

University Senate Meeting

February 18, 2026 | 2:00 P.M. | CELS 120

- Meeting Minutes: S. Sangregorio

Voting Members in Attendance:

Z. Aidala, J. Alexandre, S. Baglieri, Y. Bai, S. Bellum, H. Benton, J. Bilek, M. Chaifetz, C. Challenger, L. Carr, W. Colucci, S. Collins, C. Dilkes, D. Falloon-Blake, C. Flores, B. Garlick, S. Ghoshal, C. Gunhouse, P. Haggerty, K. Handeli, E. Jacobson, R. Kunstadter, N. Kurzynowski, P. La Fountain, F. Lauby, L. LeFever, Y. Luo, S. Mamonov, S. McCarthy, R. Misra, S. Nicholas, S. Nowak, D. Peterka-Benton, C. Reinisch, I. Ren, J. Robinson, A. Rzepka, S. Sangregorio, M. Smith, A. Spadaccini, W. Sullivan, A. Toro-Carnevali, D. Trubatch

Voting Members Missing:

C. Baird, A. Beringer, D. Chong, O. Gharehgozli, T. Gorman, M. Kamenetskiy, B. Krist, N. Panorkou, C. Rodriguez-Unalt, L. Simeon, A. Talamo

Previous Meeting Minutes

Available in the University Senate Google Drive: [📄 2026-01-28 Senate Meeting](#)

1. Call to Order

- **Call to Order:** 2:07 PM
- **Shannon Bellum** called the meeting to order.

2. Call for Quorum

- **Shannon Bellum** asked to confirm the quorum.
- **Sarah Sangregorio** confirmed that there was a quorum.

3. Land Acknowledgement Statement

- **Shannon Bellum** read the land acknowledgement statement.

4. Senate President's Updates

- **Shannon Bellum** reminded the group that unauthorized recordings are prohibited except for those requiring accommodation. The minutes of this meeting shall stand as the official record of University Senate proceedings.
 - Voting senators were reminded to notify **Sarah Sangregorio** if they leave early to help maintain accurate quorum counts.
- **Shannon Bellum** reminded the group to follow orderly discussion procedures:
 - Use the hand-raise function on Zoom or in person.
 - One speaker at a time will be recognized.
 - Senators who have not yet spoken will be prioritized over those who already have.
 - Non-voting attendees will be recognized after voting members.
 - Comments on Senate actions should be held until the Voices of the Community section.
- **Shannon Bellum** clarified:
 - Only Senators may speak during the Q&A with President Jonathan Koppell.
 - Non-senators must wait for Voices of the Community.

5. Report from the Administration

- **President Jonathan Koppell (Assisted by James Solodar)**
President Koppell delivered an extensive set of remarks addressing campus culture, governance assumptions, higher-education climate, CHSS restructuring, and the forthcoming University budgeting model.

Opening Reflections

- **President Jonathan Koppell** opened with extended remarks about Senate culture and communication. He expressed concern about interactions that begin with an assumption of ill intent, stating that some questions carry “a kind of sub rosa suspicion or adversarialism” and begin from an assumption “that somehow the intentions of the President and the administration are malign.” He emphasized that he welcomes disagreement but asks colleagues to engage from a place of mutual respect rather than suspicion. He reiterated his passion for higher education, stating, “There is nobody who loves universities more than I do.”

Context of Higher Education

- **President Koppell** described the present moment as “an incredibly complex environment” and “more uncertain than ever before,” citing demographic shifts, technological change, political polarization, and external pressures on universities. He warned that resisting change entirely would be “a losing strategy for us,” emphasizing that the institution must adapt intentionally.

Campus Life Observation

- **President Koppell** shared reflections from attending a multilingual Mother Tongue Day event earlier that afternoon, praising faculty and student presentations and describing it as emblematic of MSU’s interdisciplinary opportunities, intellectual richness, and community engagement.

