

Laura: Okay we have a quorum. We'll go ahead and get started. We'll call the meeting to order. Our first item is approval of the agenda. Is there?

Anna: I actually wanted to make a motion to introduce a new agenda item 7.7. As we communicated to Faculty Senate via email on April 11 last week, we are introducing a resolution to call the Academic Congress into session to discuss the presidential search process and the criteria needed in the MSU President. This is an action item which we will discuss and vote on.

Moderator: Could you identify yourself too, please?

Anna: Sorry, sorry. Anna Pegler-Gordon, James Madison College.

Laura: Time that would be a motion at that time-

Moderator: Yes.

Laura: after the discussion.

Moderator: Correct.

Laura: Okay. Is there a motion, a second? All in favor? Oppose? Okay. Is the agenda, is there a motion to approve the agenda so change? I got one. Second? All in favor? Oppose? Okay. All right. Approval of the draft minutes from March 20. Is there a motion to approve? Second? All in favor? Oppose? Okay. President Engler is not here so we'll go to the Provost.

Provost Youatt: No, Interim President Engler is not in the office this afternoon. I only had one comment and I think it's in response to some concern about an email that went out last Thursday that talked about the integration of IT on campus and what that would mean for those who you work with daily. I don't know that I can give a very comprehensive response but I will just give you an update. Needless to say, that has caused a great deal of concern across campus from not just your academic units but from the units that work alongside us, everything from the police department to residential housing services. There was a meeting this morning with President Engler before he left town with vice presidents that represent everyone from our advancement office that also had great concerns to RHS and others.

Provost Youatt: In that conversation, one of the things that I hope became clear maybe for the first time is that when we're talking about IT in our, particularly in our colleges, it means very different things in different places. We certainly have people, I have them in my office, analysts who are embedded in my office who certainly use the computer to do the work that they do, but their work is primarily as an analyst or as a research assistant. It is not as an IT professional. It isn't doing the kind of commodity work that that we think about.

Provost Youatt: I think in the ... I know in the days ahead there will be additional communication that talks about the next step, and the next step is trying to understand the work of the people in your units that are actually doing what is called IT work. Part of the problem that some of you have already identified is that in our job classifications we don't have much flexibility. There are lots of people who are in these broad classifications of IT who are, again, not doing the commodity IT work they're now working on. They're not taking care of your servers, they're not managing a whole set of things that you would really think of it's just IT.

Provost Youatt: The next step in this is really to have conversations, not just but actually in your colleges about who's doing what and then to sort that, because I don't believe, this is coming from me not from the folks who made the decision, but I don't believe the intention was ever to scoop up all of those people out of our units. I think it really was here's a list and all these people look like IT people and so it was not a very nuanced examination for a whole set of reasons but I think there is an opportunity, there will be an opportunity to try to do the sorting that frankly should've been done before that email went out.

Provost Youatt: What you can do today is share that information. That's information that I am glad for you to share that I talked about and really I think to try to assure people that all is well. No one is getting moved out of their offices, no one is ... it's not is chaotic. That email caused incredible chaos and I'm sorry about that. I didn't have anything to do with it but I'm sorry because these are the people that are our colleagues and people that we count on every day and to see how distressed they were is really unfortunate. It's beyond unfortunate. To the extent that you can help help them, you may reassure them that no one is coming in the middle of the night vest that say IT to take them out, which is the image that I frankly got by Sunday with all the calls and emails.

Provost Youatt: I spent a great deal of the weekend interacting with people by phone and email who just were really, really worried about the individual people but also how their work would proceed if there was some significant reorganization that didn't take into account who and what was being done. I've told you all I know. I don't think there's anything else. If there are questions and I can answer them and I'm glad to but I think that's pretty much what I know about IT and where it's going. I think there is a very concerted, I think there is a concerted effort to move servers into the data center for security reasons.

Lisa: That's a problem. That is not the ... your concern is not the only concern.

Moderator: Before you continue, could you identify yourself please?

Lisa: Lisa Lapidus, College of Natural Science. We have been fighting with central IT for years about the, a bit there need to grab all the authority and in my department, which is Physics which has maintained its own servers for decades because we didn't have anybody to do it before then, we are losing that. Now I understand the need for it, but I would like to impress upon you, and I would

like you to impress upon IT that the way they do almost everything is at the last second with no notice and no understanding of what is required from people when they make these edicts. They gave us basically days notice that they were going to start blocking certain websites that used to be available from off campus without using a VPN. Our IT person was running around trying to desperately get everything on the exception list because we had people trying to access certain websites. That's ridiculous. Why did it have to be done in 24 hours notice?

Lisa: Most of the things that they do are not done with any consultation for the people who actually have to do them. They assume that everybody at this university sits in an office with a single PC that's not attached to any equipment and has no understanding of how we actually do our computing, which is generally research oriented. I would really like somebody to tie their hands behind her back. Thank you.

Provost Youatt: Thank you. I took what I hope are good notes to share. I should have said that not, while I said that there is this ambition to consolidate servers, there is also a clear understanding that there are servers in particular areas doing particular work that cannot and will not be moved because they're part of very particular arrangements with the Department of Defense, with Department of Energy, so there are a set of reasons that things certainly will not be moved. But thank you, I think you made some broader points that need to be shared.

Deborah: Deborah Moriarty, College of Music. I'm not going to go into the IT problem but I would like to say that they do operate on this very last minute and they operate in a way that is completely authoritarian just acting on their own. I would like to be assured that they would need to go through some kind of, go through the steering committee, go through UCFA, go through UCSA, and then come to Faculty Senate before they make these huge changes that they not be allowed to simply operate on their own, that they are responsible to the faculty and they are responsive to the faculty. I think we all need to be assured that is the case. Thank you.

Laura: Thank you. Okay, so we'll move on. I wanted to note that I attended the first statewide meeting of the Faculty Senate chairs so that all the Faculty Senate chairs of the universities and colleges in Michigan were invited. This took place at U of M on April 7. Places like Ferris, Wayne State, Eastern Western Grand Valley, Andrews University had a representative. There was a discussion about a variety of issues, one of those was RVSM and we'll be hearing about that today. It was interesting. Some of those schools that they noted they're looking to us. They want to make sure that what's happened here doesn't occur there.

Laura: Some of those schools aren't mandatory reporters like we are. I found that we're moving in a direction where I think we ... I felt confident in the training that I've received so some faculty were talking about needing students to discuss the situation more so they can make a decision as to whether or not it's

reportable or not, and here we just, we report and because it's out of our lane we don't have the expertise to do that. They're here, other faculty talk about it in that way I was thinking, "Oh no! You need to report this." I found that interesting.

Laura: There was also ... that was on, RVSM was a major part of the discussions. There was discussion about forming a legislative committee that could have a strong voice for higher education within the state of Michigan. The group was looking towards doing that in the near future. They like the idea. I mentioned how we had talked about this having party chairs come and talk with us or legislature, and the other schools thought that was a good idea of what we're considering here. It was an interesting get-together, it's the first one and there's going to be another one next year, and hopefully they'll continue on so that we can work together with higher education across the state of Michigan.

Laura: I had just another note, in case some of you don't know the NSF is reviewing proposed policies in response to high-profile cases of sexual harassment by prominent scientists. Now, the NSF-funded investigators, their proposal is to have reports sent from the University to NSF and NSF then could potentially remove investigator funding. This is, right now, they're seeking input and some of the societies had provided input on this. This is up-and-coming. This idea of reporting is going higher up into the funding agencies.

