

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI  
Columbia . Kansas City . Rolla . St. Louis



BOARD OF CURATORS  
Minutes of the Board of Curators Meeting  
Thursday, November 20, 2025

A Health Affairs Committee meeting was held November 13, 2025 in conjunction with the November 20, 2025 Board meeting.

**BOARD OF CURATORS MEETING – PUBLIC SESSION**

A meeting of the Board of Curators was convened in public session at 8:00 A.M. on Thursday, November 20, 2025, in Century Rooms A & B of the Millenium Student Center on the University of Missouri–St. Louis campus, St. Louis, Missouri, pursuant to public notice given of said meeting. Curator Todd P. Graves, Chair of the Board of Curators, presided over the meeting.

Present

The Honorable Robert D. Blitz  
The Honorable Robert W. Fry  
The Honorable Todd P. Graves  
The Honorable Lyda Krewson  
The Honorable Jeffrey L. Layman  
The Honorable Blaine Luetkemeyer  
The Honorable John M. Raines  
The Honorable Jeanne C. Siquefield  
The Honorable Michael A. Williams

Also Present

Dr. Mun Y. Choi, President, University of Missouri  
Mr. Mark A. Menghini, General Counsel  
Ms. Valerie Slayton, Secretary of the Board of Curators  
Dr. C. Mauli Agrawal, Chancellor, University of Missouri–Kansas City  
Dr. Mohammad Dehghani, Chancellor, Missouri University of Science and Technology  
Ms. Marsha Fischer, Vice President for Human Resources and Chief Human Resources Officer  
Dr. John Middleton, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Chief of Staff  
Mr. Ryan D. Rapp, Executive Vice President for Finance and Operations, Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer

Dr. Holly Sheilley, Executive Director of Athletics, University of Missouri-St. Louis  
Dr. Kristin Sobolik, Chancellor for University of Missouri-St. Louis  
Media representatives

## **General Business**

University of Missouri Board Chair's Report – presented by Chair Graves (slides on file)

Chair Graves presented a report that included:

- Recognized UMSL Curators' Distinguished Professors Steve Moehrle, Michael Nichols, and Lee Ann Slocum
- Partnership with South Korea
- Memorial Stadium Centennial Project
- MU and UMKC Schools of Law

University of Missouri System President's Report – presented by President Choi (slides on file)

President Choi presented a report that included:

- US News and World Report ratings for each campus
- FTE Enrollments and Graduation Rates
- Student and Faculty Success
- Major Grants and Federal Awards

University of Missouri-St. Louis Campus Highlights – presented by Chancellor Sobolik (slides on file)

Chancellor Sobolik presented a report that included:

- Enrollment outlook and new faculty
- Research and sponsored activity
- Transform UMSL update

Review of Consent Agenda – No discussion.

## **Consent Agenda**

It was endorsed by President Choi, moved by Curator Blitz and seconded by Curator Williams, that the following items be approved by consent agenda:

## **CONSENT AGENDA**

- A. Minutes, September 4, 2025 Board of Curators Special Finance Committee meeting - as provided to the Curators for review and approval
- B. Minutes, September 5, 2025 Board of Curators Committee Meetings and Board Meeting – as provided to the Curators for review and approval
- C. 2026 Board of Curators Meeting Calendar - Revised

that the revised 2026 Board of Curators meeting calendar be approved as follows:

**2026 BOARD OF CURATORS MEETING CALENDAR**

<u>DAY(S)</u>	<u>DATE(S)</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>
Thursday	February 5	UM – Kansas City
Thursday	April 16	Missouri S&T
Thursday	June 25	TBD
Thursday	September 3	UM – Columbia
Thursday	November 19	UM – St. Louis

- D. Amendment, CRR 330.110 Standards of Faculty Conduct

that the amendments to Collected Rules and Regulations 330.110, Standards of Faculty Conduct as presented, be approved.

**330.110 Standards of Faculty Conduct**

Bd. Min. 4-27-17; Bd. Min. 9-24-20; Amended 11-20-25.

**A. General**

A Faculty Member at the University of Missouri assumes an obligation to behave in a manner compatible with the University’s function as an educational institution. These expectations are established in order to protect an environment conducive to research, teaching, learning and service that fosters integrity, personal and professional growth, a community of scholarship, academic success and responsible citizenship. Faculty Members are expected to adhere to community standards in accordance with the University’s mission and expectations.

**B. Jurisdiction**

1. Jurisdiction of the University of Missouri generally shall be limited to conduct which occurs on the University of Missouri premises or at University-sponsored or University-supervised functions. However, the University may take appropriate action, including, but not limited to, the imposition of sanctions under the Standards of Faculty Conduct against Faculty Members for conduct occurring in other settings, including off-campus, (1) in order to protect the physical safety of students, employees, visitors, patients or other members of the University community, (2) if there are effects of the conduct that interfere with or limit any person's ability to participate in or benefit from the University's educational programs, activities or employment, (3) if the conduct is related to the Faculty Member's fitness or performance in the professional capacity of teacher or researcher or (4) if the conduct occurs when the Faculty member is serving in the role of a University employee.
2. The Standards of Faculty Conduct applies to all Faculty Members, as defined in Section 330.110.E.1. below, at the University of Missouri. This process does not apply to conduct by academic administrators when they are acting in their administrative, at-will role. Except as noted in Section 330.110.C. below, the Standards of Faculty Conduct is in addition to and does not limit other processes and procedures for addressing conduct and employment issues, including but not limited to Research Misconduct (Section 420.010), Procedures in Case of Dismissal for Cause (Section 310.060), Resolution Process for Resolving Complaints of Sexual Harassment under Title IX (Section 600.030), and Equity Resolution Process for Resolving Complaints of Discrimination and Harassment against a Faculty Member or Student or Student Organization (Section 600.040). A final decision on the merits in another disciplinary process precludes subsequent initiation of the Standards of Faculty Conduct process for the same allegations of inappropriate conduct.

**C. Statement of Nondiscrimination and Process for Alleged Violation of the University's Anti-Discrimination Policies**

The University of Missouri prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, ancestry, religion, sex, pregnancy, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, age, disability, protected veteran status, and any other status protected by applicable state or federal law. The University's Anti-Discrimination Policies include the Equal Employment/Educational Opportunity Policy located at Section 600.010 of the Collected Rules and Regulations and the Sexual Harassment under Title IX Policy located at Section 600.020 of the Collected Rules and Regulations. Alleged violations of the University's Anti-Discrimination Policies are within the jurisdiction of the applicable Title IX and Equity Resolution Processes, including Sections 600.030 and 600.040 of the Collected Rules and Regulations, and not subject to enforcement through the Standards of Faculty Conduct.