CHSS Restructuring Clarification

- Addressing concerns about the CHSS restructuring process, **President Koppell** stated that multiple faculty committees and department chairs had developed several possible organizational models. He rejected assertions that the administration predetermined outcomes, stating that it would be “insulting” to colleagues to claim their extensive work merely replicated an administrative agenda.

Budget Model

- **President Jonathan Koppell** began the budget discussion by acknowledging that Senate leadership had specifically requested an in-depth explanation of upcoming changes to the University’s budgeting approach. He noted that he had brought **Vice President for Finance James Solodar** with him “in case the questions get too deep”.
- Before entering the mechanics of the new model, **President Koppell** situated the conversation within the University’s broader financial reality. He stressed that this conversation must be understood as part of a national moment of demographic, cultural, technological, and fiscal challenge. Higher education institutions, he argued, cannot choose stagnation. He emphasized that Montclair is not exempt from forces reshaping higher education but does have the agency to adapt strategically rather than reactively.

- He explained that Montclair State must generate substantial new recurring revenue every year simply to maintain existing obligations. He described the financial environment bluntly, stating that the University must come up with around “\$35 million a year more revenue that we'll have to have next year.”
- **President Koppell** emphasized that this need is driven primarily by salary obligations, sharing that “80% of our budget is salary,” meaning that annual contractual step increases alone require tens of millions in new revenue. Because of this, he rejected the idea that discussing budgets or revenue growth is “corporatizing” higher education; instead, he characterized it as necessary stewardship: “That's not to say it hasn't been worse, but it's never been more uncertain... we have bills to pay... I don't think that makes us corporatist. I think that makes us responsible in running the university.”
- After this framing, **President Koppell** shifted to the forthcoming budget model itself. He stressed that the model MSU is adopting is not Responsibility Centered Management (RCM), distancing the University from that system repeatedly and forcefully. “What we are proposing is so far from anything remotely RCM,” he said. He elaborated that, unlike a true RCM model, MSU’s approach does not require colleges to cover their own utilities, IT, administrative overhead, space costs, or other internal charges. Instead, the University will continue to centrally fund major institutional obligations, including contractual raises, faculty lines, and managerial salaries.
- Importantly, **President Koppell** emphasized that no cuts are associated with the rollout of this model. “We are not cutting anything,” he stated. Rather than reallocating existing resources, the model is designed to shape future growth by recognizing units that generate increases in enrollment, retention, research, or other mission-aligned improvements.
- At this point, **Vice President James Solodar** took over to provide the technical structure of the model. Solodar explained that MSU has never before allocated revenue in the way the University is now preparing to do.
- **Vice President James Solodar** then outlined the allocation formulas:
 - Undergraduate tuition revenue will be divided using a 60/30/10 model:
 - 60% based on credit hours taught,
 - 30% based on majors enrolled, and
 - 10% based on degrees conferred.
 - This approach reflects not only teaching contributions but also the role departments play in advising and supporting students through

- completion. **VP Solodar** emphasized that this structure acknowledges that departments contribute not only to majors but also to the instruction of students outside their home units.
- He clarified that this formula acknowledges:
 - Teaching students from outside one's major
 - The advising and enrollment responsibility for majors
 - The labor and value associated with graduating students
 - For graduate programs, **VP Solodar** explained that revenue will follow a straight 70/30 split between the college and the University for all programs except those in the Unbound portfolio. "At the graduate level, we're doing a straight 70/30 split for everything that's not Unbound."
 - **VP Solodar** noted that Unbound sits outside the standard structure because it was intentionally designed to incentivize innovation and adult learner pathways.
 - **VP Solodar** then emphasized that these formulas are not final. He described the model as "a little bit art, a little bit science," noting that MSU will learn from the first year of implementation and revise the model annually: "we will be revisiting this regularly, as we redesign it for the upcoming year's budget process." Feedback from deans, department chairs, faculty, and staff will be directly incorporated into annual refinements.
 - **President Koppell** connected the technical formulas to their underlying purpose. He emphasized that the model is designed to reward—not punish—units that contribute positively to the University's mission. Instead of being a system of austerity or competition, Koppell described it as "a nudge in the right direction," a tool that encourages enrollment-building behaviors, program development, improvements in student retention, and innovative academic offerings. He underscored that the University does not intend to pit colleges against each other, rejecting the competitive model some RCM institutions adopt.
 - **President Koppell** ended the budget portion by emphasizing the alignment between financial incentives and the University's core mission. Projects that improve access, retention, student success, and program innovation will help the University financially because they advance MSU's public mission—not in spite of it. "If we do right by our students, we do better financially," he said.