Laura: We also, which will be sent out to you tomorrow, received a letter from the board which wasn't attached to the agenda. It was ... on April 11 the board remains committed, this is from Brian Breslin, I'll just touch on a couple of the key components of it. He is writing on behalf of the MSU Board of Trustees in response to the faculty's vote of no-confidence. The board remains committed to work alongside all members of the University community, including the Faculty Senate to strengthen our institution that includes a renewed commitment to transparency and proactive communication. To that end, several board members have been interviewing individuals to serve as an advisor during the search process for the permanent president to lead MSU. This advisor will provide guidance to the board assisting us in establishing a process that's inclusive and that provides MSU with the strongest possible presidential candidates.

Laura: We recently released a statement explaining this next step and that's on the Board of Trustee website. You'll get this email, in an email, this PDF image it has the website that you can click into.

Provost Youatt: Can I just make a comment on that. I'm not ... I don't meet with the board regularly, but I do, I had a conversation with them about this advisor or counselor role. What they are doing is speaking with AAU former presidents so presidents of AAU institutions. They intend to hire one of those individuals, a former president, to help them form a process. I happen to know and I don't know who but I know they're down to two female candidates who have served

as presidents of large research intensive universities. That person will help them think about a process, think about, advise them on things like eventually a search firm but they're trying to ... they don't know how to do this process and they've had lots of input about who wants to be on steering committees.

Provost Youatt: I think they have heard the need for input. The steering committee has done a really good job of explaining that more than once, and I think you could say they're fairly open to that, but I am hopeful that this individual that they hire can help steer them, but that also helps you calibrate where you are in this process. They're going to bring someone to campus to just talk about process and help them do this. There will be ... They don't have a search firm. They don't even have a search firm yet. They certainly don't have a position description. This summer, I think their entire plan is to just do, for those of you who've done searches for a Dean or an administrative position you know that one of the things that you do is actually create a prospectus of the role.

Provost Youatt: This summer part of the job will be to just try to put together a document that describes Michigan State University and its assets. I don't know what the timeline is but I can tell you at the pace they're going perhaps when we come back in the fall they will be at a point of actually talking about a search committee and a process. I think they're not rushing even though Pres. Engler has indicated that he is not wanting to stay, but I think that the timeline would be to be able to identify someone by spring who would be here in the fall of '19. Bringing in somebody that I think all of you will recognize is a credible person who can help them in some of this decision-making is where I ... that's where I think they are at this point.

Samuel: Point of inquiry. Do I need to move for a suspension of the rules to speak because I'm not a member of this legislative body or can I just say something?

Laura: We have to vote on it?

Moderator: Yeah, we have to vote on that.

Samuel: Cool.

Laura: Is there a motion, do we have to have a motion?

Moderator: We have to have.

Laura: Is there a motion to accept?

Moderator: Yup, please identify yourself.

Samuel: Hi! My name is Samuel [Quan 00:19:34], I'm a Junior in the James Madison College in the College of Arts and Letters.

Laura: Is there a motion to accept this? Second? I see. All in favor? Oppose?

Moderator: You're welcome to speak.

Samuel: Super fun, thank you so much. What I just heard, and Provost, please tell me if I'm wrong, I don't want to misquote you on this. The essence of the sentence that stuck with me is that the board does not what they're doing when it comes particular to the search process. I think the sentiment that I've heard from several people isn't necessarily that that the board isn't trying but it's that who is trying, and the idea that these interviews and the reaching out of this academic [inaudible 00:20:19] is going to help with the presidential search process is coming from them or the information about it is being disseminated through these channels and it's not coming from the faculty and it's not coming from other involved and invested community stakeholders.

Provost Youatt: I think that's a misrepresentation of what I just described.

Samuel: Okay, would you please clarify for me then?

Provost Youatt: Significantly.

Samuel: Okay.

Provost Youatt: This board has never done a search. They have never conducted a presidential search, a national or a global search so they are inexperienced as are, as is everyone in this room. What they're doing is asking someone to help them with a process that is inclusive and that involves the sentiments of faculties and students. That's exactly what I expect, and staff and postdocs, that is what I would expect an experienced president to advise them to do and then it will be done. This is not, someone isn't doing this for them, it is advising them what needs to be done to do a credible global search for a president.

Samuel: Okay, thank you so much for the clarification. Is that incongruous with not having confidence?

Provost Youatt: I don't have confidence that any of us on our own today know how to pull off a global search for a president. I think everyone in this room would admit that advice from someone who is experienced would be useful.

Samuel: I'm sorry, let me rephrase the question specifically with the faculty vote of no confidence, do you think that that would be ... how is that being considered with the board moving forward on those types of processes?

Provost Youatt: I don't have any idea.

Moderator: Move to new business.

Laura: Yeah okay. Prof. Moriarty, would you ... you met with the board at breakfast, do you want to talk about that discussion?

Deborah: Before I do that, I want to say thank you to Dr. McCabe for an extraordinary. I don't know what the music is on this, I think it's nothing. It's certainly celebratory.

Laura: Thank you. I could use this.

Deborah: I don't think that anyone realized ... I don't think anyone realizes that they have not been chair of the steering committee how much work it is, how much additional work, how many emails you send, how many emails you respond to, how many agendas you have to trying to think of things to do. Last year at this time we were doing bicycle safety. This year, we are, we have full spread chaos and Laura McCabe has been ... I can't even describe the card says to our fearless leader, and truly she has been that. She has there every single day answering emails, trying to make things work, trying to be responsive to the faculty, and honestly we couldn't have gotten through this, we couldn't have gotten to where we are without her so thank you very much.

Laura: Thank you, but I also have to thank the team, the at-large steering committee members who have met with me. We've had these meetings at all strange times in Starbucks all over campus. Then the steering committees, sometimes the entire steering committee was meeting off-hours and the, I think, the Senate themselves because we've had a crazy time, two Senate meetings in February, it's unprecedented, and that we're all working very hard and we're all trying to make things work. I think this builds bonds between us as we move through this, we become a closer community, and we'll have that. I think also I felt at the meeting with the other chairs, Senate, we can do something we have. This is a time where we can make changes and others can look to us for how, what the best way to do it is, so thank you.

Moderator: The Office of Academic Governance would also like to thank Laura tremendously for the endless hours that you put in. Also, we'd like to thank Sherry Lot for the endless hours. She has been this past year, 24/7. I have never known anyone to work as late and as long as she has to facilitate a lot of this conversation. Thank you, Sherry, too.

Laura: Yes the academic governance.

Deborah: One of the good things about standing here is that I don't need to look at the bubbles. I don't know if anyone else is finding them a non sequitur to what we're doing. Anyway, a report from the faculty liaison breakfast with the Board of Trustees. We made it very clear to the Board of Trustees that the faculty wanted to have voice and vote on the steering committee and right now I'm speaking just for faculty. I am not including students and staff because we were representing the faculty at that meeting. Though we wanted to have voice and

vote on the steering committee, and we also made it very clear that one of the ways in which we wanted to have representation on the committee that would be on the presidential search committee, would be to open it up to a vote of the entire faculty to have Pete to represent the faculty on the search committee. The vote would go the same way that we do for at-large members. There would be nominations, there could be self nominations, you could nominate someone else.

Deborah: People would accept the nomination and they would write what they have, essentially put a short CV, talk about why they would want to be on the presidential search committee, it would go to you UCAG, UCAG would come up with a list of people who were nominated and then it would go to the entire faculty who would vote on representatives for the search committee. We made it quite clear that we did not think it was a good idea to have people who were appointed by the administration, that at this point in time it was very important that the entire faculty be involved in the representation on that particular search committee. There was no negative response to that at all. I think they are totally in favor of that or they seemed very receptive to it. We will send them a letter outlining that also.

Deborah: The other thing that we made very clear is that we thought that it was very important for the Board of Trustees to get out to the colleges and to talk to the colleges not to have some sort of zoom thing where everybody gets in and does it online, but to see where people work, where people live, and to realize what happens in the colleges. They also seemed very agreeable to that, they seem to understand that that was an important thing to do. They were concerned about a timeline. We also made it very clear that to do something, to form a search committee in the summer would be a terrible idea because there is, as we all know, there is a feeling that things that happened in the summer somehow or other happening behind our backs or happening without faculty involvement.