#### **D. Statement of Professional Ethics**

(Excerpted with modification from the University of Missouri-Columbia Bylaws and the AAUP Redbook Statement of Professional Ethics)

1. Faculty Members recognize the special responsibilities placed upon them. Their primary responsibility as scholars is to state the truth as they see it. They accept the obligation to exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. They practice intellectual honesty. Although Faculty Members may follow subsidiary interests, these interests must never seriously hamper or compromise their freedom of inquiry.
2. As teachers, Faculty Members encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students. They uphold the best scholarly and ethical standards of their disciplines. Faculty Members demonstrate respect for students as individuals and adhere to their proper roles as intellectual guides and counselors. Faculty Members make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to ensure that their evaluations of students accurately reflect the merit of each student's work. They avoid exploitation, harassment, or discriminatory treatment of students. They acknowledge significant academic or scholarly assistance from them. They protect academic freedom.
3. Faculty Members neither invidiously discriminate against nor harass colleagues. They respect and defend the free inquiry of associates, even when it leads to findings and conclusions that differ from their own. Faculty Members acknowledge intellectual pluralism and strive to be objective in their professional judgment of colleagues. Faculty Members accept their share of responsibilities for the governance of their institutions.
4. As members of an academic institution, Faculty Members seek to be effective teachers and scholars. Faculty Members observe the stated regulations of the institution, provided the regulations do not contravene academic freedom, and maintain their right to criticize and seek revision. Faculty Members give due regard to their paramount responsibilities within their institution in determining the amount and character of work done outside it. When considering taking leaves of absence, permanently departing the university to pursue other opportunities, or other actions that could interrupt or end their service, Faculty Members recognize the effect of their decision upon the program of the institutions and give all due notice possible of their intentions out of respect for their colleagues.
5. As members of their community, Faculty Members have the rights and obligations of other citizens. Faculty Members measure the urgency of these obligations in light of their responsibilities to their subject, to their students, to their profession, and to their institution. When they speak or act as private persons, they avoid creating the impression of speaking or acting for their university. As citizens engaged in a profession that depends upon

freedom for its health and integrity, Faculty members have a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom.

#### **E. Definitions**

1. Faculty Member. For purposes of Section 330.110, Faculty Member includes all regular and non-regular academic staff appointments as defined in Sections 310.020 and 310.035 of the Collected Rules and Regulations.
2. Respondent. Respondent is the Faculty Member alleged to have committed Inappropriate Conduct.
3. Complainant. The Complainant is the University student, staff, administrator or faculty member who files a Complaint. Within five (5) business days from the final decision, Complainant will receive notice that the process has concluded and at what stage (Informal Resolution, Dean Decision, Provost Review and Decision or Appeal to the Chancellor).
4. Complaint. Complaints must be submitted in writing using the applicable online form and identify the alleged Inappropriate Conduct by the Respondent.
5. Informal Resolution. Informal Resolution is the preliminary efforts made to resolve the Complaint through discussions or facilitated dialogue in the unit where the Respondent has a primary academic appointment.
6. Investigator. The Provost selects the Investigator who will be the campus ombudsperson or other appropriate individual as determined by the Provost.
7. Dean. Dean as listed throughout the policy is the Dean where the Respondent has a primary academic appointment.
8. Faculty Panel. The Faculty Panel consists of three tenured professors appointed by the Faculty Council/Senate Chair from outside of the academic unit in which the Respondent has a primary academic appointment. The Faculty Panel members may be chosen from the standing Grievance Resolution Panel.

#### **F. Inappropriate Conduct**

Inappropriate Conduct for which Faculty Members could be subject to sanctions includes but is not limited to the actions below:

1. Violating University rules, regulations, policies or procedures, including but not limited to those related to conduct of academic duties and those governing the use of University funds and University facilities.
2. Violation of Professional Ethics, as set forth in Section 330.110.D above, and professional guidelines that apply to the field of the Faculty member. Faculty Members have a special obligation to adhere to such professional ethics and responsibilities as these form the basis for the academic reputation of the University.
3. Threats, intimidation, harassment, physical abuse, or any other conduct that endangers the health or safety of any person, or unreasonably interferes

with a person's ability to perform University duties including teaching, research, administration, or other University activities, including public service functions on or off campus.

4. Neglecting or refusing to perform reasonable assigned teaching duties, or quitting duties without due notice in accordance with the Collected Rules and Regulations.
5. Intentional and habitual neglect of duty in the performance of academic responsibilities.
6. Willfully damaging or destroying, improperly taking, or misappropriating property owned by the University, a member of the University community, or a campus visitor, or any property used in connection with a University function or approved activity, or unauthorized use of University facilities, or the attempt to commit any such conduct.
7. Forgery, alteration, misuse of University documents, records, or identification, or knowingly furnishing false information to the University.
8. The illegal or unauthorized possession or use of firearms, explosives, other weapons or hazardous chemicals.
9. Conviction of a felony that is clearly related to performance of University duties or academic activities.

#### **G. Filing a Complaint**

1. The Complaint must be submitted in writing using the applicable online form and identify the alleged Inappropriate Conduct by the Respondent.
2. The Provost of each campus will ensure the approved form is easily accessible for the submission of a Complaint of Inappropriate Conduct.
3. Following submission, the Dean will receive the Complaint.
4. If a Dean is the Respondent because of conduct relating to the Faculty appointment, the Provost will receive the Complaint instead. The Provost shall then serve the role described for the Dean for all further actions described below, and the Provost's recommendations will be delivered to the Chancellor.

#### **H. Informal Resolution**

1. Informal Resolution is the preliminary efforts made to resolve the Complaint through discussions or facilitated dialogue in the unit where the Respondent has a primary academic appointment.
2. The Dean coordinates Informal Resolution.
3. Informal Resolution should typically be concluded within ten (10) business days of the Dean's receipt of the Complaint.
4. Any Informal Resolution should be documented in writing and filed with the Dean.

