FACULTY SENATE
SENATE ASSEMBLY
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

1120 Ruthven Building
1109 Geddes Avenue
Ann Arbor, MI 48109

Secretary of the University Advisory Committee (SAC)

Minutes of Meeting: 9/8/25
Circulated: 10/15/25
Approved: 10/20/25

Present: Francine Dolins (Chair), Barbara Klein, John Tropman, Jonathan Shillingford, Beth Wilensky, VP Jon Kinsey, Vilma Mesa (SACUA Liaison), Liz Rohan

Absent: Samantha Kreklau, Rashmi Rama, Jay Winkler

Faculty Senate Office: Eric Vandenberghe

12:02pm-12:11pm: Call to Order, Approval of Agenda and Minutes, Announcements

Introductions are made by the committee members. The draft Charge is read out loud by the Faculty Governance Coordinator. The agenda was approved. The minutes for the April SAC meeting were approved.

12:11pm-12:25pm: University of Michigan Presidential Search

Summary: VP Kinsey provides context for the UM Presidential Search. He indicates that there will be several listening sessions where members of the community can offer their feedback as to what qualities the next UM President should have. The UM President posting will be available in the coming days. The makeup of the search committee is completely in the purview of the Regents. Faculty offer critiques of the makeup of the committee, particularly around certain UM factions that are not represented, including faculty from Flint and Dearborn, lecturers, emeritus faculty, among others. VP Kinsey attests that his office received hundreds of suggestions regarding who should be on the search committee. VP Kinsey indicates that he is open to the feedback the committee has offered and will provide the information to the Regents.

A member asks what prior presidential searches at UM have looked like and how they compare to the current process. VP Kinsey provides examples of a few different search types. A recent history of presidential searches at UM is discussed. The process that brought former President Schlissel was a narrow process, while the process that brought former President Ono was wide. The current process is more in the middle. Some community members have suggested an open search. The current process is a closed process. The Regents have full control over how the search takes place. The search committee will provide a recommendation to the Regents, and they will make the final decision.

A member offers advice regarding the search process. They suggest that the candidates should be offered to the Regents ranked by the search committee.

Action: Discussion

12:25pm-1:05pm: Activities of the Federal Government affecting the University

1120 Ruthven Building
1109 Geddes Avenue
Ann Arbor, MI 48109

Summary: The Chair introduces the topic and indicates that this will be an ongoing topic that the committee will likely discuss at each meeting.

VP Kinsey informs the committee that the University has received a number of stop-work orders from the federal government. The University has offered to appeal every single order. The Principal Investigator has the right to choose whether to appeal or not. Statistics regarding these stop-work orders are shared. Many of those cases appealed are still to be decided. UM has had several of these stop-work orders overturned.

UM has received money mostly on schedule for current research. Proposal submissions are up at UM. The amount of money awarded so far in this academic year is lower than is normal. The potential ramifications could lead to necessary spending adjustments. This is discussed by the committee. It is not clear if these proposals will be rejected, or if the reviews are taking longer than normal. A question is asked on how UM is faring on this front compared to peer institutions. VP Kinsey indicates that he will look into this. A member asks how equivalent universities in red states are faring in losing research funds compared to those (such as UM) in blue/purple states.

Bridge funding offered by OVPR is discussed. A member asks what ramifications this funding change will have on the promotion process for junior faculty. It is indicated that some ongoing awards that are served stop-work orders may be eligible for bridge funding. VP Kinsey indicates that he will look into what changes to the promotion and tenure clock may change if any.

Members offer their perspectives on this issue. One member discusses the primary reasoning the government gives for stop-work orders on grants. One of the most common reasons provided is that the work is no longer a priority of the federal government.

A member asks how many are related to minor gender-affirming care. This is unknown. A member of the medical school provides their perspective on the sentiment of colleagues in the medical school.

It is suggested that the committee meet with VP Lupia to discuss this matter further. The Chair will confer with the Chair of the RAC regarding a possible collaboration.

A member brings up the updated ECRT policy changes related to Title VI. The member asks if the new reporting system requires faculty to notify individuals coming into their office, with visible language, that they are a mandatory reporter. Another member discusses how faculty are fearful of students and staff retaliation for something that things said in the classroom.

The Chair asks how the new Title VI policy relates to surveillance on campus. What does it mean to have to report on the community members? A member wonders about the capabilities on the surveillance technology on campus. A member indicates the need to hear from those who implemented the new surveillance measures. A member indicates that this is an attack on academic freedom. A member offers that speech in classrooms is protected, per the new ECRT guidance. It is determined that this topic will be revisited by the committee at a later date.

A committee member brings up the gender-affirming care announcement that occurred in

1120 Ruthven Building
1109 Geddes Avenue
Ann Arbor, MI 48109

late August. Many community members have indicated their displeasure with this. The consequences of making this decision and not making this decision are shared. A member asks about the specifics of the decision-making process. VP Kinsey indicates that UM has faculty members who have devoted their career to this issue. The committee is encouraged to have the colleagues meet and discuss this with them. It is indicated that the Regents did not make this decision. The Regents do not tell management how to manage clinical operations. Many universities are making similar decisions.

A member asks about the communication process for this. Why was this publicly announced vs just communication with the patients affected? It seemed out of the blue to the committee member. Further discussion ensues on this topic.

Action: Discussion

1:21pm- 1:25pm: Bylaws project update

Summary: This subject was discussed at length last year with the SAC Committee. Former Secretary of the University Sally Churchill has been working on the Regent Bylaw revisions, and the proposed revisions have been shared with the regents. Some changes will be made in the coming months, particularly those that are not substantive. Robust discussion and community engagement will take place regarding further changes. The committee will meet with Sally Churchill at a later meeting to receive her update prior to reviewing the specifics of this project.

Action: Update

1:05pm-1:21pm: OVPR changes

Summary: The Chair introduces this topic and provides context. CSCAR has been closed and OVPR has cancelled block funding that had been funding smaller grants to faculty in Stamps, SMTD, and LSA. The effect this will have on the promotion and tenure of affected faculty is discussed.

A member indicates their frustration with the decision to close CSCAR. The member indicates that they believe there was not sufficient consultation with faculty and deans. The member states the need to have faculty involved in this decision-making process. Another member let the committee know that the staff of CSCAR will be provided with other positions at the University.

Another member asks rhetorically- how are these financial decisions made? Faculty should consider how they can play a role in collaborating. A further call for VP Lupia to join an SAC meeting is made.

Action: Discussion

1:25pm-1:31pm: Other Business

Summary: A member brings up several topics that are carried over from last year's committee meetings. Given the current time crunch, these topics will be reviewed at a later meeting. The topics include the programming of WUOM, increasing the enrollment of the

1120 Ruthven Building
1109 Geddes Avenue
Ann Arbor, MI 48109

School of Nursing substantially to meet the rising medical professional demand, and creating a No Binge Campus campaign.

Action: Discussion

1:31pm: Adjournment

Respectfully submitted,

Eric Vandenberghe
Faculty Governance Coordinator
Faculty Senate Office