee to increase greater community involvement in the revision process, including people with disabilities on our campus.

There are problems with the current language which is old, outdated, and refers to procedures that no longer exist. Errors are found throughout. They are punitive in focus and dis-communicative in nature. One SPG involves removal of faculty for lack of ‘fitness for duty,’ but it does not explicitly provide for sufficient consideration of whether reasonable accommodations can first be provided.

The SPG’s paint a picture of administrative incompetence. 2.Moral standards are not always reflected.

There was a slide addressing lack of fitness for duty. This proposed committee would formalize expertise and community involvement

Vote yes on Motion 2

Speakers in favor of Motion 2

A professor of the Ross School, and a member of AAAC, states that SPG 201.12 “Discipline” justifies firing staff, not faculty, but exemplifies the problems with SPGs. It is a vague SPG which takes a punitive approach and does not lay out any procedures. It leaves a great deal of room for interpretation and subjectivity, resulting in unfair use and outcomes.

The policies of peer institutions such as the Univ. of Chicago, MIT and UC Berkeley appear to more clearly communicate the intent and processes involved in processing workplace concerns. An SPG committee composed of faculty and staff would be able to assess the clarity, logic, and fairness of Univ. of Michigan policies. For all of these reasons, please vote yes on Motion 2.

An Associate professor of Neurosurgery, Neurology, Anesthesiology and Biomedical Engineering in the Medical School is here to speak in support of the principles of shared governance but also in support of Motion 2. He believes that motion 2 is fundamental to these principles. The Motion calls for (1). Formal Faculty representation, engagement and review, (2). Dialog, commentary and a deliberative process of approval for proposed SPG amendments. (3). Revision of SPG’s with an eye for accuracy, clarity, logic, equity and academic values. OGC serves the administration, not the faculty. Independent-minded faculty are systematically excluded from the process. Faculty need enforceable rights, and we at the University of Michigan unfortunately do not have them. Moreover, when SPGs are violated, the university spends up to millions of dollars on outside attorneys to defend the accused administrator against

the faculty who reported them. The faculty who file a grievance receive no support. In fact, the general counsel endorses this injustice, stating that administrators are employers while faculty are employees.

The Chair stated that there were no speakers against this motion so the Floor is open to discussion. She asked if anyone would like to speak.

A professor from the School of Public Health's statement is not for or against the motion but trying to get clarity from the faculty here. It would be a lot of work for faculty to review these 200 SPG's every 2-3 years. Why would there have to be a motion for all of these SPGs and how would we involve staff?

An Associate professor from the School of Social Work and Department Women and Gender Studies in Ann Arbor, attends online. She says that much of the language woven through the policies of our current SPG, for both faculty and staff are problematic. Throughout this document are myriad examples of gender binary, gender essentialist, and ableist language which should be removed in favor of more inclusive language. Flexibility and inclusion of employees with disabilities continues to be a challenge for our institution and not adding such language to our policies is unfortunate. The support for the call of an independently led, faculty and staff committee, in consultation with subject area experts would modify existing SPG policies to be more inclusive and more in line with the university's outward commitment to DEI. Vote Yes on Motion 2.

A professor from Psychiatry in the Medical School, LSA and Nursing commented that each of these SPG's follow on other SPGs. The SPG's need review. These used to be open for comment in the Record and other venues, available for faculty comments and responses. So he would like to see that again and urges us to Vote Yes on Motion 2.

An Emeritus Professor from the College of Engineering, Online – commented on one example of a flawed SPG, 601.09 A few years ago he was asked to serve on a faculty senate committee making a recommendation of a tenured removal. One of his concerns was would the university provide legal defense if he is personally sued by the individual involved. In the absence of a commitment from the administration with regard to a legal defense The administrator's verbal response was not supported by the SPG. Support for Motion 2 would help make shared governance a reality.

The Chair stated that voting for Motion 2 would be accessible for 72 hours, starting at 5pm

As we are approaching 4:10 the Chair asked if there were any objections to moving to Motion 3. There were no objections.

There will be voting on the motion for 72 hours.

**Motion 3: Motion to Censure the University of Michigan Regents
The motion was placed on the agenda by a professor from the School of Information.**

The professor moves to ask the Faculty Senate to approve motion 3. The motion was made and seconded.