#### **I. Investigation**

1. If an Informal Resolution is not reached, the Dean will provide to the Respondent a copy of the Complaint and a written notice that an investigation will be conducted (“Notice of Investigation”). The Notice of Investigation shall contain sufficient information to inform the Respondent of the alleged inappropriate conduct being investigated.
2. Within five (5) business days from receipt of the Notice of Investigation, the Respondent may provide a response to the Complaint (“Response”) to the Dean.
3. The Dean will forward the Complaint, the Response if provided and any notes from the Informal Resolution Process to the Investigator.
4. The Provost selects the Investigator, who will be the campus ombudsperson or other appropriate individual as determined by the Provost.
5. The Investigator may interview the Complainant, the Respondent and witnesses and gather written documents or other relevant information.
6. The investigation shall typically be complete within ten (10) business days.
7. The Investigator prepares a written investigation report, which will provide a summary of the information gathered and attaches a copy of the Complaint and the Response. The investigation report and attachments are sent to the Dean and the Respondent.

**J. Dean Decision**

1. The Dean shall review the Complaint, any Response and the investigation report.
2. The Dean will meet with the Respondent typically within five (5) business days of receiving the investigation report unless the Respondent refuses to meet.
3. The Dean may but is not required to meet with Complainant.
4. The Dean will make a decision as to whether or not the Respondent is responsible for Inappropriate Conduct.
5. If the Dean finds that the Respondent is responsible for Inappropriate Conduct, the Dean will decide the appropriate sanctions.
6. The Dean will notify Respondent of the decision of responsibility and if applicable, sanctions, typically within ten (10) business days of receipt of the investigation report.
7. If the sanction is suspension, the Dean will forward a copy of the decision to the Faculty Panel and Provost.

**K. Faculty Panel Review**

1. The Faculty Panel consists of three tenured professors appointed by the Faculty Council/Senate Chair from outside of the academic unit in which the Respondent has a primary academic appointment. The Faculty Panel members may be chosen from the standing Grievance Resolution Panel.

2. Any sanction for suspension, paid or unpaid, will be reviewed by a Faculty Panel.
3. The Faculty Panel sends a recommendation to the Provost stating either the Panel's agreement or disagreement with the suspension and the grounds for the Panel's recommendation within twenty (20) business days of receiving the Dean's decision.

**L. Provost Review and Decision**

1. All decisions by the Dean for suspension, paid or unpaid, will be automatically sent to the Provost for review and decision.
2. For all decisions for sanctions other than suspension, Respondent may request review and decision by the Provost by sending the request for reconsideration to the Provost within five (5) business days of receipt of the decision letter.
3. The Provost shall review the Complaint, the Response if any, the investigation report, the decision by the Dean and Faculty Panel recommendation, if applicable.
4. The Provost may but is not required to meet with the Respondent, the Complainant and the Dean.
5. The Provost may affirm, modify or reverse the Dean's decision of Inappropriate Conduct and/or Sanctions.
6. The decision by the Provost will be sent to the Respondent and the Dean typically within five (5) business days of receiving all applicable information.

**M. Sanctions**

The following sanctions may be imposed upon Respondent found to have committed Inappropriate Conduct. Multiple sanctions maybe imposed for any single violation. Sanctions include but are not limited to:

1. Warning. A notice in writing to the Respondent and included in the Respondent's personnel file indicating that there is a finding of Inappropriate Conduct.
2. Loss of Privileges. Denial of specified privileges of Respondent for a designated period of time. This may include but is not limited to suspending travel privileges and/or payment of travel or conference expenses, restricting use of laboratories or offices, limiting contact with students, or suspending access to teaching or research assistance or grant accounts, service on University committees or representation of the University on official business. The loss of privileges sanction may not be applied in manner to create a constructive suspension.
3. Education or Training. Respondent may be required to complete education or training.

4. Restitution. Compensation by Respondent for loss, damage or injury to the University or University property. This may take the form of appropriate service and/or monetary or material replacement.
5. Suspension. Separation of the Respondent from the University for a definite period of time, after which the Respondent is eligible to return. Conditions for return should be specified. Suspension may be with or without salary (full or partial) for a period not to exceed one-half of the individual's normal appointment period. During the suspension period, health and retirement benefits shall be maintained.
6. Referral to the Chancellor to consider/initiate dismissal for cause as detailed in Section 310.060 of the Collected Rules and Regulations.

**N. Appeal to the Chancellor**

1. Respondent may appeal the decision by the Provost to the Chancellor, by filing an appeal stating the grounds or reasons for appeal in detail within five (5) business days after receipt of notification of the decision. The appeal shall be limited to the following grounds:
  - a. A procedural error occurred that significantly impacted the outcome of the finding or sanctions, e.g., substantiated bias or material deviation from established procedures.
  - b. To consider new evidence, unavailable during the original resolution process or investigation that could substantially impact the original findings or sanction.
  - c. The sanction falls outside the range typically imposed for this offense, or for the cumulative disciplinary record of Respondent.
2. Within five (5) business days of receipt of the appeal from Respondent, the Chancellor shall provide a copy of the appeal to the Provost.
3. Within five (5) business days of receiving a copy of the appeal, the Provost may file a response to the appeal.
4. Within ten (10) business days of receiving the Provost's response to the appeal, the Chancellor shall provide a determination in writing to Provost and Respondent. The Chancellor can affirm, modify or reverse the decision of the Provost.
5. The determination of the Chancellor is final and not subject to further review under the Academic Grievance Procedure in Section 370.010 of the Collected Rules and Regulations.
6. Status during appeal – The Respondent may petition the Chancellor in writing for permission to stay the imposed sanction pending final determination of the appeal. The Chancellor may permit the stay of sanctions under such conditions as may be designated pending completion of the appeal, provided such continuance will not seriously disrupt the University or constitute a danger to the health, safety or welfare of members

of the University community. If a stay is granted, any final sanctions imposed shall be effective from the date of the final decision.

**O. Complainant**

Within five (5) business days from the final decision, Complainant will receive notice that the process has concluded and at what stage (Information Resolution, Dean Decision, Provost Decision or Appeal).

**P. Notice**

All communication including notices, request for reconsideration and appeal may be sent via a secure platform approved by the University. The Dean's decision and when applicable the Provost's Decision and the Chancellor's determination shall be sent to the Respondent via the approved platform. If transmission through the approved platform is not feasible, communications may be made by University e-mail and certified mail.

**Q. Extensions of Time**

For good cause, the Chancellor or Provost may grant reasonable extensions of time for any of the proposed time deadlines in the Standard Faculty of Conduct.