Deborah: I don't think they were as aware of that as we clearly are. As Provost Youatt said, things will start to happen in the fall with regard to the presidential search committee. That was the ... that's the report from the breakfast. Thank you.

Laura: Thanks. One other thing. I just wanted to note, you have a handout of criteria for the new president that was developed from the University Council that we sent out for. It was a motion to move it to the steering committee here with the idea we were going to rank the criteria. In the steering committee, they moved to go ahead and move it to Academic Congress with a vote of approve or disapprove, and it clearly became apparent that this wasn't the best way to do this but we continued with the voting process.

Laura: What happened was actually really quite nice. There is a lot of faculty input that came in. At first, the thought was we couldn't handle the input of 2,700 some odd faculty, but actually it was manageable and we've put the list, some list of some comments attached to on the second page and beyond some of the

faculty input. They expand on what was discussed in University Council and added even more ideas and I thought that was really good. There were 494 votes, 397 approved to move it forward 72 disapproved, 25 abstain, but we felt with all these comments that maybe there's a couple of ways we can pursue this. We haven't met after this, this is just hot off the press, is that we could provide this to the board in its entirety as things that came up from the faculty and have the board look over it or the new search committee. Or this can be WordSmithed and continued on and also sent out again to academic Congress.

Laura: I think you can certainly read this but if somebody, if there are opinions, I'm looking to you to know if you would like to have this go out for another vote or what we do now with all this information.

Andaluna: Andaluna Borcila, James Madison College. My colleague and I sent to all Faculty Senate and I know you were copied, actually I addressed it to you, an email in which we said that our opinion is that we should call for a meeting of the Academic Congress. For that matter, we introduced the resolution today that we worked on wording for faculty consideration and for adoption. That was what our perspective was and it's on the agenda for later but we sent that email way in advance, that was the idea, thank you.

Lisa: This is Lapidus, College of Natural Science. I was the one that made the initial motion that we pass it to the steering committee. I have to say that this is not exactly what I was expecting. I thought it should've been shorter because I just don't think the board's going to read anything longer than like five items and that these things ... and each sentence should be shorter. I definitely don't think that they're going to read all of this. If the choice is between sending it all and Wordsmithing it, I would definitely vote for Wordsmithing it. Also, there were a lot of comments in the feedback that said why can't we just put on these things individually, and that was a suggestion I made. Is it technically impossible to do it?

Laura: After the fact, we found that once we had ... just prior to sending, we realize we could do that individually. However, it was already voted to do just the one vote and there was some concern that that might take time and that maybe faculty wouldn't do it. I think in the end, it became clear the faculty were really into it and they really want to have a say and so we could potentially work to send it out.

Lisa: Right. That might also help with that WordSmithing too because then you can have everyone vote on it and just pick the ones that are phrased the way people like it. You'll never have a total consensus but you will get closer to one if you get them to vote individually. They're just checkboxes.

Robert: This is Robert Ofoli, College of Engineering. I was going to wait to make my comments later but the struggle we are having with this is a reflection that we don't really know what we are looking for. I think this idea of having a president

here by the fall 2019, I don't think it's even possible. The problem is that this place is a mess. The first decision we have to make we're going to look for somebody who is going to come in and clean it up or are we going to clean it up and then hope that we'll find somebody who's willing to come into an environment that is much different from what we have right now? I think we need to make that decision.

Robert: It seems like business as usual. During the first part of the discussion, I was hoping that the Provost or Laura would bring some updates on that incredible news that was displayed at the Board of Trustees meeting last Friday, that somebody is claiming that our interim president who knows exactly why he's here would make such an offer, if it is true. This sounds to me like all the young girls and women who made claims and we never did a thing about it because I have not heard a single word since Friday.

Robert: Also we heard that our interim president actually made an offer to a survivor during that phone call. As long as these things just happen and we never seek to find the truth, I'm not sure how long it's going to take to fix this place. My guess is that it is going to be very difficult to find a president with all these leadership attributes that we are seeking to come into this mess. If we are looking for somebody to clean it up, then I'm all in, but if you are looking for somebody who's going to come to the Michigan State that everybody, all of us want to have, I think putting a lot of energy into finding a president is totally premature.

Laura: Thank you. Yup.

Dan: Dan [Gold 00:37:01], Education. One thing I'm concerned with is there's a lot of investigations going on and hopefully by the end of the summer we'll have some results. I'm becoming alarmed over this year. First, what happened was horrible, we're all on the same page with that. But there's another side of it. This is a huge billion-dollar business and some things need to get taken care of like finances and settlements and President Engler talked about that. Whether something got misconstrued on the phone, etc, it's very difficult.

Dan: One the problems right now, I think no matter what anybody from MSU says about settlement it's going to get interpreted in a certain way. Maybe on our agenda for fall, if the investigations are in we should get those a discussion of those because that will solve I think some of the problems of knowing what's fixed or what's not fixed. Just the discussion we had earlier, I think some of the problems we're running into is, I'd probably be shot for this but sorry what I say what I say, people have hired presidents for a long time, there's a system, etc. The problem is we're doing it in a political cesspool where nobody trust anybody else and if somebody has situation misspoken word.

Dan: I don't think the process, I think we're got to sort things out, get some of the reports in, hold people accountable if they knew or didn't know, then maybe move forward, maybe talk about the culture. He talked about that last time like

the faculty. There's research on culture like you unfreeze it, which where in that phase then you grow it and then you try to freeze it. We talk a lot about culture change, but I don't know what that means. Does that mean we have mandatory training? How do we go beyond it? I think maybe we should have a plan that addresses like what we're going to do with the findings, how we're going to rebuild the culture and probably most important, I think we need to start trusting each other little because nobody around here seems to trust anybody anymore, and we're not going to be able to move forward and we also have to make a commitment on that I think.

Provost Youatt: If I could say, I did not say anything about what was reported at the board meeting because I don't know anything about it. I couldn't add anything beyond what you have read. I don't know a thing more, and so there's nothing to say there. I will say, I mean in terms of that accusation, I don't know anything. I will say that I think most of you have read this that there is mediation that begins on the 25th and the 26th with all parties in. I think there's a lot, I don't want to say optimism because that suggest, again, something I don't know, but I think there is real hopefulness that the mediator is someone that is fair and trusted by the survivors, those who are representing them, I believe, and someone that we trust as well.

Provost Youatt: I think there's really, at least from the Michigan State University side, there is every intention of going into this very seriously and hopefully that we can do the right thing and be respectful of those who have been hurt and also come to some conclusion about what our responsibility is. I think a lot of people, it doesn't fix everything that everyone is concerned about on this campus, but it would alleviate one anxiety if we knew what our liability was and what our responsibility was.

Andaluna: Andaluna Borcila, James Madison College. I don't quite know how to respond to some of the statements here, but I will try. I think a big culture, a healthy culture change is that when we see something that's outrageous we call it. Second, the Board of Trustees meeting, it was outrageous for a number of different reasons. I cannot, I'm not into discussing who said what, I know that it would be a good idea for us to listen to survivors because this institution has not done so. I also want to say that that meeting was outrageous for other reasons, including that there were decisions made, such as not to allow people to bring in the pictures of their daughters into the meeting.

Andaluna: I don't want to ... I want us to get to really important things such as policy proposal because in a while, one can reassure me that you know the issue here is if we only had more trust things would happen better. The fact of the matter is we had trust, we lost trust, and we need to do something about it. We can't just trust whom and why. That's what I want to say. I found it outrageous and very many people are hurt by what happened there and they are hurt on this campus. It is not the fault of those people that they don't trust this governance,

it is the fault of this board and it was the fault of President. I'm saying now, Engler has a big fault in that as well. I just want to clarify that, thank you.