The chair recognized the professor to open discussion and remarks for up to 3 minutes. Motion 3 seeks to censure the regents of the University of Michigan for their dramatic, authoritarian actions over the last few days. This past year the regents appear to have stopped even pretending to care about the opinions of those they oversee, not students, not staff, and not faculty, a departure from prior, more cordial relations.

As noted in the motion, they have repeatedly rebuffed faculty requests to meet with faculty, and they have undertaken a series of changes in university policies that are autocratic in nature, both in how the changes were made, and in substantive content. As such, the regents no longer follow even their own rules. By upending democratic policies and making changes to rules, as well as their refusal to follow them, is a tactic of unruly despots. You may have heard that some of these changes were made in response to a Title VI investigation by the US Department of Education, threatening federal funding for the university. There is some reason to doubt that, but it is no excuse to give the regents the right to make unilateral decisions and place us under totalitarian control.

I hope that we all believe in shared governance and that our voice and expertise as faculty should play a part in how the university is run.

He urges us all to vote yes on Motion 3.

The chair stated that we have 2 speakers signed up to speak for the motion. The chair introduced the first speaker, a professor of Afro-American and African Studies.

A Professor from the Department of Afro-American and African Studies encourages us to vote yes on Motion 3. As detailed in the motion, prior described by our previous colleague, and amplified by the discussion of motion 1, the evidence dictates a clear pattern of regental overreach. Among the multiple expressions of this, he will emphasize one. Under the guidance and direction of the regents, the university has portrayed itself as a complainant against individual students and student groups. In so doing, the university has established itself as witness, prosecutor and judge. He closes with three reasons why he supports this motion: (1). to stand up with and for our students, (2). to call out and halt erosion of shared governance and the troubling precedence it sets, (3). to stop the behavior of the regents and the precedent it sets, opening the way to further consolidation of power and stifling of speech. Vote Yes for Motion 3.

The Chair introduced the second speaker from the Department of Linguistics in LSA. A Professor of Linguistics who is also president of the local chapter of AAUP. The recent behavior of the regents is far removed from well-established norms. Those norms were jointly put together in 1966, by three groups, the AUP representing faculty. The Association of Colleges and Universities Governing Board, the Regents, and ACE representing institutions and governing boards everywhere. Here are key points: (1). Faculty are not merely employees and regents may only rarely disregard faculty input. When they do so, they must communicate the

reason to faculty. This has been disregarded repeatedly over the last year. (2). The means of faculty input must be designed by the faculty's own representatives. For us it is the Senate Assembly.

The regents did not pick from the Senate Assembly, but rather, picked their own faculty representatives. This has become common and is not shared governance.

The UM belongs to the Association of Governing Boards of colleges and universities. AGB's website advocates strongly for shared governance. Please vote Yes on Motion 3.

One speaker signed up to speak against the motion, a professor from the School of Public Health. They stated they have had personal contact with regents in the past. The faculty member stated that the current and previous chairs of SACUA had the opportunity to interact with the regents, as did the SACUA chair before that. They interacted in a collegial way and developed trust and respect. The Parliamentarian paused the speech of the professor, stating that their statements were an ad hominem attack on the current Chair. The professor verbally disagreed and said they were not focusing on the person but on the role; they were asked to speak to the amendment which they claimed they were doing. The faculty member stated that if faculty don't like what the regents are doing they should vote them out of office. Vote No on Motion 3.

Further discussion on Motion 3

A Librarian and SACUA member expressed anger and commented that no one told him to be angry. He is angry watching the regents approve police brutality against students. It is unacceptable.

A Professor of Economics- responded to the Professor of Public Health, that he was not responding to an activist SACUA chair. He has sent several open letters to the regents with no response. We may disagree on policy but there has been an abuse of process by the regents. He read from the Michigan Constitution regarding the regents. "Each board should have general supervision of the institution." Period That's it. We should begin by censoring the regents since they and the administration overrode the process.