**R. Behavior during Process**

1. All individuals involved in the Standards of Faculty Conduct process should keep the matters confidential and only share the information with those who have legitimate educational or business need to know. This rule shall not preclude the placement of notes in the record of a Respondent that may be used for subsequent action in determining ongoing professional misconduct, grievances, or other University proceedings.
2. Nothing in this rule shall be construed as interfering with the ability of any University member to contact law enforcement when necessary.
3. All University employees must be truthful in providing testimony during this process, and all non-testimonial evidence must be genuine and accurate.
4. All participants, including the Complainant and Respondent, are expected to conduct themselves in a professional manner.
5. False reporting is making an intentional false Complaint as opposed to a report or accusation, which, even if erroneous, is made in good faith. False reporting is a serious offense that would be a breach of professional ethics and subject to appropriate disciplinary action.

**S. Reporting Data**

Campus level statistical data, including the types and numbers of complaints and findings of Inappropriate Conduct, as well as sanctions imposed, shall be reported annually to the Intercampus Faculty Cabinet for transmission to each campus Faculty Senate/Council.

**T. Records**

Records of complaints and decisions will be kept in a platform approved by the University, which will be available to the Unit in which the Respondent has a primary academic appointment and accessible in accordance with applicable

University policies governing employment records. The “Record of the Case in the Section 330.110 Process” will include, if applicable, the Complaint, the Response, the investigation report, the decision by the Dean, the recommendation by the Faculty Panel, the decision by the Provost and the determination by the Chancellor. The Record of the Case in the Section 330.110 Process will be kept for a minimum of seven (7) years following final solution.

E. Amendment, CRR 370.010 Academic Grievance

that the amendments to Collected Rules and Regulations 370.010, Academic Grievance Procedure as presented, be approved.

**370.010 Academic Grievance Procedure**

Bd. Min. 4-8-05; Extended Bd. Min. 4-4-08; Amended 12-12-08; 04-03-09; Bd. Min. 6-17-11. [The 6-17-11 version replaces 370.015 (Pilot Academic Grievance Procedure), and the prior version of 370.010.] Amended 6-19-14; Revised 2-5-15; Amended 2-9-17; Bd. Min. 9-24-20; Amended 11-20-25.

The Board of Curators, the faculty, and the administration of the University of Missouri recognize the importance of providing a prompt and efficient procedure for fair and equitable resolutions of grievances with the University without fear of prejudice or reprisal for initiating a grievance or participating in its settlement. To the extent possible, all grievances should be settled through informal discussions at the lowest administrative level, and disputed matters should be processed as formal grievances only when either party feels that a fair and equitable solution has not been reached in the informal discussions. Accordingly, the members of the faculty as defined in the rules and regulations, Section 310.020.A, including faculty who hold an administrative title or function, are encouraged to use this procedure for grievances relating to their status or activities as faculty members. Former faculty members may only use this process to grieve the non-renewal of their employment. This grievance procedure should not be used in connection with a matter relating to any administrative title or function which the faculty member currently holds or may also have had. The grievance procedure should not be used in connection with a matter relating to a complaint of discrimination or harassment, including sexual harassment. Such complaints should be addressed in accordance with the applicable Title IX or Equity Resolution Process:

Section 600.030 Resolution Process for Resolving Complaints of Sexual Harassment under Title IX

Section 600.040 Equity Resolution Process for Resolving Complaints of Discrimination and Harassment against a Faculty Member or Student or Student Organization

Section 600.050 Equity Resolution Process for Resolving Complaints of Discrimination and Harassment against a Staff Member or the University of Missouri  
The success of this procedure is contingent upon the good faith effort of all participants. It is the responsibility of the Faculty Council, Senate and Campus Administration, and the University President to encourage and sustain such efforts, and to ensure that the procedure is followed in its entirety in its spirit as well as letter. The Chancellors will be responsible for ensuring that the determination reached in a grievance is implemented. The Faculty Council/Senate Oversight Committee will monitor this process, as per Section 370.010.C.11.c.

**A. Definition:**

1. A grievance is defined as an allegation that one or more of the following has occurred:
  - a. There has been a violation, misinterpretation, or arbitrary application of written University rule, policy, regulation, or procedure which applies personally to the faculty member, notwithstanding that it may apply to others within or without the grievant's unit, relating to the privileges, responsibilities, or terms and conditions of employment as a member of the faculty.
  - b. There has been an infringement on the academic freedom of the faculty member.
2. This policy shall not be interpreted in such a manner as to violate the legal rights of religious organizations or the recruiting rights of military organizations associated with the Armed Forces or the Department of Homeland Security of the United States of America.

**B. Termination and Non-Renewal of Regular Faculty**

1. The termination of regular faculty on continuous appointments, on whatever grounds, is governed by the Academic Tenure Regulations (Section 310.020) and the Procedures in Cases of Dismissal for Cause (Section 310.060) rather than this Grievance Procedure. Any matter related to the termination of regular faculty on continuous appointment cannot be grieved under Section 370.010.
2. The non-renewal of regular faculty on regular term appointments, on whatever grounds, is governed by the Academic Tenure Regulations (Section 310.020) rather than this Grievance Procedure. As laid out in Section 310.020.F.3., if a tenure-track faculty member's non-renewal has been unsuccessfully appealed to the Chancellor, the faculty member may use this grievance process only to allege that the decision resulted from inadequate consideration or that the decision was based significantly on consideration violative of academic freedom.