Anna: Anna Pegler-Gordon, James Madison College. I want to just very briefly add someone else to that fault. Provost Youatt, you say you don't know anything. This is exactly what happened on this campus when women repeatedly reported that they had been assaulted and that terrible things had happened to them and everyone said, "I don't want to find out. I don't want to know." If my boss was reported as having said something like that, I would ask. I wouldn't not ask and then say to everyone that I don't know. It is our responsibility to know what happened and I find it very upsetting that you feel that it is acceptable to stand up here and say that you do not know.

Robert: This is Robert Ofoli. I owe the Provost and Laura an apology because I didn't explain what I meant but I was surprised that neither of you made a comment. I would think that interim President Engler would know that we have this meeting today. I would've liked some assurance or some explanation of what was said on the phone for this young woman to understand that she was being offered money. I think that since ... Anyway, the TV reported [inaudible 00:44:17] been asked during the discussion between the two of them on the phone. I didn't know that it was in person. In any case, I was hoping that since he wasn't going to be here he would've given information to either of you to come here and assure the Senate of what the situation actually was.

Robert: My statement that I was surprised you didn't make a comment wasn't a reflection of you, it was more a reflection on the system that the idea of not coming out clean just keeps happening, not on your part but on the part of our interim president.

Laura: Introduce yourself.

Jean: My name is Jean [inaudible 00:45:05], I'm in the Sociology Department faculty fixed term.

Laura: Is there a motion to approve? Second? All in favor? Oppose? Okay.

Jean: Thank you. I started here last August and you could imagine what a year to start at MSU. I guess what disturbs me the most is the ... I'm just going to echo what you said, this behavior just keeps continuing and continuing. There's this hope that somehow at some point they're going to get it. I don't know if people have seen, and this is another political matter, if people have seen the apology from the CEO of Starbucks that just went out today. Amazing, a wonderful ... laid it out, going to investigate, beautiful apology. Where is that? Why isn't ... why hasn't that happened yet?

Jean: We all make mistakes, we all make screw ups. If I was on the Board of Directors I'd probably would. I would've been there in that slot and then I would need to

own up. I don't see ... there's been a vote of no confidence, these meetings keep continuing, we're hoping Engler comes in, Engler's doing ... Engler told us he's doing financial solvency. the girls, the girls can take care of the culture stuff, right? Like women's work. How long is this going to continue? We're going to sit here and just keep eating it. Power concedes nothing without a demand and until we start pushing back they're going to just keep behaving, those are my thoughts. Thanks.

Laura: All right. In the sake of time, I think I'll move to new business. Item 7.1 is the ECC report.

Marcy: Marcy [inaudible 00:47:20], College of Nursing. I have the report for [UCC 00:47:23]. In our recent meeting, we approved four new programs, ComArt certificate programs, all effective fall of '18 involving digital media, K-12 computer science education, media analytics and organizational communication for leadership. We approved an additional 20 program changes and no program deletions. With this, we considered and approved 13 new courses, 29 course changes and one course deletion. There is only one moratorium, it's in computer science, disciplinary, teaching minor for secondary education and it's only for one semester and that's spring 2019. This short report is available on appendix B and you can see the link for the long report.

Laura: Do you want to make a motion?

Marcy: I'll go ahead and move to approve the UCC report.

Laura: Is there a second? All in favor? Oppose? Okay, so moved. UCFA report?

Tom: I'm Tom Tomlinson, College of Medicine, Chair of UCFA. In your appendix, you'll find this letter to the Provost, with the UCFA's recommendations regarding the raised pool for this coming year. You also see in there an accounting of the raises that we've asked for over the last five or six years, and also what University ended up being able to give faculty. The premise behind these requests is to try to make sure that MSU remains competitive with our peer institutions, and of course, that our faculty are receiving a fair compensation for the work that they do.

Tom: You see on the last, there's a graph which is not all there because it needed to be landscaped, which demonstrates the University has fallen behind peer institutions, particularly at the lower ranks, not so bad for full Professors and Associates but less good for our Assistant Professors. On the last, page 3 you'll see that we recommend that a 4.5% increase in faculty salary for 2018-19 with 4.0% increase in the general [inaudible 00:50:01] pool, and .5% increase in the market adjustment.

Laura: Yeah, a motion.

Tom: I move to approve this recommendation to the Provost.

Laura: Is there, I see a second. All in favor? Oppose? Okay, so moved. All right. Now we have Dr. Rebecca Campbell, Carrie Moylan and Detective Lieutenant Andrea Mumford to talk about RVSM workgroup.

Rebecca: Thank you much. Good afternoon, colleagues. My name is Rebecca Campbell, I'm a Professor in the Department of Psychology in the College of Social Science. I am the Chair of the Expert Advisory Relationship Violence and Sexual Misconduct Workgroup. I'll tell you more about that in just a second, but I'll allow my two colleagues introduce themselves to you as well.

Carrie: I have to ... a little short. My name is ... thank you. My name is Carrie Moylan. I'm an Assistant Professor in the School of Social Work in the College of Social Sciences.

Andrea: Hi! I'm Andrea Mumford. I'm a Detective Lieutenant with the MSU Police Department.

Rebecca: We are three representatives of a nine-person workgroup that was appointed by interim President Engler to advise him on services for survivors and prevention strategies regarding relationship violence and sexual misconduct on this campus. All of us on the workgroup are folks who have tremendous substantive expertise in this area. I've been doing research on sexual assault in the criminal justice system for 25 years. My area of focus is on disclosure help seeking and how the disclosure and help seeking process is often re-traumatizing to victims and how it creates additional trauma for them.

Rebecca: It is germane that I am serving on this group. I also stand here with a very heavy heart given the events of the last several days. Our appearance here was scheduled many moons ago, and I appreciate the opportunity to address you. Why are we here? We are a group of people who have been doing direct service work, research, practice, policy activism, direct service and prevention our entire careers. We were asked to advise the interim president on steps moving forward to improve victim services and prevention.

Rebecca: Given that we are not a cross-section of all different entities on campus in terms of race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, ability, disability, students, faculty and staff, we view it is our job to reach out to different groups on campus, to make sure that we connect with all branches of academic government, to introduce ourselves to all different student groups and advisory groups to say this is who we are, this is what our charge is and we want to hear your input.

Rebecca: Given that we make advisory recommendations to the interim president, we want to make sure that people are aware of who we are, that our door is opened, that our email is open, and that we're here to hear your suggestions. The president has a website where people can send in their suggestions. We've

received about 140 suggestions to-date. We review them, I respond to each one individually. We discuss them in our workgroup to consider what we want to recommend to the president in our advisory capacity.

Rebecca: There's been a lot of talking not a lot of listening, so I don't have a whole lot more of talking to do, but I'm unfamiliar with the rules of this body and that feels weird is a full professor. We're happy to answer any questions it's why you have additional colleagues here if anybody would like to ask us or give us suggestions or just ... this is who we are, please reach out to us.

Laura: I guess I have a question. In your workgroup, are you ... how is this working? Are you meeting regularly and you're reviewing things? What is going on?

Rebecca: Our process is that we meet ... we have a standing meeting every two weeks. We are in communication with each other daily including weekends. We review comments that come in through the president's website. Those are shared with him, they are shared with our workgroup. We review them, we discuss them, we also respond to whatever the current situation might be.

Rebecca: We also go out to different groups. I'm looking in this audience and I can see people that I've seen at other meetings, to say this is who we are, we welcome your feedback, we welcome your suggestions, we want to hear from diverse groups throughout campus. We take that feedback in, we review it against what research says is best practice in research in, excuse me, in victim services and prevention. We look at what are other policies and other big ten institutions other comparable institutions. We focus on what is in the best interest of survivors and with that is the guide we use in making recommendations moving forward.

