

Secretary of the University Advisory Committee (SAC)

Minutes of Meeting: 11/24/25

Circulated: 1/30/26

Approved: 2/2/26

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

Absent: Samantha Kreklau, Rashmi Rama

Faculty Senate Office: Eric Vandenberghe

12:03pm-12:04pm: Call to Order, Approval of Agenda and Minutes, Announcements

The agenda was approved. The minutes for the October SAC meeting were approved.

12:04pm-12:15pm: Update from VP Jon Kinsey

Summary: VP Kinsey provides an update on the most recent Regent's meeting.

The regents reiterated their opposition to the [proposed \\$2.4B outside investment in the Big Ten conference](#). A member of the committee asks about the genesis of this idea. It is something that is happening with professional athletic teams. Most athletic departments at academic institutions run financial deficits, so there is a desire to find ways to address this financial issue.

Construction of new residence halls continues to progress. The regents approved the naming of the new residence hall at 355 E Hoover Ave. as [Wolverine Village](#). It is set to open in time for next year's Fall term.

Regent Ilitch commented on the [Maize and Blue Cupboard](#). She recently toured the facility and praised the work that takes place there. She called for further funding of the Cupboard and commented on the vital need to ensure that the UM community has enough to eat.

Due to the ongoing search for the next UM president, the Regent bylaw revision project is being delayed. VP Kinsey expects the project to begin again in February 2026. Members discuss this matter. Discussion ensues on if the next UM President should be consulted before making any changes. Differing opinions are offered on this matter. A member suggests that this committee could review the proposed changes prior to February so that the project can hit the ground running once it resumes. This request will be considered. It is suggested that former VP Churchill join the March meeting, as she has been heavily involved in the initial review process of the bylaws.

Action: Update and discussion

12:15pm-12:52pm: Follow up on the University Senate Motions and Voting Results from the November 3, 2025, Meeting

Summary: The University Senate convened on [November 3, 2025](#), to consider nine motions put forth by members of the faculty body. All nine motions passed. The committee proceeds to discuss several of the motions.

The committee discusses [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. Questions are asked on if the Regents have oversight over this question. VP Kinsey indicates that the regents have had extended conversations about this but are not able to alter that policy unitarily.

[Motion 7](#): “Motion to Restore Fair Rules and Rule of Law to the University” is discussed. This motion focuses on the Student Statement of Rights and Responsibilities, as well as the faculty grievance process. The committee discusses the Board of Regent’s recent decision to restore the appeals board to the SSRR. This is a welcome decision, and there is more to be done.

The final motion discussed at length is [Motion 3](#): Resolution to Reject Participation in the “Compact for Academic Excellence in Higher Education.” VP Kinsey indicates that the University has not been offered or agreed to any such compact. He poses a hypothetical that all federal funding depended on agreeing to such a compact, and how the university should respond in the eyes of the committee. A member suggests that the initial step would be for the University to band together with other academic institutions to sue the federal government over this issue.

A member shares their suggestions in how the university can effectively lobby members of Congress who may not value providing funding to academic institutions. This includes working with other universities to provide persuasive examples of value provided directly from universities.

Another suggestion is made regarding simplified demonstrations of how universities positively impact society as a means of swaying public opinion of universities. Members offer further related suggestions including highlighting the amount of money spent by other nations on academic research. This would indicate that the US could fall behind. The committee discusses public perception of UM. Many outside the university feel as though UM is elitist. Members discuss community programs that could help with that perception.

Action: Discussion

12:52pm-1:22pm: Other issues

Summary:

UM Budget Model

A member raises concerns about funding inequality across the three campuses. The member lays out examples of this. Discussion ensues on the endowments of the three campuses and the parameters by which funds can be distributed. Other means of fund



distribution are discussed. The Go Blue Guarantee has been expanded and includes the Dearborn and Flint campuses. This is a positive step in the right direction, but there is more to be done.

Austerity measures and resource disparities at the Dearborn and Flint campuses are discussed. Members voice that the Flint and Dearborn campuses are not adequately valued, and that needs to change.

Food insecurity

A member discusses food insecurity on all three of the UM campuses. Specific stories are described. Federal funding issues with SNAP and WIC have exacerbated this issue. VP Kinsey indicates this was a point of discussion at the most recent Regent's meeting.

Committee members brainstorm suggestions to improve upon the existing resources at UM, and how to expand beyond existing resources.

Action: Discussion

1:22pm: Adjournment

Respectfully submitted,

Eric Vandenberghe
Faculty Governance Coordinator
Faculty Senate Office