**C. Grievance Process:**

1. Grievance Resolution Panel (GRP):

- a. Grievances shall be addressed by a standing GRP consisting of a senior administrator and two or four tenured faculty members:
    - (1) Two models for the GRP are possible and the model employed by each campus, as well as the number of GRP members, will be determined by the Chancellor in consultation with Faculty Council/Senate.
      - (a) Model A: Two or four GRP faculty members (plus 2 alternate faculty members) will be chosen by the Faculty Council (FC) or Faculty Senate (FS) after consultation with the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee (hereafter "Chancellor"), via an application process designed by the FC or FS.
      - (b) Model B: The GRP will consist of two panels, each with two or four tenured faculty members and two alternate faculty members. Faculty will be chosen by FC/FS as described in Model A above.
    - (2) Faculty members may be granted release time to compensate for the effort devoted to the GRP. The amount of release time will be negotiated between the Chancellor and the faculty member's dean/department chair.
    - (3) The senior administrator member of the GRP under either Model A or B will be appointed by the Chancellor after consultation with the FC or FS.
      - b. GRP members will serve up to three-year renewable terms pending FC or FS and Chancellor approval. In the interest of continuity and consistency, faculty terms on the GRP will be staggered.
      - c. A conflict of interest is a situation in which financial or other personal considerations have the potential to compromise or bias professional judgment and objectivity.
        - (1) In the case of a conflict of interest of the senior administrative member of the GRP, the Chancellor will appoint an alternate senior administrator after consultation with the FC/FS.
        - (2) In case of a conflict of interest of a faculty member of the GRP, the FC/FS will appoint alternate faculty members of the GRP. Release time, if any, for faculty alternates will be negotiated between the Chancellor and the alternate's dean/department chair, as needed.
2. Faculty Council/Senate Oversight Committee (OC):
    - a. The OC will monitor the grievance process. (Additional details on OC committee are provided below in Section 370.010 C.11.)
  3. Filing a grievance:
    - a. A faculty member files a grievance by completing the Faculty Grievance Filing Form ("Filing Form"), which shall be substantially similar to the content of Appendix A. Following submission, the GRP will receive the grievance.
      - (1) The grievant may submit any relevant evidence/attachments that the grievant would like to be considered by the GRP as well as a list of additional sources of information, including persons with knowledge, subject to the limitations as to length

specified on the Filing Form.

(2) The grievant may also request that the GRP gather any additional relevant evidence that the grievant believes exists and that is not in the grievant's possession or to which the grievant does not have access. Taking into account considerations of FERPA, HIPAA, attorney/client privilege and impact on any party or university unit, the GRP will make reasonable attempts to obtain information that it deems relevant and central to the grieved matter(s).

b. There are three requirements the grievant must meet when filing:

(1) The grieved act must meet the definitional criteria in Section 370.010.A.

(2) The grievant must demonstrate that the grievant attempted to informally resolve the complaint before filing the grievance.

(3) The grievant must file the grievance within one hundred and eighty (180) calendar days after the grievant knew, or reasonably should have known, of the occurrence of the event or omission out of which the grievance has arisen. In situations where the grievance arises out of a series of events or omissions, the filing period shall be measured from the last event or omission in the series.

(a) A faculty member who does not initiate a grievance in accordance with the 180-day calendar limit specified herein shall be deemed for purposes of these procedures to have accepted the last decision rendered by an appropriate administrative officer.

c. If the GRP determines that neither of these requirements (Section 370.010.C.3.) are met, they may reject the grievance. Rejections of grievances cannot be appealed.

4. Processing a grievance:

a. The GRP will meet with the grievant to discuss the complaint and gain a greater understanding of the issues.

b. The GRP will also name a university respondent, in consultation with both the Chancellor and the Chair/President of Faculty Council/Senate or their designee.

c. Early in the process, the GRP may hold one face-to-face meeting simultaneously with both the grievant and the person against whom the grievance is directed.

d. Both the grievant and the respondent have the right to consult with an attorney of their choice, but that attorney may not be present at any meetings with the GRP. Both the grievant and the respondent may have an advisor present at meetings with the GRP but the advisor must be a current university employee and cannot act in the capacity of an attorney. The advisor may not make presentations or statements to the GRP, or any other parties present.

e. The university respondent will be provided with the Filing Form and any other information gathered that the GRP deems relevant, and will be required to write a rebuttal statement.

(1) The respondent may include any relevant evidence/attachments that the respondent would like to be considered by the GRP, as well as a list of additional sources of information, including persons with knowledge.

(2) The respondent may request that the GRP gather any additional relevant evidence that the respondent believes exists and that is not in the respondent's possession or to which the respondent does not have access. Taking into account considerations of FERPA, HIPAA, attorney/client privilege and impact on any party or university entity, the GRP will make reasonable attempts to obtain information that it deems relevant and central to the grieved matter(s).

(3) The respondent has 15 calendar days from receipt of the Filing Form to write this rebuttal statement. The respondent may submit a written request to the GRP for a time extension to prepare the rebuttal. Such extensions will be granted at the sole discretion of the GRP.

- f. The GRP will investigate, gather evidence, meet individually or jointly with either or both parties, as well as other relevant individuals. There shall be no formal hearing in this process.
- g. Based on its own investigation, the GRP may collect evidence that it deems as having relevance and centrality to the grieved matters.
- h. The GRP shall receive the cooperation of campus administrators, the collegiate dean, the department chair, the grieving faculty member, other faculty members, other University employees, and students enrolled at the University. It will be the duty of all such individuals to provide, in a timely fashion, all requested non-testimonial evidence relevant to the case.
- i. The GRP will consult with University Legal Counsel concerning legal issues of evidence, including but not limited to FERPA regulations, attorney/client privilege, and HIPAA-protected materials.
- j. All University employees must be truthful in providing testimony to the GRP and all non-testimonial evidence must be genuine and accurate. False testimony, fraudulent evidence, refusal to cooperate with the GRP and breaches of confidentiality (see Section 370.010.C.12) may be the basis for disciplinary action against the uncooperative individual.
- k. The grievant(s) and respondent(s) shall be promptly provided with a copy of all evidence collected by the GRP, or in the case of materials deemed confidential by the GRP, a summary of this evidence.
- l. The GRP will have three months from the date of a correctly filed grievance (see Section 370.010.C.3.a) to conduct an investigation and render findings and recommendations, if any.
- m. Prior to rendering its findings, the GRP will inform the parties in writing of their tentative findings and the basis for these findings, including documents collected and information received orally. The parties shall meet jointly with the GRP and each will have the opportunity to provide a 30 minute oral presentation to the GRP

regarding their perspective on these tentative findings. Each party will be provided with the opportunity to make one ten minute rebuttal to the other party's presentation.

5. Potential GRP Actions

- a. The GRP has broad administrative latitude to address grievances.
- b. At any point in the process, the GRP may:

(1) Facilitate a settlement agreement between the grievant and the University of Missouri.

(2) Make a determination that the grievance has no merit. This determination is not appealable.

(3) Terminate a grievance if a lawsuit related to the substantive content of the grievance, as determined by the GRP, is initiated at any time. The grievant and the respondent are immediately released from requirements imposed by Section 370.010.C.12. This action is not appealable.

- c. At the conclusion of their investigation, the GRP shall make findings and recommendations that may include, but are not limited to, the following, which will be provided to the Chancellor, Provost, the parties, and the Oversight Committee Representative:

(1) A finding in favor of the grievant and the recommendation of remedies, if any, to resolve the grievance.