Provost Youatt: Have there been recommendations so far that have been implemented? How is that?

Rebecca: We have made four recommendations to-date. The first was a policy closing of the loop, if you will, that we had a practice where if a survivor reported to OIE that OIE would inform MSU, the police department. If the survivor went to the MSU Police Department, it wouldn't necessarily automatically result in a referral back to OIE. That is something that we recommended be changed so that there is complete consistency in how referral and sharing of information works. In both instances, survivors always have the option to say I do not wish to pursue this further but there's communication and the services are being referred, the information about resources and services are going to survivors from both things, that was number one.

Rebecca: The second one was that we needed restructuring in the title IX office. There is a press release and a new org chart that I realize was that the University spokesperson put out that outlined a very substantial restructuring in the title IX process, excuse, the title IX office to create an overarching office title IX, oh shit,

what's the title? Office of Title, oh shit. Title IX Outreach Compliance, it's a long title that went through a lot of Wordsmithing. Yeah, could you look that up. I'm sorry, it's been a long year.

Rebecca: Within that office, we have a new office of prevention, outreach and education that will be staffed by six people. This is a significant change. We've had one person, one staff person doing prevention work for a campus of this size. We can pull the numbers, we can pull the data to say that that is not commensurate with need, but it's also obvious you don't have a robust prevention program if you have a single person.

Rebecca: We have a new office of prevention, outreach and education that we have open positions listing now searching to bring in additional prevention specialists. That is part of this new IT, new office and we also have the OIE office, the investigation office there. It was the recommendation regarding a large restructuring that also provides additional positions for a service coordinator which is two people who will be able to help respondents and claimants understand the Title IX investigation process to be able to link them to services to really try to help them navigate what is, by federal rules, a very complicated process and to really try to make sure that folks are understanding what their options are, what their services are and the like.

Rebecca: That is separate from the continued role of an advocate and advisor. All OIE respondents and claimants can have respondents and advisors that continues. The idea of these service coordinators is to try to help make sure everybody's in communication that needs to be in communication and that victims, claimants and respondents know who to turn to and where they can seek different services. A massive restructuring was recommendation number two.

Rebecca: Recommendation number three was that the service, the staffing levels of the MSU sexual assault program were not commensurate with need and demand, not even close, and that we needed to increase the staffing levels. The MSU sexual assault program is funded as most rape crisis centers in the United States are through a federal grant called the Victims of Crime Act. They already had funding which is administered through the state of Michigan to support counseling positions there. It was a very straightforward request to go to the state administrator, the Voca program to say there's a need for additional services. Two new counseling programs, two new counseling positions and two new advocacy programs were what we recommended in the Voca office, Michigan has agreed to support those positions.

Rebecca: Our fourth was to administer a climate survey that is truly comprehensive of all issues regarding relationship violence and sexual misconduct to be conducted sometime in the coming year after we had an opportunity for broad-based involvement and from students, faculty and staff. Most RVSM climate surveys focus only on students that is problematic. We need a survey that can actually address the RVSM needs of students, faculty and staff and so we recommended

that that move forward in the fall. Those are our four recommendations to-date.

Strangas: [Strangas 01:00:13], Engineering. Is part of your deliberation or does research show that offering a fixed or negotiable amount of money part of the healing process?

Rebecca: What research very clearly demonstrates is that the process of healing is long, it is complicated. One of the things that is most salient for survivors in their recovery process is what's called procedural justice, how they are treated in the process of help seeking and whether they are treated with dignity and respect. It is unclear to me because I have not talked with any of the survivors in this particular situation, but as a scientist I find it hard to believe that something like that would in any way, shape or form facilitate the risk recovery. It's the office of Civil Rights Title IX Education and Compliance. That's a lot of words, that's why I couldn't remember them in order.

Tom: Thank you. Let me just add a related note. Did UCFA sent a request?

Moderator: Identify yourself please.

Tom: I'm sorry. Tom Tomlinson, College of Human Medicine, Chair of UCFA. I'll just add that the UCFA made a request to the Provost to have the director of the office of civil rights or OIE to report to the UCFA twice each year, once each semester. The idea being to hear from the director about what issues they are facing, what their problems are, what their needs are, what the faculty's perspectives and recommendations might be, so that we can establish some communication link between the faculty, at least has represented the UCFA and that office. We thought that was very important and we are very pleased that the Provost approved their request.

Anna: Anna Pegler-Gordon, James Madison College. I just really wanted to say thank you very much. I know this is really difficult work and I really appreciate all the work that you are doing and I want to say thank you especially to Detective Lieutenant Mumford for believing the victims and for helping to bring Larry Nasser to justice when the rest of the University really failed them. Thank you.

Laura: Renee? Next up is healthcare benefits. A brief discussion about that from Renée River.

Renee: This is probably the most insignificant item on your agenda given the very heavy topics that you're all dealing with today, so I'll try to make this brief and hopefully, this is a positive thing and some good news. We continue to work with the Faculty Healthcare Council as well as our union committees on various ways, various initiatives to address healthcare and the trend that we're seeing in various aspects of our healthcare. I'll talk about a couple of those today.

Renee: One of them, one of the items, and many of you may have heard me talk about this before, we have specialty medications that continue to be one of our top parts, component of healthcare that's increasing, and all you have to do is watch TV and watch the commercials that are on TV in almost every drug commercial that you see is for specialty medication. One of the things that the pharmaceutical companies, the pharmaceutical manufacturers do is they allow or put aside a certain amount of funding that can be used by individuals who either can't afford to purchase the medication if they don't have health coverage or pharmaceutical coverage, and it helps employers who do offer healthcare coverage pharmaceutical benefits to reduce the overall expense.

Renee: What this means is if you are on a specialty medication, not all specialty medications, but there are medications like high cholesterol, cancer medications, HIV, human growth hormone, those are types of medications where the pharmaceutical companies are putting money aside. Basically, what they're trying to do is buy your loyalty, if you will, or the loyalty of the physicians to keep prescribing that particular med. What it does, these programs allows you as the individual if you're on one of these medications to reduce the co-pay even though our co-pay is not terribly expensive for specialty medications. It can reduce the co-pay under the \$50 that you currently pay to either zero or some amount underneath that. It allows for MSU to save on purchasing those medications as well, so the patient ... it's a win for the patient. It's also a win for MSU to help reduce our overall expense.

Renee: It's a completely voluntary program. When you get your prescription filled, you will be asked by the pharmacist if you'd like to sign up for the program, it's what's called the co-pay assistance program, and that would though, it's available as of May 1, so those of you who are on specialty medications, the ones that identified, you'll get a letter from CVS Caremark that identifies that you're an individual who was on one of the medications that actually has a program in place by the pharmaceutical companies. I just wanted to let you know that that is something in the works, something that's really easy for us to do. The money is there. It's available through the drug manufacturers and, again, it helps MSU on our overall expense for drug medications, and it's a win for the patient because your co-pay would be significantly less than what you're paying today. That's on its way.

Renee: The second initiative that were launching or really have launched is a diabetes management program. Diabetes is one of the number one expenses not only on our medical side but also on the pharmaceutical side as well. We have identified a program called [Lavongo 01:07:25], strange name but it's called Lavongo, that is also voluntary. What the Lavongo program will do is allows you to have access to a, what's called a connected meter. This connected meter, and if you're diabetic, you have family members who are diabetic, you know that as a diabetic, you're constantly monitoring your blood glucose, your blood sugar. This particular meter uses a cloud-based program and allows you as the individual to identify individuals whether it's in your family or friends that can

be alerted if your blood sugar is reaching a certain threshold where you may need some assistance.