A Professor of Comparative Literature - Online – Commented that the Chair is doing a great job. She addressed the professor from Public Health. The regents will only talk with those who know the secret handshake, and not to faculty governance, and if the regents won't listen, why speak? She would respond by saying we should only use the tools at our disposal which are a record of censor and our collective voice of protest. We should not accept that they do not listen to us. Begin the process of unionization, so that this long period of helplessness should finally come to an end. She urges us to vote yes on Motion 3.

A Professor from the Residential College and LSA is also vice chair of AAUP. The university suspended SAFE students advocating for justice in Palestine. Student activity of SAFE was suspended for 3 years (2-4 years) which is a grossly disproportionate sanction. This is the first time an outside consulting agency was paid to move against a student organization, to move against our students using the SOAR complaint process. We should be concerned about the

faculty advisors who are up against university attorneys and HR consultants. Concern for free expression at the hands of regents is bad. Vote yes on Motion 3 to stem regental overreach.

There was a motion to call the question. The motion was seconded. There were no objections to moving to Motion 4.

Motion 4: Motion on Accountability for the Handling of Gender-Based Violence and Discrimination at the University

The motion was added to the agenda and introduced by a faculty member from the Ross School in support of Motion 4.

He asks that Motion 4 be adopted by the faculty. The motion was seconded, and he was recognized by the Chair to speak on behalf of Motion 4.

The Professor from Ross says that ECRT ensures equal protection, and provided statistical data from the university based on surveys. The data says that only 18% of students reported sex-based discrimination, including LGBTQ+ discrimination in the prior 12 months. Considering that the university has over 50,000 students, this means that 9k may have experienced sex discrimination in the prior 12 months. Gender-based violence continues to occur at an alarming rate here in the university. Based on recent statistics, only 10% of sexual offenses were reported to ECRT, and only 6% of reports against a university respondent resulted in an investigation by ECRT or was met with any kind of disciplinary or restorative responsibility. Also, only 14% of formal investigations resulted in a finding of responsibility at the time of ECRT's report. Therefore based on the university's ECRT's own publicly released data, there is an ongoing and systemic pattern of gender based violence being under-reported and under-investigated. We propose through this motion that the university take the issue of gender based violence far more seriously by contacting them directly and supporting this motion. Some of the recommendations are in their books but they are very rarely implemented. Of known perpetrators, very few are investigated by ECRT. There should be immediate action to take this seriously. We ask you to vote Yes on Motion 4.

The Chair said there were 2 speakers signed up to speak in favor of Motion 4.

A Professor of Psychiatry in the Medical School, LSA, and Nursing commented that this motion really merits a yes vote. There are a number of concrete solutions and offers he would like to speak to. The motion proposes an independent annual audit, by a reputable, highly independent third party intermediary. Also, if there are already "no contact orders," the current policy on page 46 of the PDF, uses mutual restrictions of contacts as a default. Our resolution says there are FOIA restrictions for the respondent but not the complainant, which could be in default so as to prevent harassers from weaponizing a restriction against their victim, and to prevent victims who seek help from their school from being disciplined as a result. We also recommend that all ECRT personnel receive rape crisis counseling. The motion also calls on the university to require all RMI personnel to receive rape crisis counseling and education. I strongly encourage you to vote for Motion 4.

A Professor from the College of Engineering says this motion merits a vote of yes because it offers a number of concrete solutions that are based on evidence. In our opinion, as you heard from the previous speaker, these ECRT interviews just don't go far enough. They need to be extended. There are specific measures that pertain to protection and support of complainants. For example, we know from US wide studies, there are a number of retaliations. To address this issue, we can go to the university's best practices to ensure that complainants are not punished for reporting harassment and discrimination. We should protect students from being disciplined for language associated with reporting for being disciplined. Complainants should not be punished or retaliated against for language associated with the complaint. They want complainants to have a wider variety of support. ECERT needs more people and investigators to cover the number of complaints. There is also very limited use of supportive measures, such as online classes or recorded lectures, excused absences and adjusted attendance requirements, finding alternative labs, etc. Vote yes on Motion 4.

There were no volunteers to speak against the motion so the floor opened for discussion.