(2) A finding that both the grievant and the respondent have legitimate complaints and the recommendation of remedies, if any, to resolve both sets of complaints.

(3) A finding against the grievant with no recommendations for remedies to address the grievant's complaint.

(4) A finding that the respondent was subject to some adversity in connection with the aggrieved act and the recommendation of remedies, if any, to alleviate this adversity.

- d. In the interest of solving problems, the GRP, which is in a unique position to view university functions from multiple viewpoints, may occasionally identify areas of functioning of the University of Missouri that could be improved or changed to prevent future problems. These findings and recommendations shall be provided periodically to the Provost, the Chancellor, and the Chair of Faculty Council/Senate.

6. Appeal of the GRP findings:

- a. Within 15 calendar days, either the grievant or the respondent may appeal the GRP findings and recommendations, if any, to the Chancellor using the Grievance Appeal Form, which shall be substantially similar to the content of Appendix B.

- b. The Chancellor will have 30 calendar days from the time it is received to act on the appeal. If the Chancellor needs more time, then the Chancellor shall provide reasons and a new estimated time via a letter to all parties (grievant, respondent, GRP, Oversight Committee representative). If the Chancellor does not act within 30 calendar days and does not provide such a letter, the decision of the GRP becomes final.
  - c. If neither party appeals the GRP decision within 15 days, then the Chancellor will have an additional 30 days to accept or reject the findings of the GRP in whole or in part, and accept, reject or modify the recommendations of the GRP. If the Chancellor needs more time, then the Chancellor shall provide reasons and a new estimated time via a letter to all parties (grievant, respondent, GRP, Oversight Committee representative). If the Chancellor does not act within such additional 30 calendar days and does not provide such a letter, the decision of the GRP becomes final.
7. Chancellor's review of the GRP Decision:
- a. In reviewing the GRP decision:
    - (1) The Chancellor may speak to the grievant and the respondent. If the Chancellor meets with one party, however, then the Chancellor must also meet with the other party as well, although not necessarily at the same time.
    - (2) The Chancellor will have access to all relevant documents.
    - (3) The Chancellor may seek additional information or input as needed. If the Chancellor seeks additional information, however, then the Chancellor shall inform the GRP and the OC representative to the grievance under consideration what additional information or input the Chancellor has sought.
  - b. The Chancellor may accept or reject the findings of the GRP in whole or in part, and accept, reject or modify the recommendations of the GRP. If the Chancellor rejects or modifies, the Chancellor shall meet with the GRP and the OC representative prior to rendering the final decision.
  - c. The Chancellor's decision is final.
  - d. Upon rendering of the final decision, the Chancellor will notify the grievant, respondent, GRP and Oversight Committee representative regarding the final outcome and remedies, if any.
8. Grievant's acceptance of the final decision:
- a. Once a decision is final, the grievant has 15 calendar days to provide written acceptance or non-acceptance of the decision and any recommended remedies.

- b. The grievant uses the Grievance Acceptance Form, which shall be substantially similar to the content of Appendix C, to file a response to the final decision.
9. If the grievant fails to provide a written acceptance of the final decision or submits a Grievance Acceptance Form that rejects the final decision, the grievant suffers the loss of all remedies favorable to the grievant.
10. Grievant's legal rights:
  - a. Upon acceptance of the final decision, the grievant waives the right to bring a lawsuit concerning all waivable matters that were a subject of the grievance.
  - b. If a lawsuit related to the substantive content of the grievance is initiated at any time, then this grievance process will immediately end and the grievant and the respondent are immediately released from requirements imposed by Section 370.010 C.12.
  - c. Upon rejection of the final decision, the grievant and the respondent are released from the confidentiality requirements imposed by Section 370.010 C.12.
11. Oversight:
  - a. There will be a Faculty Council/Senate Oversight Committee (OC), whose purpose will be to monitor the Grievance process as neutral observers and provide feedback on the process to the Faculty Council or Faculty Senate, the faculty and the Provost's and Chancellor's Office.
    - (1) The OC will consist of 3-5 tenured faculty appointed by Faculty Council or Faculty Senate for up to three year staggered terms.
    - (2) Chair of the OC will be a member of the Faculty Council or Faculty Senate.
      - b. OC monitoring of individual grievances:
        - (1) A member of the OC will be appointed to each grievance case following receipt of the Grievance Filing Form by the GRP. OC members will rotate grievance case membership unless a conflict of interest is identified.
        - (2) The OC representative will sit in on all GRP deliberations and will be copied on all correspondence. If during deliberations, the OC member has process or procedural concerns, the member may raise the concerns with the GRP, without the grievant or respondent or any other parties present.
        - (3) The OC representative is an observer: The OC representative may not participate in the deliberations or rendering of findings and recommendations by the GRP.
        - (4) GRP requests for extensions of up to two weeks may be approved by the OC representative on that case. Any additional requests for extensions must be approved by the OC. The OC shall rule on such requests within five calendar days from the receipt of the request.

(5) The OC representative shall not discuss the ongoing grievance with anyone, including other OC members, except any information necessary to the OC committee decision regarding time extension requests from the GRP.

(6) At the close of each grievance case, the OC representative shall present to the other OC members, and the GRP, a summative and evaluative report of the process as it relates to that particular case. These reports will not reveal any substantive information concerning grievances including but not limited to supporting materials, specific findings, and identifying information about any participant.

c. OC monitoring of the grievance process:

(1) The OC will continually monitor the overall grievance process.

(2) On a yearly basis the OC shall present a summative and evaluative report to Faculty Council or Faculty Senate Executive Committee, the Provost and the Chancellor.

(3) The OC will monitor the implementation of remedies resulting from the final grievance decision by communication with relevant parties, and in cases in which remedies are not being implemented the Faculty Council/ Faculty Senate will be notified.

12. Confidentiality:

a. All parties involved (grievant, respondent, GRP and OC) must agree to maintain strict confidentiality regarding any substantive information concerning grievances including but not limited to supporting materials, specific findings, and identifying information about any participant. The substance of the cases shall not be discussed at any time, before or after a final decision is made, except as provided in Section 370.010.C.5.b.(3), and 370.010.C.10.c. Additionally, information related to claims of discrimination shall be reported to the Equity Officer or Title IX Coordinator.

The motion carried unanimously (9-0) by voice vote with no abstentions.