Renee: Let's say if you have kids, for example, and a child who is diabetic. As a parent you would want to know that when your child takes their blood glucose that if it's within a certain range that you would be automatically notified so that there's an issue you can connect with that individual right away. That's a little different than the meters that you have today that might be available through or are available through either Bluecare network or Community Blue. It's a much more smart meter and allows communication between individuals.

Renee: Also, if you're a diabetic, you know that you have to usually write down in a log what your glucose testing is coming through. This meter allows you to download your report, your report over the last three months, take it to your physician and you have everything right there. It gets rid of that manual tracking, if you will, of your glucose. It also provides access 24/7, 365 days a year to diabetes educators, which from our understanding and talking with some of our physicians on campus these individuals tend to be in short supply so having access to a diabetes educator, particularly when you're having trouble with your blood glucose can be very, very instrumental in helping you manage your condition.

Renee: MSU is purchasing and paying for the program, but it will only pay if you participate. We're encouraging those who are dealing with this chronic condition to participate. We think there will be no a good outcome for you in helping manage the diabetes condition as well as for overall cost, helps keep individuals out of the emergency room, keeps out of out of the urgent care, and hopefully will help manage what can be a very difficult condition to manage. That's something that is coming into play as well.

Renee: The last thing is we are researching telemedicine, offering telemedicine services. You may be familiar with telemedicine. This allows you to pick up the phone and talk with a physician 24/7. They're board-certified physician, they're a part of a network of, again, board-certified physicians and depending on your needs. If you have kids and you don't want to haul them all out to the emergency room because you have more than one child at home or to the urgent care, this allows you to speak to a physician, usually through a video, whether that's on your phone or through Skype, right at your home. This, again, it's a convenience item and one that we are exploring with the Faculty Healthcare Council as well as the union groups that we work with. John, anything? Did I miss anything? Okay. Thank you.

Laura: Thank you.

Moderator: Laura, may I recommend? Since we have an action item at the end of our agenda here, that we have the committee reports limit themselves to five minutes.

Laura: Yeah, I was thinking perhaps we could even just those key ones, the ones that have relevant information now, and then we can probably have that posted to the agenda, the final reports.

Moderator: Correct. It's your direction on this one.

Laura: Okay, so maybe then I'm just going to call out to the committee chairs of you know, who has, who would like to come forward with any pertinent information. Otherwise we can post it to the agenda. Do we have we have any? UCAG?. Do you want to? Do you have any?

Gayle: Gayle Lourens. I'm the Chair. I'm from College of Nursing and I'm the Chair of UCAG. The only thing that I'm going to mention that's not going to be in the report, well, it will be in the report but I'll mention it, is that that ad hoc committee that you guys approved has been populated with faculty members. They will begin, they will probably start their mission and their work starting in May.

Laura: Thank you. Tom? UCFA.

Tom: I'm Tom Tomlinson, Human Medicine, UCFA. Just a couple of things to note that the UCFA is done this semester. We made recommendations to the Provost that the University provide retirement contributions to summer salary for faculty and academic staff. I believe that those have been accepted. If your off summer appointment and you're faculty academic staff then you will receive the University match to your retirement.

Tom: Another thing that came about this last meaning is that we've begun a conversation regarding the University's policy on conflict of interest in educational responsibilities resulting from consensual amorous or sexual relationships. If you look up this policy, you will discover that these are permitted so long as you disclose them to one's supervisor or chair, whatever happens to be. The conversation is going to be about whether it could simply ban them. That will continue in the fall.

Laura: Thank you. Richard.

Richard: Richard [inaudible 01:14:05], College of Human Medicine. I'm Chair of University Committee on Undergraduate Education. We'll keep this very short. Detailed report has been submitted and will be appended to the notes. I just want to, in addition, point out that we heard and endorsed changes to the ITN system for administering integrative studies, University diversity, distribution requirement which are being implemented by the Provost office. We heard the discussion and recommended that MSU institutional license [inaudible 01:14:46], be renewed for an additional cycle going forward.

- Richard: We enthusiastically support the changes that are being made in the Associate Provost for undergraduate education office for the Gateway mathematics curriculum reform that will lead to eventual phaseout of MTH 1825 for credit but non-counting course that entering student sometimes take. They have implemented a change in the other way entering students meet math requirements. We also endorsed a discussion, and it's going to essentially we hope to change the coding of students who are entering undergraduates from no preference which may have some derogatory connotations to exploratory preference, and that's going to be a progress change.
- Laura: Okay. I don't see any other chairs with information, so I think we can go ahead and move forward to 7.6, Reclaim MSU policy.
- Andaluna: Hello everyone! Andaluna Borcila from James Madison College. I'm here to introduce the Reclaim MSU policy proposal. I just want to say that what we're asking is for Faculty Senate to endorse this policy proposal. I'm not asking you to ask the board to resign, we've already done that and I don't want you to do that again. I think that whatever board is in place, we need new policies for them. Reclaim MSU has been working a group of faculty, students and staff have been with working since the end of January on crafting a policy proposal.
- Andaluna: Basically, I can't see the PowerPoint because of the microphone here, but I will try, maybe I can. I'm just going to go back and forth. I have to get used to using new glasses. Basically, you know the story. The Board of Trustees that MSU has appointed the most recent permanent and interim president without a search, the current board closed the ranks around [inaudible 01:17:46] at a critical time showing their loyalty to her rather than their loyalty to this institution, to our community and to survivors of sexual assault. In addition, in the appointment of the interim president, they refused to listen to the advice of faculty, students, and deans. We voted no confidence in them as a faculty, overwhelmingly as Senate and we voted also to ask them to resign.
- Andaluna: But as I said, whoever is on this board, we really need to make sure that the by-laws of the board are changed. The only people who can do that are the board. Reclaim MSU is asking the board to change these by-laws in order to allow full participation of faculty and students in governance. We're going to go through the various parts of these, but basically we propose the creation of a University board. That means changing their by-laws. It is also critical that members of the MSU community play a central role throughout the process of searching for and selecting a new president. As I've mentioned before, when we've talked about this, the board doesn't have any stipulations as to how that process should happen.
- Andaluna: I hear their reassuring us, they'll do this, they'll do that, but writing in their bylaws something specific like, it is that that we'll go into like a process in which faculty and students and staff play a critical role would be key. The other part of

this proposal is a constitutional amendment. Of course, they can't make that constitutional amendment butt we can push for it.

Andaluna: I just want you to know that Reclaim MSU has, again, not only been working on this since the end of January but also we have been really ... we're reaching two people who are lawmakers to talk about the constitutional amendment in particular, and there seems to be support for this. I'm going to go into more specifics with my colleague, Anna Pegler-Gordon. You already have the document but we just want to foreground some points.

Anna: I know we need to move quickly. You do have the full document, but I just wanted to highlight some key points in the changes to Board of Trustees by-laws. First of all, the key thing that it would ... It would create a university board that surrounds the Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees is by the Constitution, eight members, it would add two students and two faculty members to that with full voting rights on everything except for the final vote on the president and also on faculty salaries.

Anna: If we can move to the next slide, this is just how we define the election process for the new faculty and student members of the University board. It's very similar to how we currently like people through the representative organizations. Then, the next slide just shows how there was some concern about a conflict of interest with faculty, but it would be the Board of Trustees that would continue to vote on items related to regular faculty appointments including salary.

Andaluna: Now, if we can move to the next slide. This pertains to the presidential search process, and all of the Constitution says that the board is in charge of that. Basically, what we want to ask them to do, I feel weird turning around but I will, is to adopt this language. This is all the underlying language is new so it would be an addition under article 3 voting procedures. The University board affirms that the search for a president shall be conducted with the faculty, students, and staff playing a central role, including articulating the qualities and qualifications required for a president, having representative from the faculty, students and staff on the search committee, engaging with top candidates in open forums. Then we go into some more specifics about the preliminary selection, shall be decided by a rollcall, a vote of 2/3 majority of the University board. Can you please go to the next slide?