Q&A

- Following the budget portion by **President Jonathan Koppell** and **Vice President for Finance James Solodar**, **Shannon Bellum** opened the floor for Senators-only questions, consistent with her earlier procedural reminder.
- **Mary English** was the first senator recognized. She asked a technical question about how the budget model distinguishes between:
 - departments that generate large numbers of majors, and
 - departments that generate revenue by teaching large numbers of students from outside their major, especially through required courses.
 - “What balance are we going to strike in academic departments between departments that draw majors in... and another way to think of enrollment is by what classes the students are taking, and because they didn't pay the university... by the class... and which are not always in their major, right?... Could you talk more about how we're going to balance majors with SSHs...?”
- **VP James Solodar** responded first, indicating that the “weedy answer” involved a tuition allocation mechanism using a 60-30-10 formula. He explained that undergraduate tuition is allocated to colleges “60% by credit hours taught, 30% by majors enrolled, and 10% by degrees conferred,” noting that this approach acknowledges both instruction and major advising responsibilities. He clarified that the model also recognizes instruction provided to students outside a department’s own major and that, while this approach is intended as the starting point, it may evolve over time based on experience.
- **President Koppell** added further explanation, describing the formula as “our starting point” and emphasizing the importance of encouraging shared academic programming across units. He argued that the University should avoid becoming overly concerned with identifying which unit “owns” a student, as this may undermine interdisciplinary collaboration. He also identified the risk of unintended incentives, explaining that the budget model must be constructed carefully to prevent departments from artificially inflating courses for general-education credit merely to increase credit-hour production. He concluded by agreeing that a reliance on major counts alone would not accurately represent how universities function.
- The next senator recognized was **Adam Rzepka**, who began by acknowledging his illness and apologizing for any audio issues, then immediately addressed an issue from earlier in the meeting. He noted that

a prior question he had asked was attributed to another senator and stated, “I didn’t really hear much of an answer to it,” adding that President Koppell had characterized his earlier question as “factually false” and “insulting to my colleagues.” He requested that the full text of that earlier question be entered into the record - the question was submitted per Adam Rzepka as follows: “We are nearing the one-year anniversary of the launch of the CHSS restructuring process. The basic plan a year ago is identical to the plan that the new Provost and Dean is insisting on now: departments will be cut from 15 to something like 9, and put into 4 new containers within the College. Can you tell us why this basic plan has never changed, in the face of enormous amounts of detailed feedback—most of it highly critical, much of it offering immediately actionable alternatives? The only rationales that we have ever been given for this plan are (1) fostering interdisciplinarity; and (2) increasing enrollments. Yet we have never heard an explanation of why this model, as opposed to others, is particularly likely to improve either factor.”

- Before the aforementioned question was answered, **Adam Rzepka** then raised the core of his budget inquiry. He asked, in exact terms, “if you were to apply the hybrid RCM model now, right, like just all at once, right now, what would the anticipated range of cuts or increases... be like?” He continued by asking which colleges would see budget reductions of “10% 15% 30%” or increases of the same range under such an immediate implementation and stated that he assumed such calculations “must have come up.”
- **President Koppell** responded that Rzepka’s question did not reflect how the model actually functions. He explained that the proposed system does not involve taking a fixed pool of money and redistributing it among colleges based on comparative performance. He stated, “We are not presuming to take a pot of money and divide it based on who’s doing the best and who’s doing the worst.” He further emphasized that MSU is not pursuing a model in which colleges’ allocations rise and fall strictly according to performance metrics. Rather, he clarified that the institution operates many programs with very different structural cost profiles — such as business programs, which often enroll large numbers of students, and arts programs, which may require small-format or individualized instruction — and therefore the University is not shifting to a system of performance-based cuts or rewards.
- **Adam Rzepka** then asked a follow-up question, turning from the budget model to his prior question entered into the record regarding CHSS restructuring. He stated that certain structural features being discussed in