## **Finance**

Curator Krewson provided time for discussion of committee business.

Fiscal Year 2025 Financial Status Report, UM – presented by Executive Vice President Rapp (slides and information on file)

## **Academic, Student Affairs, Research and Economic Development**

Curator Sinuefield provided time for discussion of committee business.

UMSL Annual Intercollegiate Athletics Report – presented by UMSL Executive Director of Athletics Dr. Holly Sheilley (slides on file for this information only item)

BS in Economics, University of Missouri-Kansas City

It was recommended by Chancellor C. Mauli Agrawal, endorsed by President of the University of Missouri Mun Y. Choi, recommended by the Academic, Student Affairs and Research & Economic Development Committee, moved by Curator Blitz, seconded by Curator Williams that the following action be approved:

that the University of Missouri-Kansas City be authorized to submit the attached proposal for a BS in Economics to the Coordinating Board for Higher Education for approval.

Roll call vote of the Committee:

The motion carried unanimously (4-0) by voice vote with no abstentions.

It was recommended by Chancellor C. Mauli Agrawal, endorsed by President of the University of Missouri Mun Y. Choi, recommended by the Academic, Student Affairs and Research & Economic Development Committee, moved by Curator Sinquefield, seconded by Curator Krewson that the following action be approved:

that the University of Missouri-Kansas City be authorized to submit the attached proposal for a BS in Economics to the Coordinating Board for Higher Education for approval.

Roll call vote of the Board:

The motion carried unanimously (9-0) by voice vote with no abstentions.

BS in Data Science, Missouri University of Science and Technology

It was recommended by Chancellor Mohammad Dehghani, endorsed by President of the University of Missouri Mun Y. Choi, recommended by the Academic, Student Affairs and Research & Economic Development Committee, moved by Curator Blitz, seconded by Curator Williams that the following action be approved:

that the Missouri University of Science and Technology be authorized to submit the attached proposal for a BS in Data Science to the Coordinating Board for Higher Education for approval.

Roll call vote of the Committee:

The motion carried unanimously (4-0) by voice vote with no abstentions.

It was recommended by Chancellor Mohammad Dehghani, endorsed by President of the University of Missouri Mun Y. Choi, recommended by the Academic, Student Affairs and Research & Economic Development Committee, moved by Curator Sinquefield, seconded by Curator Krewson that the following action be approved:

that the Missouri University of Science and Technology be authorized to submit the attached proposal for a BS in Data Science to the Coordinating Board for Higher Education for approval.

Roll call vote of the Board:

The motion carried unanimously (9-0) by voice vote with no abstentions.

#### MS in Data Science, Missouri University of Science and Technology

It was recommended by Chancellor Mohammad Dehghani, endorsed by President of the University of Missouri Mun Y. Choi, recommended by the Academic, Student Affairs and Research & Economic Development Committee, moved by Curator Blitz, seconded by Curator Williams that the following action be approved:

that the Missouri University of Science and Technology be authorized to submit the attached proposal for a MS in Data Science to the Coordinating Board for Higher Education for approval.

Roll call vote of the Committee:

The motion carried unanimously (4-0) by voice vote with no abstentions.

It was recommended by Chancellor Mohammad Dehghani, endorsed by President of the University of Missouri Mun Y. Choi, recommended by the Academic, Student Affairs and Research & Economic Development Committee, moved by Curator Sinquefield, seconded by Curator Krewson that the following action be approved:

that the Missouri University of Science and Technology be authorized to submit the attached proposal for a MS in Data Science to the Coordinating Board for Higher Education for approval.

Roll call vote of the Board:

The motion carried unanimously (9-0) by voice vote with no abstentions.

#### MBA in Business Analytics, University of Missouri-Columbia

It was recommended and endorsed by President of the University of Missouri Mun Y. Choi, recommended by the Academic, Student Affairs and Research & Economic Development Committee, moved by Curator Williams seconded by Curator Blitz that the following action be approved:

that the University of Missouri-Columbia be authorized to submit the attached proposal for an MBA in Analytics to the Coordinating Board for Higher Education for approval.

Roll call vote of the Committee:

The motion carried unanimously (4-0) by voice vote with no abstentions.

It was recommended and endorsed by President of the University of Missouri Mun Y. Choi, recommended by the Academic, Student Affairs and Research & Economic Development

Committee, moved by Curator Sinquefield seconded by Curator Krewson that the following action be approved:

that the University of Missouri-Columbia be authorized to submit the attached proposal for an MBA in Analytics to the Coordinating Board for Higher Education for approval.

Roll call vote of the Board:

The motion carried unanimously (9-0) by voice vote with no abstentions.

### **Health Affairs Committee Chair Report**

Executive Vice Chancellor Report – presented by Richard Barohn, MD (slides on file for this information only item)

The minutes for the August 28, 2025 Health Affairs Committee meeting were approved at the November 13, 2025 meeting. All information reports presented at the committee meeting are on file with the minutes of this meeting.

### **General Business**

Good and Welfare of the Board - Draft February 5, 2026 Board of Curators meeting agenda – no discussion (on file)

2025 Board Year Comments and the Election of 2026 Board Officers – no materials

Election of Board of Curators Chair, 2026

Upon the motion of Curator Sinquefield, Curator Todd Graves was nominated to serve as Chair of the Board of Curators for the term January 1, 2026 through December 31, 2026. The nomination was seconded by Curator Blitz.

The motion carried unanimously (9-0) by voice vote with no abstentions.

Election of Board of Curators Vice Chair, 2026

Upon the motion of Curator Sinquefield, Curator Robert Blitz was nominated to serve as Vice Chair of the Board of Curators for the term January 1, 2026 through December 31, 2026. The nomination was seconded by Curator Krewson.

The motion carried unanimously (9-0) by voice vote with no abstentions.

Resolution for Executive Session of the Board of Curators Meeting November 20, 2025

It was moved by Curator Raines and seconded by Curator Williams, that there shall be an executive session with a closed record and closed vote of the Board of Curators meeting November 20, 2025 for consideration of:

- **Section 610.021(1), RSMo**, relating to matters identified in that provision, which include legal actions, causes of action or litigation, and confidential or privileged communications with counsel; and
- **Section 610.021(2), RSMo**, relating to matters identified in that provision, which include leasing, purchase, or sale of real estate; and
- **Section 610.021(3), RSMo**, relating to matters identified in that provision, which include hiring, firing, disciplining, or promoting of particular employees; and
- **Section 610.021(12), RSMo**, relating to matters identified in that provision, which include sealed bids and related documents and sealed proposals and related documents or documents related to a negotiated contract; and
- **Section 610.021 (13), RSMo**, relating to matters identified in that provision, which include individually identifiable personnel records, performance ratings, or records pertaining to employees or applicants for employment.
- **Section 610.021 (14), RSMo**, relating to matters identified in that provision, which include records which are protected from disclosure by law.