An Internal Medicine Physician in the Medical School and SACUA member commented that this is a huge problem in the medical field. Unfortunately Dr. Anderson shared one of her specialties and he began abusing patients and students. In 1975 he began abusing patients and staff, but was allowed to continue to practice medicine for thirty years and was only held accountable for his crimes ten years after his death. She also pointed out that MSU's Dr. Larry Nassar's victims were not just students but patients. She added that there is lots of hierarchy within the field of medicine. The perpetrators bring in big NIH money for the university so they are able to keep their jobs. She recommends that we support Motion #4.

A motion was made and seconded to call the question. There was no objection to moving to the next matter.

The Chair asked if any one else would like to speak, either in the room or Zoom. There were no responses.

Voting will be open for 72 hours.

Electronic voting starts at 5:00 pm and all faculty members will receive an email with voting instructions.

The Chair asked if there were any matters arising that would like to be addressed.

4:45 Matters Arising

A Professor in the School of Music Theater and Dance, and Chair of the Committee on Oversight of Administrative Action, praised the current leadership of SACUA for having done an exceptional job calling attention to erosion of faculty rights on campus. This is not a matter of

one person's activism but of critical and necessary steps. Commends Chair Modrak for her hard work

The Chair asked for other comments.

An Assistant Professor of Radiology commended SACUA and Faculty Senate for the work being done.

**The chair asked if there was any further business. There was none.
The chair adjourned the meeting at 4:51pm**

5:00 Adjourn 4:51pm

Respectfully submitted,

Deirdre D. Spencer
Secretary (2021-2024)

Addendum

University Senate Actions

Between regular meetings, the University Senate has performed the following actions that should be included in the University Senate minutes:

- On October 29th, the Ann Arbor members of the University Senate elected the following member to the Ann Arbor Police Department Oversight Committee for a two-year term: Kathleen Kruse, Clinical Assistant Professor of Psychiatry and Medical Director of Nyman Unit, Medical School
- On November 7, 2024, the University Senate elected the following faculty member as the Senate Parliamentarian, with a three-year term commencing on January 1, 2025: Deirdre Spencer, Librarian, Library Research, Arts and Humanities, University Library.
- On November 7, 2024, the University Senate approved the following resolutions:
 - Motion 1: Call to Pause Implementation of the Revised Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities
 - Motion 2: Motion on the Creation and Review of SPGs
 - Motion 3: Motion to Censure the University of Michigan Regents
 - Motion 4: Motion on Accountability for the Handling of Gender-Based Violence and Discrimination at the University
- The University Senate was convened for a special meeting on April 17th (see 4/17/25 special meeting minutes) and [approved](#) on April 20th four motions, with 3088 of 7588 members voting (the largest number of voters in Faculty Senate history):
 - Motion 1: [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](#): Yes 2761 (92.8%); No 214 (7.2%); Abstain 113

- o Motion 2: [Statement in Support of the Core Mission and Values of Higher Education in the United States of America](#): Yes 2843 (95.1%); No 146 (4.9%); Abstain 99
- o Motion 3: [Resolution to continue DEI initiatives that are in alignment with our university values, an extension of the mission of our schools, and legally compliant](#): Yes 2123 (78.7%); No 574 (21.3%); Abstain 391.
- o Motion 4: [Resolution Urging the University of Michigan to Protect International Students, Faculty, and Staff from Unwarranted Detention](#): Yes 2744 (93.1%); No 203 (6.9%); Abstain 141.
- As University Senate Secretary, for a term ending on April 30, 2028, the Senate elected on March 16, 2025, the following faculty member:
 - o **Rogério Pinto**, University Diversity and Social Transformation Professor, Berit Ingersoll-Dayton Collegiate Professor of Social Work, Professor of Social Work, School of Social Work, Professor of Theatre and Drama, School of Music, Theatre & Dance and Professor of Art and Design, Penny W Stamps School of Art and Design.

University of Michigan Bylaws of the Board of Regents, Sec. 5.02:

Governing Bodies in Schools and Colleges

Sec. 4.01 The University Senate

"...[t]he Senate is authorized to consider any subject pertaining to the interests of the university, and to make recommendations to the Board of Regents in regard thereto. Decisions of the University Senate with respect to matters within its jurisdiction shall constitute the binding action of the university faculties. Jurisdiction over academic policies shall reside in the faculties of the various schools and colleges, but insofar as actions by the several faculties affect university policy as a whole, or schools and colleges other than the one in which they originate, they shall be brought before the University Senate."