Andaluna: Then, following this vote. The academic Congress may conduct among its members a vote, a veto vote. If more than two thirds of the members of the Academic Congress oppose the selected candidate, the Board of Trustees shall not elect this candidate has a president. If less than two thirds oppose the selected candidate for president, the Board of Trustees may elect to this candidate as president of Michigan State University. On there, the bullet points that foreground these. Could you please move to the next slide?

Andaluna: As it is now, it's very easy for the Board of Trustees to adopt these by-law changes. They need the majority of 50.1, but what we would like to do is to change the language in this as well so that what we have is a way in which ... to make it harder for the board to repeal these changes once these changes have been adopted. The specifics, they're all again in the paperwork. You have, but are that this would require a majority vote of the University Council and the University board to amend or repeal. The point here is that ensures that faculty and student representatives on board cannot be removed without approval of faculty and students on University Council. Move to the next slide please.

Anna: As Andaluna mentioned earlier also, this would not be a real permanent change, but Reclaim MSU has been working on a constitutional amendment which would also, this would affect MSU, U of M, and Wayne State, their governing bodies. The proposals that we have in the constitutional amendment that we also seek endorsement from the Faculty Senate are that this would include the addition of two student members and two faculty members from different colleges within the universities. The other key points are that it would reduce the length of the trustees terms, which has fairly recently been increased to eight. It would reduce it back down to four. It would also really importantly bring MSU and U of M into line with other big 210 universities because currently it is only MSU, U of M, and University of Minnesota that have no student or faculty representation on their boards.

Anna: Then if we could go to the next slide. Also, we have introduced term limits because we think that is really important that no member of the controlling board should be elected for more than two terms. The final point I just wanted to make which Andaluna Borcila already mentioned is that Reclaim MSU has been working with state legislatures to introduce this as legislatively referred constitutional amendment, although that would still require 2/3 of the vote both. The members are elected to each house, so that's yeah.

Andaluna: We tried to rush through this, but we thought we just do it, foreground the points and then, I don't know what we do now? Do we move or [inaudible 01:25:27] discussion, right?

Laura: Do we have to move?

Moderator: We'll move and then discussion.

Andaluna: We move for the Faculty Senate to endorse the Reclaim MSU proposal.

Laura: Is there a second? Okay. Now, we can discuss. Can you introduce yourself?

Natalie: My name is Natalie Rogers.

Laura: Okay. Is there a motion to allow Natalie Rogers to speak? Okay, I see two, all in favor? Oppose? Okay.

Natalie: Okay. We're all up here, I'll be the one speaking, but we're just up here to demonstrate our support for this proposal. We've had a petition circulating that has over 650 signatures by students, faculty, staff, alumni who all support this and all support these changes. It's important right now to remember that culture change doesn't just start from the bottom, culture change is not just grassroots, culture change comes from the top down too. It's so important that in these times we make efforts to change the top, we make efforts to change this institution.

Natalie: While everything that's happening has been awful and heartbreaking for so many of us, it's allowed us as a community to open up a dialogue about sexual assault. It's allowed us to think about what real change would look like and think about how institutions should be responding to these things, especially in the wake of the #MeToo movement, especially everything that we've just been going through as a nation this year.

Natalie: Right now, MSU is in a position to be a model for positive change, to be a model for how institutions should respond to these types of things. In the past few months, MSU has been really doing a poor job without responsibility, so now the responsibility falls to us, to students, to faculty, to staff, to create that model for positive change, to take matters into our own hands and ensure that our university takes this seriously and makes the changes necessary to ensure that this never happens again.

Natalie: Sexual assault is something that's an institutional problem. It's a problem of power. It's a problem of the voices. It's a problem of whose voices are valued and whose voices are silenced. By including students and staff on a University board and eventually onto the Board of Trustees, we are ensuring that the voices of the community are installed in everyday governance and that the well-being and the safety of the community is in the hearts and minds of those who'll lead us. I urge you today to support these policy proposals. Everyone standing behind me is urging you to support these policy proposals, and the people who couldn't be here today are urging you to support these policy proposals. Thank you.

Moderator: Do you want to call a vote at this point?

Laura: Further comments? I think we have discussion.

Moderator: There is more discussion with people.

Strangas: [Strangas 01:29:16] in Engineering again. I have a concern about this proposal, which comes from the fact that we have a system here already, which has the Board of Trustees to whom we very clearly and very loudly expressed our non-approval and whom we asked to resign. We the Faculty Senate, we have the University Council, we have the steering committee, and we have the at-large members of the steering committee and the Board of Trustees refused to listen

to any of this. I have to express my disappointment at the students actually because they, although they expressed their lack of confidence with the Board of Trustees, unlike this group did not asked him to resign.

Strangas: I'm a little concerned lead by adding yet one layer of decision groups is going to make things much more cumbersome and actually will not move things forward. A couple of ... we have something that's not working and I think the solution to that is to strengthen the institutions that we have already, and demand that, again, that these institutions have allowed an actual say on what happens not add one more organization and institution.

Strangas: I have also a couple of minor concerns. One is that the group you're defining is too prescriptive, so many people from here, so many people from there. I'm not so sure this is the best way, I'm not so sure this is not the best way, but we cannot start playing the game now for two of this or three of that. The last thing is, it seems to be mostly concerned about hiring a president. What about the issue that we had not right now in front of us, what we had a few months ago firing a president. Shouldn't that be part of a job of these groups? That's all. Thank you.

Deborah: This is a huge proposal, and it's a very serious proposal. I think that we should take it very seriously. From my perspective, it is because of the breadth of what is being proposed, this is something that should go through regular governance and go to the University committee and academic governance, start there so that people can look through it and spend some serious time so that the committee can look through it and spend some serious time looking at it rather than just simply moving it through immediately. I am concerned about the fact that ... I'm concerned about pushing something through without having spent enough time on it. I think this doesn't just affect us. This constitutional amendment would affect the University of Michigan, it would affect Wayne State University, it would have a huge effect on a lot of things. That's just ... just wanted to express that concern, thank you.

Moderator: Could you identify yourself please?

Deborah: Sorry, Deborah Moriarty, College of Music, at-large member.

Moderator: Thank you.

Richard: Richard [inaudible 01:32:52]. CHM. I would echo many of the comments we just heard from Deb Moriarty. In addition, I see many redeeming features in the Reclaim MSU proposal, but I see this is a very heavy lift. Personally, I find it difficult to support a measure that is going to have very limited chance of success. The reasons for that is that it focuses on changing the Board of Trustee by-laws that we have absolutely no input on or control over, that requires a matter of good faith. It also requires a change to the U.S. Constitution.

Richard: Rather than pushing forward for something that, excuse me, ain't going to happen, as important as this might be, I would take a completely different strategy. This is what I would suggest. I would focus on what we, as academic governance can do, and that is to constitute within our own by-laws a University board that essentially assumes all the powers of the Board of Trustee. The composition of the board would include all members of the Board of Trustee, in addition to faculty and student representation.

Richard: This would be codified within our by-laws, we can control that. We can move those by-law changes along to the Board of Trustee for approval. If they see merit in this they would accept those by-law changes and de facto except the fact that the Board of Trustees now becomes part of the University board in which faculty and student have input. It requires no changes to the Board of Trustee by-laws unless they choose to do so. It requires no changes to the Michigan Constitution. I would recommend that the ad hoc committee on academic governance that is looking at by-laws changes considers a proposal like this.

Anna: Thank you. Can I respond to some of those points?

Moderator: Yes, you can.