Roll call vote of the Board:

Curator Blitz voted yes.

Curator Fry voted yes.

Curator Graves voted yes.

Curator Krewson voted yes.

Curator Layman voted yes.  
Curator Luetkemeyer voted yes.  
Curator Raines voted yes.  
Curator Sinquefield voted yes.  
Curator Williams voted yes.

The motion carried.

The public session of the Board of Curators meeting recessed at 10:15 A.M. on Thursday, November 20, 2025.

### **BOARD OF CURATORS MEETING – EXECUTIVE SESSION**

A meeting of the University of Missouri Board of Curators was convened in executive session at 10:45 A.M., on Thursday, November 20, 2025, in Century Room C of the Millenium Student Center on the University of Missouri–St. Louis campus, pursuant to public notice given of said meeting. Curator Todd P. Graves, Chair of the Board of Curators, presided over the meeting.

#### Present

The Honorable Robert D. Blitz  
The Honorable Robert W. Fry  
The Honorable Todd P. Graves  
The Honorable Lyda Krewson  
The Honorable Jeffrey L. Layman  
The Honorable Blaine Luetkemeyer  
The Honorable John M. Raines  
The Honorable Jeanne C. Sinquefield  
The Honorable Michael A. Williams

#### Also Present

Dr. Mun Y. Choi, President, University of Missouri  
Mr. Mark A. Menghini, General Counsel  
Ms. Valerie Slayton, Secretary of the Board of Curators  
Dr. C. Mauli Agrawal, Chancellor, University of Missouri–Kansas City  
Dr. Leah Cohn, Assistant Dean for Admissions, College of Veterinary Medicine  
Dr. Mohammad Dehghani, Chancellor, Missouri University of Science and Technology  
Ms. Marsha Fischer, Vice President for Human Resources and Chief Human Resources Officer  
Mr. Michael Hoehn, Program Director, NextGen MURR  
Mr. Kevin Hogg, Treasurer, UM System  
Dr. John Middleton, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Chief of Staff

Mr. Ryan D. Rapp, Executive Vice President for Finance and Operations, Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer

Mr. Matt Sanford, Executive Director, MURR

Dr. Kristin Sobolik, Chancellor for University of Missouri-St. Louis

Dr. Srinand Sreevatsan, Dean, College of Veterinary Medicine

Mr. Laird Veatch, Athletic Director, University of Missouri-Columbia

### **General Business – Executive Session**

MU Athletics Update – presented by Athletic Director Veatch

No action taken by the Board.

Mr. Veatch left the meeting.

KWMU and KCUR Public Radio Stations Update – presented by Executive Vice President Rapp

No action taken by the Board.

Faculty Salary Competitiveness – presented by President Choi

No action taken by the Board.

President's Report – presented by President Choi

No action taken by the Board.

MURR Contract and Financial Update – presented by MURR Program Director Hoehn, MURR Executive Director Sanford, UM Treasurer Hogg, and Executive Vice President Rapp

No action taken by the Board.

Chancellor Deghani, Chancellor Agrawal, and Chancellor Sobolik, Mr. Sanford, and Mr. Hoehn left the meeting.

College of Veterinary Medicine Report – presented by Dr. Srinand Sreevatsan and Dr. Leah Cohn, College of Veterinary Medicine

No action taken by the presented by the Board.

Dr. Sreevatsan and Dr. Cohn left the meeting.

General Counsel's Report – presented by General Counsel Menghini

No action taken by the Board.

Curators' Only Report

No action taken by the Board.

**Consent Agenda – Executive Session**

It was endorsed by President Choi, moved by Curator Raines, and seconded by Curator Williams, that the following items be approved by consent agenda:

**CONSENT AGENDA**

A. Curators' Distinguished Professors Emeritus – Nelson Cowan, MU

that upon the recommendation of President Mun Y. Choi, the Provost, and the University of Missouri System Office of Academic Affairs, it is recommended that Professor Nelson Cowan be named to the position of University of Missouri Curators' Distinguished Professor Emeritus, effective 09/01/2025.

B. Curators' Distinguished Professor Emeritus Mian Liu, MU

that upon the recommendation of President Mun Y. Choi, the Provost, and the University of Missouri System Office of Academic Affairs, it is recommended that Professor Mian Liu be named to the position of University of Missouri Curators' Distinguished Professor Emeritus, effective 09/01/2025.

C. Curators' Distinguished Professor Emeritus Eric Sandvol, MU

that upon the recommendation of President Mun Y. Choi, the Provost, and the University of Missouri System Office of Academic Affairs, it is recommended that Professor Eric Sandvol be named to the position of University of Missouri Curators' Distinguished Professor Emeritus, effective 09/01/2025.

Roll call vote of the Board:

Curator Blitz voted yes.

Curator Fry voted yes.

Curator Graves voted yes.

Curator Krewson was absent.

Curator Layman voted yes.

Curator Luetkemeyer voted yes.  
Curator Raines voted yes.  
Curator Sinquefield voted yes.  
Curator Williams voted yes.

The motion carried.

### **General Business – Executive Session**

#### Adjourn, Board of Curators Meeting and Committee Meetings, November 20, 2025.

It was moved by Curator Fry and seconded by Curator Luetkemeyer that the Board of Curators meeting and committee meetings, November 20, 2025, be adjourned.

Roll call vote of the Board:

Curator Blitz voted yes.  
Curator Fry voted yes.  
Curator Graves voted yes.  
Curator Holloway voted yes.  
Curator Krewson voted yes.  
Curator Layman voted yes.  
Curator Sinquefield voted yes.  
Curator Wenneker voted yes.  
Curator Williams voted yes.

The motion carried

There being no other business to come before the Board of Curators, the meeting was adjourned at 2:30 P.M. on Thursday, November 20, 2025.

Respectfully submitted,



Valerie M. Slayton  
Secretary of the Board of Curators  
University of Missouri System

Approved by the Board of Curators on February 5, 2025