February 2026 — specifically, the presence of “four, exactly four units” and a reduction in the number of departments “to something like eight to ten departments” — were “identical to what was floated as early as November 2024.” He said these parameters appeared unchanged and stated, “I take offense at being told that my asking this question is an insult to my colleagues.”

- **President Koppell** disagreed, responding that the committees working on CHSS restructuring had produced multiple configurations and that department chairs had generated their own models later in the process. He stated, “That’s not true... it gives short shrift to the work people have done,” describing Adam Rzepka’s assertion as inconsistent with the actual range of options developed by faculty.
- **Shannon Bellum** asked **Adam Rzepka** to re-enter the queue for questioning to give more time to people who had not asked questions.
- **Adam Rzepka** responded that he still wanted to receive the numerical information he had asked about, stating, “I still... would like to find those numbers to the second question about the budget.”
- The next question came from **Susan Nowak**, a professional staff member in the College of the Arts. Susan Nowak explained that staff members often do not participate in academic program design, tuition-generating strategies, or enrollment planning and asked how professional staff could meaningfully contribute to the University under the developing budget model. She sought direction for staff roles within a system that appears to place emphasis on academic units, academic programming, and enrollment performance.
- **President Koppell** responded by noting that, in his experience, professional staff often have more direct understanding of student experiences than faculty, especially regarding administrative processes. He explained that advisors and other student-facing staff commonly hear concerns that students may not share with faculty. He stated that “a dean who knows what she’s doing will utilize staff as a resource” and that staff are well-positioned to identify “where there’s dysfunction” or “roadblocks” that affect student success. He described staff involvement as essential and emphasized that student success responsibilities should not be confined to academic units alone.
- The final questioner in this section was **David Trubatch**. David Trubatch prefaced his remarks by noting his respect for the administration’s vision but expressed concern about the implementation process. He explained that Senate leadership learned about the forthcoming budget model through the University’s self-study report and not through direct

communication, noting that such significant developments should ideally be communicated earlier and more directly. He underscored the importance of shared governance involvement and encouraged the administration to rely on organized bodies like the Senate and the Senate Executive Committee to provide structured feedback.

- **David Trubatch** then asked the central logistical question: what would faculty and staff actually “see” in practice once the model was implemented? He asked whether departments would receive reports containing their “bottom line,” whether college budgets would be broken down into unit-level figures, and how transparent the new allocations would be. He explained that faculty needed clarity around what information would be accessible in order to interpret expectations under the new system.
- **President Koppell** responded first, stating that the day-to-day appearance of the budgeting process might not feel dramatically different for faculty. He explained that the central change lay in shifting deans away from a model of compiling “wish lists” toward one where they would receive more predictable base allocations and exercise greater autonomy in determining how to use them. **President Koppell** also highlighted a structural incentive change in which departments or units that save money in one year will retain the benefit in the subsequent year, rather than having savings automatically absorbed centrally, which had previously led to inefficiencies and end-of-year spending spikes.
- **Vice President Solodar** expanded on these points by noting that this year represents “year almost zero rather than year one” and that the system would evolve through annual adjustments. He explained that each dean has access to their own financial data but that the University does not intend to disclose inter-college comparisons at this early stage, citing experiences at peer institutions where such disclosures led to unhealthy dynamics. He stressed that future iterations of the model may expand transparency but that the administration is being cautious in phase one. Solodar reiterated that the administration has asked deans to prepare multi-year plans under the new system and that faculty and staff feedback will be integrated as the model matures.
- After David Trubatch’s question was addressed, **President Bellum** asked if there were any final questions. Hearing none, she concluded the Q&A and transitioned the meeting to the next agenda item.
- **President Koppell** closed by confirming that the administration would hold an updated University-wide “budget road show” to explain the evolving model more broadly.