Rules of the University Senate, the Senate Assembly and the Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs:

Senate: "In all cases not covered by rules adopted by the Senate, the procedure in Robert's Rules of Order shall be followed."

Assembly: "The Assembly may adopt rules for the transaction of its business. In appropriate cases not covered by rules of the Assembly, the rules of the University Senate shall apply."

SACUA: "The committee may adopt rules for the transaction of its business."

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

University Senate Special Meeting

Thursday, April 17, 2025, 1:30

The Hybrid meeting was held in 2000 University Hall, Ruthven and Zoom
Attendance included approximately 145 in-person and 1,389 online attendees.

Minutes: April 17, 2025

Circulated: October 24, 2025

Approved: DATE

Call of the Meeting

The [2025 special meeting of the University Senate](#) was called pursuant to [a petition](#) of more than 200 faculty. Per the rules of the Faculty Senate, which permits the calling of a special meeting by a petition of not less than fifty members of the Senate, a University Senate meeting was convened. The purpose of the special meeting, as provided in the petition, was the following:

A significant number of faculty members — along with staff, and graduate students, lecturers, and Ann Arbor residents — have expressed grave concerns about the threats to the foundational principles of American higher education and the need for faculty to take collective action within the University of Michigan and in concert with other university faculties across the U.S.

Scheduled Speakers

- Samuel Bagenstos, Frank G Millard Professor of Law, Arlene Susan Kohn Professor of Social Policy, Professor of Law, Law School and Professor of Public Policy, Gerald R Ford School of Public Policy
- Sandra Levitsky, Arthur F Thurnau Professor, Associate Professor of Sociology, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts and Professor of Law, Law School
- Fred Terry, Professor of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, College of Engineering
- Keith Riles, H Richard Crane Collegiate Professor of Physics and Professor of Physics, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts
- Kentaro Toyama, W K Kellogg Professor of Community Information and Professor of Information, School of Information
- Scott Greer, Professor of Health Management and Policy, Professor of Global Public Health, School of Public Health and Professor of Political Science, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts
- Yi-Li Wu, Associate Professor of Women’s and Gender Studies and Associate Professor of History, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts
- John Carson, Associate Professor of History and Director Academic Program, History, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts
- Kevin Cokley, University Diversity and Social Transformation Professor, Associate Chair, Department of Psychology, Professor of Psychology, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts and Professor of Education, Marsal Family School of Education
- Terri Friedline, Professor of Social Work, School of Social Work
- Derek Peterson (introduction of motion and then remarks), Ali Mazrui Collegiate Professor of History and African Studies, Associate Chair, Department of History, Professor of History and Professor of Afroamerican and African Studies, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts

- Kirsten Herold, President of the Lecturers' Employee Organization and Lecturer IV, School of Public Health
- Rima Mohammad, Clinical Pharmacist Specialist and Clinical Professor of Pharmacy, College of Pharmacy

Press:

Genevieve Monsma – *University Record*

Carter Carino – *Daily*

The remarks of speakers are summaries and are not comprehensive or a transcription.

1:30 Chair Opening Remarks

Chair Rebekah Modrak called the meeting to order and the meeting protocols were reviewed. Deirdre Spencer was recognized as Faculty Senate Parliamentarian. The University Senate meetings are open to the public and speaking privileges are limited to University Senate members. The University Senate, also known as the Faculty Senate, includes over [7,000+ members](#). For each of the four motions on the agenda, the motion sponsor will speak first for up to three minutes. Then, any scheduled speakers for or against the motion will be given the floor for three minutes. This will be followed by 25 minutes of general discussion. Procedures for speaking and basic decorum were reviewed. Zoom chat was disabled, and both in-person and zoom members were asked to raise their hand if they wished to speak. An invitation was made for written comments and/or video statements to be submitted immediately following the meeting, with a deadline of April 18th, at 4 pm, and any such statements received would then be made available on the Faculty Senate website.

It was announced that voting on all four motions would begin at the end of the special University Senate meeting and would continue for 72 hours to end on Sunday, April 20th, at 4 pm. The voting would be anonymous and through a third-party vendor.

1:42 Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was approved by unanimous consent.

1:44 [Motion 1: 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](#)

- Samuel Bagenstos, one of the three sponsors of the motion, moved that motion 1 be adopted. There were multiple in-person seconds of the motion.
- Samuel Bagenstos then spoke in favor of the motion. Motion 1 is being pursued across Big 10 universities, and U-M's resolution is identical to a motion adopted by Rutgers. Other Big Ten schools such as those in Indiana, Nebraska, Ohio and Minnesota, have or will soon consider this resolution. Since the beginning of the Trump administration, the academy has been at a crosshairs, with attacks on both civil society and the research enterprise, with cuts announced to NIH, the Department of Energy, and coverage of indirect costs. These attacks are a capricious termination of funding, jeopardize academic

institutions, and attempt to control curriculum. Motion 1 establishes a Mutual Defense Compact to break through collective action barriers by encouraging U-M to stand up and join with other Big Ten institutions.

- Sandra Levitsky spoke in favor of Motion 1. This political moment is asking for something different from us, and universities have been facing a relentless attack. The Trump administration strategy is for universities to abandon DEI, and the strategy has been working, with a preemptive capitulation by academic leaders. This is an existential moment and most institutions are genuinely terrified. The task is to create circumstances such that universities can stand up and protect academic institutions and the research enterprise.
- Fred Terry spoke in favor of Motion 1. The stakes are very high. U-M claims to serve the people of Michigan and to develop leaders and citizens. This mission cannot be accomplished without academic freedom and, while debates are healthy, censorship is not. It is the federal administration's intent to have unchecked power and appeasement is not possible. Federal funding has been weaponized, which will harm students, research on a national level, and the economy. Universities must stand together and convince the public that research should be free from interference from either the right or the left. A unified effort is needed.
- Keith Riles spoke against Motion 1, remarking that current laws have been interpreted such that discrimination against men is permissible. The university should comply with the law and ideologues have disgraced the name of the university. U-M should choose its battles and allies wisely and it is not a wise strategy to support DEI.
- The floor was then opened for discussion. Comments covered the following topics. A Professor of Psychology remarked that U-M's local AAUP chapter voted unanimously to endorse the motion and also expressed concerns with the prior speaker's remarks, noting that anti-discrimination efforts have resulted in the opening of pathways in psychology to all genders, races, abilities, and socioeconomic statuses. A Michigan Medicine faculty member commented that, if there was some overreach in the DEI program, this doesn't mean you allow the U.S. to fall into a dual legal state. Another Michigan Medicine faculty made remarks about having lived in a communist country and experiencing restrictions on free speech and fear of neighbors informing on family members. There is power in numbers, and other countries have had peaceful transitions to democratic governments. It is important to defend academic freedom by supporting Motion 1. A Social Work faculty member asked a question about the text and whether there were any regental bylaw considerations. An LSA faculty member remarked on the importance of protecting against authoritarianism and the actions of a despot.

2:15 Motion 2: Statement in Support of the Core Mission and Values of Higher Education in the United States of America

- Kentaro Toyama, one of the motion sponsors, moved that motion 2 be put forward. A second was made by an in-person attendee.

- Kentaro Toyama read a statement written by Pauline Jones in support of Motion 2. Motion 2 is a basis for collective action across Big Ten institutions and beyond to protect the shared values and core mission of universities, including serving the public good through teaching, research, and service, furthering economic well-being, and producing scholarship that is evidence-based and non-partisan. The motion intends to draw a clear red line to external actors for not compromising values with regards to funding, admissions, and viewpoint diversity. It is important to stand up for shared values.
- Scott Greer spoke in favor of Motion 2. Mission statements can carry weight during a storm, and universities are facing a weather gale like has never before. It is important to make clear the values U-M shares with the rest of higher education. U-M is one of the great public institutions, serving everyone, regardless of citizenship, and without discrimination. The times call for taking a stand and defending what U-M cares about.
- Yi-Li Wu spoke in favor of Motion 2. Authoritarian governments are intent on crushing dissent and demanding compliance and silence. Fear is contagious and people think there is nothing that can be done. Courage is also contagious, and U-M needs to speak out, loudly and publicly. The regents have not stepped up, and faculty must do so. Elie Wiesel said, “Neutrality helps the oppressor, never the victim.” With rising authoritarianism, it is important to speak out loud enough to be heard all the way to D.C.
- The floor was then opened for discussion. A School of Information faculty member thanked Keith Riles for earlier his comments, stating that even though he may not agree with the speaker, it is important to have a forum where all faculty can have a space to speak. The sciences are particularly under attack, and imagine the impacts on science under a dictatorship. The sciences are directly influenced by authoritarian governments, and ICE has plans to arrest students and staff. A faculty member with specialties in the natural sciences echoed earlier comments, noting that it is not just the humanities and social science that are at risk. In response, Keith Riles noted that he supports Motion 2 and that Trump was elected through democratic processes. An LSA faculty responded that Hitler was also democratically elected.