- **President Koppell** offered a short announcement regarding a campus lecture series tied to the 250th anniversary. He explained he would be giving monthly talks on the “principles and values of American democracy and how we’ve evolved over the last 250 years,” adding that these talks would help contextualize “what’s going on in the country right now, which I have deep concerns about.” He encouraged senators to participate and highlighted that the next lecture would be held on March 4, focusing in part on “innovation, and support for innovation” in higher education.

6. Approval of Minutes

- The minutes from the January 28, 2026 meeting were moved for approval by **Ram Misra**, with a second by **Kevin Handeli**. They were unanimously approved by acclamation.

7. SGA Report

- No report

8. Senate President Announcements

Senate Newsletter Distribution

- **Shannon Bellum** called attention to the distribution of the new Senate Newsletter, stating that it “went out earlier today,” and acknowledged that the Provost’s Office had supported the distribution by allowing it to be sent through the University’s all-users email system.

University Committee & Advisory Task Force

- **Shannon Bellum** reminded senators that the first meeting of the newly established University Committee and Advisory Task Force would take place the following day. She welcomed late additions, saying she was “happy to have you join late if you’d like.”

Department Bylaws Repository

- **Shannon Bellum** provided an update on the initiative to create a repository of departmental bylaws. Following the January meeting, she met with **Senior Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs Emily Isaacs** in the Provost’s Office. Shannon Bellum explained:
 - The Provost’s Office is developing a webpage that will host the repository.

- The page will include a shared folder for uploading and accessing unit bylaws.
- It will also include a template for departments updating or drafting bylaws, along with a presentation Emily Isaacs created.
- Shannon Bellum noted, “We expect that to come out in the next week or two.”

Senate Workflow Chart

- **Shannon Bellum** reminded senators that she had distributed a Senate workflow chart earlier in the month and had already received helpful feedback. She emphasized the importance of senators understanding “how the process is within the Senate.”

MADC (NJ Mutual Academic Defense Compact) Update

- **Shannon Bellum** reported that on Monday she and several Executive Board members met with Senate leaders from the other participating institutions. They had collectively determined that each institution would select two representatives, and that those two representatives share one vote within the Compact. She noted that she had “more on that in a second” as she introduced the bylaw establishing MSU’s representation.

9. New Business

Introduction of the MADDC Representative Bylaw

- **Shannon Bellum** then introduced the proposed bylaw on selecting MSU’s representatives to the MADDC, noting it was a “late-breaking add” because the multi-institution meeting had taken place only a couple days earlier, explaining:
 - One representative will always be the Senate President (ex officio).
 - The second representative will be a voting member of the Senate elected by the body.
 - Together, these two individuals will “have one vote to share between the two of them.”
- **Shannon Bellum** then read the text of the bylaw into the record in full:

Bylaw on Representatives to the New Jersey Mutual Academic Defense Compact

I. Purpose

This Bylaw specifies the designation of representatives of the Montclair State University Senate to the New Jersey-Mutual Academic Defense Compact (NJMADC), including the process for election of a voting member of the University Senate to serve as one of the two representatives on the NJMADC.

II. Background

The University Senate joined the NJMADC by Resolution (11/19/2025).

The NJMADC held a founding meeting, composed of officers of the constituent Senates, on February 16, 2026. By consensus, those gathered agreed to form a body composed of two members from each constituent institution with these members designated by the respective Senates. Together, the two representatives from each institution will have one vote in the proceedings and actions of the NJMADC.

The initial representatives of the NJMADC will develop a founding document (charter or constitution) for ratification by the member Senates.

III. President of the Senate as Representative to the NJMADC

The President of the University Senate shall serve ex-officio as one of the Montclair State University Senate Representatives to the NJMADC. The President may designate a member of the Senate Executive Board to serve in their place.

IV. Elected Representative to the NJMADC

1. The representative shall be a voting member of the University Senate.
2. The term will be two years, from election through the Spring 2028 Organizational Meeting of the Senate.
3. The timeline for voting begins with a Call for Nominations and, then, a one-week voting cycle to elect the Representative.
4. In the event of a vacancy or resignation, the Senate will follow the Constitution process as outlined in Article III.E.4

V. Responsibilities of the Representatives

1. Attend meetings and voting sessions of the NJMADC.
2. Communicate relevant updates to the University Senate.
3. Submit written reports at least once in each of the Fall and Spring Terms, no later than seven days before the last regular Senate meeting of the term.
4. Serve as the University Senate's official voting delegates.
 - a. The delegates shall share a single vote with consensus on the vote to be reached in a collaborative manner.
 - b. If they are unable to agree on their vote, the matter will be brought to the Senate Executive Board for mediation, and next actions.

Discussion of the MADC Bylaw

- Once the bylaw text was read, **Shannon Bellum** opened the floor for discussion.
- **Adam Rzepka** was the first to speak. Adam Rzepka thanked Shannon Bellum for recognizing him and expressed concern about the timing of the vote: "Can we please have until the next Senate meeting to vote on this? There's no time to consider this in real time. I don't understand why this wasn't sent out for consideration before the meeting."
 - He added that from the text Bellum read aloud, the bylaw "is not what we passed" when the Senate resolved to join the MADC in November 2025. He argued that the earlier resolution stipulated an elected representative, and therefore did not anticipate an ex-officio representative, nor the new one-vote structure adopted by the statewide coalition.
- **Shannon Bellum** acknowledged Rzepka's concerns but explained the rationale for moving forward:
 - The statewide coalition of Senates had recently met and collectively agreed on the two-representative/one-vote structure.
 - Delaying MSU's bylaw would mean MSU's Executive Board members — rather than an elected representative — would cast votes in upcoming Compact meetings, which Shannon Bellum considered acceptable but not ideal.
 - She emphasized that she personally believed the stakes of the bylaw were procedural rather than substantive.
- **Erik Jacobson** added that:

- The earlier MSU resolution joined a body that did not yet have bylaws. The new bylaw simply reflects the structure the body itself has now adopted.
- MSU cannot impose its own governance assumptions on the multi-institution Compact.
- He also noted that if MSU's elected representative disagrees with the new MADC bylaws, that representative can raise the issue within the Compact itself.
- **Adam Rzepka** reiterated his view that the bylaw contradicted what MSU had originally passed and restated his concern that senators did not have advance access to the text.

Call of the Question and Vote

- At this point, **Laureen LeFever** called the question.
- **Shannon Bellum** asked if there were any objections; none were voiced.
- The Senate therefore proceeded to an open vote, conducted through a live electronic ballot.
- 36 senators were present, requiring 24 affirmative votes for passage.
 - **Yes:** 29
 - **No:** 1
 - **Abstention due to non-voting:** 6
- **Adam Rzepka** noted that he did not see his no vote in the projected results.
- **Shannon Bellum** assured him his "no" vote would be recorded in the minutes. (See above.)
- **Sarah Sangregorio** confirmed that his ballot had initially shown "waiting for response," - it had not been submitted during the first tally.

10. Council Reports, Committee Reports, & Voices from the Community

- **Shannon Bellum** acknowledged that the meeting had already run long, noting the considerable discussion earlier in the session, and asked the room how they wished to proceed with the outstanding reports. Several elected to deliver brief verbal reports.