2:36 Motion 3: Resolution to continue DEI initiatives that are in alignment with our university values, an extension of the mission of our schools, and legally compliant.

- John Carson made a motion for the approval of Motion 3. Multiple seconds were provided.
- John Caron then spoke in favor of the motion. As a historian, “We the people” was a founding sentiment of the American legal system. “All the people” did not mean “all” and the term has been greatly expanded since this time. In 1817, U-M was founded based upon land coerced from native peoples with the promise of offering education in return. U-M was founded on DEI, but has failed to live up to DEI principles.
- Kevin Cokely spoke in favor of the resolution, remarking that it has so often been an unattainable dream to attend and teach at the best-resourced schools. Under-represented groups have received a message of not being good enough and not being deserving of what a school like U-M offers. Long before 2023, what attracted him to U-M was the

audacity of U-M's aspiration to achieve diversity. DEI is not perfect, and black enrollment is not where it should be. Given such shortcomings, he fears that U-M will regress to a time when students, faculty, and staff felt as if they didn't belong at the University of Michigan.

- Terri Friedline spoke in favor of the resolution, remarking that she was saddened and angered by the disbanding of U-M DEI and the firing of African American ODEI staff. For those close to ODEI, such firings were an act of dishonesty, and many such faculty teach critical race theory and intersectionality for communities who are black, LatinX, immigrant, Muslim, Jewish, and first generation. These are empty words without a demonstrated commitment by U-M. For those who argue against DEI, it is an argument for homogeneity. The speaker was the first in her family to go to college within a community where neighbors died or became disabled from working in coal mines. The speaker wouldn't be at U-M, and at various institutions, without what was at the time a hidden and/or forbidden curriculum. U-M needs DEI, especially as an institution that was not designed for underrepresented groups.
- The floor was then opened for discussion. A faculty member from the law school remarked that it is a profound misunderstanding that civil rights doesn't offer protections. The purpose of civil rights legislation is to notice exclusions and gaps and to work to address such gaps. The idea that DEI violates the constitution turns on its head what DEI is about. A faculty member from LSA and Engineering remarked that DEI is a moral imperative, and that DEI has unfortunately been performative and light on measurable outcomes. Having grown up in Argentina during one of the most brutal of dictatorships, the stakes in the U.S. are incredibly high. An LSA faculty member remarked that he is old enough to remember not only conversations on DEI, but on affirmative action, as well as growing up learning about integration and about slavery. It is as if he is in the midst of a time warp. The conversation itself is traumatic. A research track faculty spoke of being very committed to the values of DEI, but also being very concerned about the loss of funding and feeling vulnerable. Faculty shouldn't need to choose between their values and their jobs. A Public Health faculty member spoke, noting that OVPR plans to support research track faculty and that it is important to know the administration is also coming for the rest of us. A lecturer in LSA remarked that, in terms of progress with diversity, the needle has not moved very much, with concerns of being at the mercy of the current administration and at risk of having the worst fate on the operating table.

3:07 Motion 4: Resolution Urging the University of Michigan to Protect International Students, Faculty, and Staff from Unwarranted Detention

- Derek Peterson made a motion for the approval of Motion 4. Multiple seconds were provided.
- Derek Peterson then spoke in favor of the motion. As of mid-April, over a thousand individuals have had their visa statuses terminated. In recent weeks, the actions against international students and the revoking of visas have been indiscriminate, including those that have not been charged with any crime, and people have been deported with little

regard to the law. The resolution calls for U-M to rise to the moment to adopt a policy of noncompliance with regard to ICE. U-M should use its resources to support international students, faculty, and staff in response to a senseless war against immigrants. During this upcoming time of sacred days for Jews, Christians, and Muslims, these traditions remind us to welcome the stranger and treat each other as neighbors.

- Kirsten Herold spoke in favor of the resolution. U-M offers language instruction in over 65 languages and the vast majority of these classes are taught by lecturers and by international lecturers, often in various stages of their visas. International faculty are a large part of the Michigan difference, and they deserve U-M's full support. U-M may advise against travel, but what does one do if your visa process tells you that you have to travel? Whether student, faculty, or staff, U-M should be offering its full support.
- Rima Mohammad spoke in favor of the resolution. This is a personal issue for her, as a refugee, and, if it were not for the opportunity the U.S. gave her, she wouldn't be at U-M. Recent events have made her feel alone and unsafe, as is true for so much of the larger immigrant community. There is generational trauma, and the statistics on ICE actions are chilling. Let's learn from the mistakes of Columbia University and do not comply and cave in.
- The floor was then opened for discussion. A professor from the School of Information spoke in favor of the resolution and called for legal support especially for international students. A Classical Studies faculty member in LSA remarked, with regards to civil disobedience, that not all laws are meant to be followed, and some laws are morally objectionable. If laws had not been broken, African Americans and women would never have gained the right to vote. An Engineering faculty member expressed support for the resolution. An LSA faculty member spoke of the wide variety of countries that international graduate students have arrived at U-M from, noting that some have come from authoritarian countries to U-M in order to study and speak in a place where their rights would be protected.
- **Motion 4 Amendment:** Derek Peterson moved that a friendly amendment be made to Motion 4. It was proposed that, in the 5th clause, the word "students" be added, so that the Be it Resolved clause refer to "staff, students, and faculty." The friendly amendment also proposed a second sentence be added at the end of the same clause, stating, "In the event of ~~academic~~ visa revocation and / or possible immigration detention, the University shall provide the affected student, faculty, or staff member with immediate legal representation by specialized immigration counsel."
 - During discussion of the friendly amendment, a Law School faculty member suggested striking the word, "academic" prior to visa to broaden the visas covered in the fifth clause (as shown above).
 - The friendly amendment was then approved by unanimous consent.
- There was additional discussion. A question was asked by a University Libraries faculty about the definition of international student. Another faculty remarked that also green card holders and naturalized citizens, in addition to visa holders, could potentially be covered by the resolution. In addition, a comment was made that there could be instances

of academic reasons where a visa might be revoked (i.e. failing a class) and that this resolution is meant to focus on “non-academic” visa issues.

Chair Modrak reminded attendees that an electronic vote would begin at the end of the meeting allowing all University Senate members to vote, for a period of 72 hours, on the four motions.

Adjournment – The meeting was then adjourned, without objection, at 3:35 pm.

Ann Marshall
Faculty Governance Coordinator

[University of Michigan Bylaws of the Board of Regents, Sec. 5.02:
Governing Bodies in Schools and Colleges](#)

Sec. 4.01 The University Senate

"...[t]he Senate is authorized to consider any subject pertaining to the interests of the university, and to make recommendations to the Board of Regents in regard thereto. Decisions of the University Senate with respect to matters within its jurisdiction shall constitute the binding action of the university faculties. Jurisdiction over academic policies shall reside in the faculties of the various schools and colleges, but insofar as actions by the several faculties affect university policy as a whole, or schools and colleges other than the one in which they originate, they shall be brought before the University Senate."

[Rules of the University Senate, the Senate Assembly and the Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs:](#)

Senate: “In all cases not covered by rules adopted by the Senate, the procedure in Robert's Rules of Order shall be followed.”

Assembly: “The Assembly may adopt rules for the transaction of its business. In appropriate cases not covered by rules of the Assembly, the rules of the University Senate shall apply.”

SACUA: “The committee may adopt rules for the transaction of its business.”