Academic Affairs Council

- **David Trubatch** delivered a report on behalf of the Academic Affairs Council. He began by acknowledging the meeting's length and stating that his full written report had already been uploaded to the Senate Drive.
- He then focused his verbal remarks on one key item he wanted all senators to remember: the upcoming Department Bylaws and Procedures Workshop.
- David Trubatch emphasized:
 - The workshop would occur one week from the date of the meeting.
 - It was designed as a "hands-on collaborative workshop."
 - Participants could expect peer sharing, discussion of effective unit practices, and opportunities to work through procedural challenges collectively.
 - He placed a registration link into the Zoom chat so senators could sign up. He explained that advance registration would allow organizers to distribute materials ahead of time, but clarified that even if someone failed to register, they would still be able to attend.
- **David Trubatch** closed by reiterating the workshop's intent:
 - To help departments strengthen their bylaws
 - To support clearer governance at the unit level
 - To encourage cross-departmental learning about good practices
- He thanked the Senate and yielded the floor.

Elections Committee

- **Christina Dilkes** began by reminding senators that "there is a call for nominations for our constituency elections—there's a significant number of them," indicating that this cycle offered more open seats than usual. She had already circulated detailed information by email, and she encouraged senators to refer back to that message for complete instructions.
 - Multiple Senate seats across categories are currently open.
 - Christina Dilkes had already sent out a detailed email outlining all necessary information.
 - The committee was actively seeking self-nominations and peer nominations.
- One of the most significant points in **Christina Dilkes's** report was a structural clarification: the Department of Social Work is now organizationally housed within the College for Community Health and Life Sciences (CCHL): "Social Work is now in the CCHL... not the humanities and social sciences." Some senators might have missed this change in earlier communications.

- She then listed several categories of open seats in the chat and mentioned a few verbally as examples:
 - Admin Professional Staff
 - CART Faculty
 - CCHL Professional Staff
 - CEEL Faculty
 - CEEL Faculty
 - CEEL Professional Staff
 - CART NTTP
 - CCOM Professional Staff
 - CSAM NTTP
 - SNUS Professional Staff
 - SBUS Faculty
 - SBUS Faculty
 - CSAM Faculty
 - CSAM Faculty
 - Bloomfield NTTP
- More information will be forthcoming.

Disability Caucus (Voices from the Community)

- **Drew Wallace**, VP of the Disability Caucus was recognized.
- He began with the calendar of upcoming general membership meetings. The next meeting would take place on Friday, February 20 at 2 PM via Zoom. Subsequent meetings were scheduled for March 20 and April 17, also at 2 PM. Drew Wallace emphasized that the caucus welcomed “all employees,” including both disabled employees and allies, making clear that the caucus fosters an inclusive and supportive environment.
- **Drew Wallace** then highlighted an important campus event: a co-hosted program featuring Pamela Rae Schuller, a comedian and nationally recognized disability advocate. This event, scheduled for February 24 from 4:00 to 5:30 PM in Calcia Hall 140, promised to bring meaningful dialogue—and humor—about disability, identity, and advocacy to the University community. He offered this update with an air of enthusiasm, reflecting the significance of bringing a nationally known figure to campus.
- **Drew Wallace** referenced ongoing connections with groups including the AFT union, the Office of Sustainability and the University’s Collaborative for Inclusive Excellence.
- **Drew Wallace** invited attendees of the meeting to join the Caucus’s meetings and events.

Concluding Remarks

- **Shannon Bellum** again asked if any remaining committees or caucuses needed to deliver verbal updates. No one indicated any new verbal reports were needed.
- She reminded senators that all remaining written reports were already uploaded to the Senate drive, ensuring transparency and access for anyone wishing to review them.
- Before adjourning, **Shannon Bellum** offered a final set of procedural reminders. She noted that constitutional amendments were on the record for their first read, and because the next Senate meeting would take place five weeks later—an unusually long gap due to the academic calendar—senators had ample time to review them. She mentioned that one amendment pertaining to at-large seats and professional staff would require a rules exception, as it needed to be passed before the upcoming at-large election cycle.

11. Meeting Adjournment

- **Call to Adjourn: 3:54 PM**
 - **Erik Jacobson**, Motion to Adjourn
 - **Anastasia Spadaccini**, Seconded
 - **Shannon Bellum**: Adjourned by Acclamation