Anna: First, our response was to the idea that this is another layer of governance. This will make MSU consistent with other universities across the country and with other Big Ten universities that do have faculty and or student representation. I don't think that it's really another layer any differently than ... it is more standard practice. An answer to Dr. Moriarty's suggestion that it go to UCAG, the by-laws section that we introduced at, not the last meeting but the previous meeting, did go to UCAG. They were discussed. They were sent back with the recommendation that it be made, that it'd be included in a subcommittee to consider Board of Trustees by-laws.

Anna: We then rejected that at our last meeting because we said that it was urgent that we actually take some stand on this and pressure the Board of Trustees right now, and that is why we are here discussing this now. It has been to the UCAG. It was ... that is, it has gone through the typical standard procedure. In terms of it being a heavy lift, I guess what I would say there is that with all due respect, we do not control the University by-laws. Anything we recommend to the University by-laws has to go to the Board of Trustees, so it really does not matter whether we propose this exact same structure as a Board of Trustees changing their by-laws or whether we propose it as us changing our by-laws, it still has to be approved by the Board of Trustees.

Anna: I would really sometimes a constitutional amendment, I understand this is a heavy lift, but this is moving forward in the state legislature and it will look really bad if the faculty are not in support and do not get out ahead and say we are in support of faculty and students being on the Board of Trustees when the

state legislature is looking into making those changes in the Constitution. I understand they may not get approved by two thirds both houses, but I do think that it is important for us to make a statement that we support this kind of inclusive governance even if it actually does not happen.

Moderator: We have about four or five more minutes. You may want to call the question after a couple more comments.

Natalie: I would just like to say just a kind of pushback, again, something that I've been hearing. Why not take dramatic action? Why not make big moves right now? If you've been in the position that I've been and if you are at the Board of Trustees meeting on Friday, the sheer emotion that was there and the anger and the hurt that this administration is causing demands dramatic action. This body took a historic vote of no confidence, that's huge, and it was completely ignored. Doesn't that demand dramatic action? I don't know how I'm going to end this but I just ... now is the time to take action. We need to. We can't let anything go to committee. We need to act because if we don't then things are just going to pass us and the window for change is going to close.

Laura: Has this been approved by the senates of Wayne State and University of Michigan? Will this wait until they have approval since they're involved?

Anna: The legislature is acting on it.

Laura: Without them?

Andaluna: I don't know what's going to happen with that honestly, I don't know. Basically, what we're asking you to do is not to, we're here not to ask you to figure out how the state legislatures was going to approach that, but rather to say that we endorse that we have students and faculty on the Board of Trustees. That's what we're asking you to do. How the legislature does this they're probably going to say Reclaim MSU has put this proposal. Obviously, it helps if faculty at this institution think that there should be faculty and students at the board, which will make on the board, which will make this more consistent with what's going on with Board of Trustees elsewhere.

Andaluna: Also, additionally, I do want to make the point that this is about endorsing that we would approve of that, of the Reclaim MSU policy proposal. Again, I think I lost my train of thought, I'm sorry I was up all night grading papers. They don't pay me to work on these policy proposals. I'm not an administrator, and I'm not in a position of directing anything here. We've been working on this because we think that we need to do something that's going to make a change. When you see me coming up here and standing up here and basically sticking my neck out there and putting hours and hours of work into this, I'm not making for your plea pity me. It's so that you understand that what I gained from this is that I don't feel that I'm just standing there. What we've been doing is working with a group of people who've been putting a lot of hours into something that ... the

legislatures might say, "Okay, it's gone on floor, we want to push back and make this change." Or, "We've talked to these other universities and we want, they don't want to have one graduate student, one undergraduate student, they just have one.

Andaluna: The numbers are not random that we picked. One graduate student, one undergraduate student is because they're different kinds of stakeholders in this institution. We have one, two faculty, one of which should be a faculty that's non-tenure track. They were not random numbers, we might get negotiation pushback from Reclaim MSU's policy proposal but this is why we did what we did. We don't have control of what's going to happen next. I'm just asking you to endorse this proposal as a way of, as a request. Thank you.

Moderator: May I recommend that we just have one more comment or question.

James: James [inaudible 01:41:27] from the College of Social Sciences. I appreciate all your work on this. I'm a little unclear about like we asked some people around me what constitutes Reclaim MSU? Is it really representative of the University? Seeing this proposal and things for the first time is ... As some have already said that it really is a heavy load. My thought is maybe it could be less as for us like not having a constitutional amendment and things like that until you get consensus from the other peer institutions that would be affected.

James: I think it's like, in spite of all your efforts there needs to be more of an information process, a few faculty governance about what's going on, who are the members of Reclaim MSU and things. This is a little confusing to us, what the background is in this movement within the school.

Moderator: A brief reply and then we should call the question.

Anna: Okay. Reclaim MSU is just ... it's a completely open group of people who formed after the resignation of Pres. Simon in order to try do work on measures related to what, I mean, the group that was there decided, sexual assault, prevention and academic governance. It includes faculty, staff, Senate, graduate students, undergraduates, but it's a completely open group. Is it representative? That's like hard to say, right? The 650 who signed the petition in support of this, not that many people come to the twice weekly meetings.

Laura: Okay. We'll call the question. Turn on your clickers. How do we do this again? On off.

Moderator: You guys, turn on your clicker.

Laura: Yup, got it. Blue lights are showing. We'll have ... is there one more? Very, very-

Keith: Point of order. Please state what we are voting on.

Laura: Yes. We'll have A as Yes and B as No, or approve and disapprove, it depends.

Moderator: Approve, Disapprove and Abstain also.

Laura: Oh, and C would be abstain.

Andaluna: The motion is for faculty Senate to endorse the Reclaim MSU proposal.

Laura: A approve, B disapprove, C abstain.

Keith: Move to table this until our next meeting, even more discussion.

Laura: This is our last meeting of the year.

Keith: I'm aware of that. It's just that I don't want to vote on something that we haven't had that information on. That does have merit but yet we have processes in play to ... we have committees we just formed to talk about these issues and here we are voting on something. It may be a great idea but I move that we postpone our vote until we have more information.

Moderator: You would need to come up and formally make an amendment to the motion, and that would have to be approved by this body.

Keith: Keith [Hampton 01:45:08] from the College of Communication Arts and Sciences. Is there a procedure other than a motion that can be done to table this until further debate? Okay, I'd like to move then that we postpone this vote until our next meeting, for further discussion.

Moderator: Is there a second?

Laura: There's a second. All in favor? Should we vote? Can we iClick our vote?

Moderator: We should iClick our vote on this.

Laura: Have you started?

Speaker 1: Yes.

Laura: They've started voting.

Speaker 2: Hold on. Let me open it up.

Laura: Wait, don't let anyone see.

Speaker 2: It won't show up.

Laura: Okay. There's been a motion to table this.

Moderator: Point of order. There's a motion on the table so we have to vote on the first motion before we entertain the second motion.

Laura: Vote on the tabling or vote on the original motion?

Moderator: Vote on the original motion and then vote on tabling the motion.

Laura: Okay, so I misunderstood. The table 1st. Okay, we vote on the table first.

Andaluna: Could I just make a quick comment that, and just to say this that we've tried in repeated times and repeated times to have this come here, repeatedly, the February meeting and the March meeting and this time it was not going to be on the agenda either. We really, really, really ... we're not just bringing this up on you, [inaudible 01:46:59].

Moderator: Vote on the table first.

Laura: Okay. A is table, B no table.

Provost Youatt: C abstain.

Laura: C abstain.

Moderator: C abstain and we'll give it a minute.

Speaker 2: Yes, it's open.

Moderator: It's open. Yes is to table it, No is not to table, or abstain.

Speaker 2: We're just not getting a green vote. I'm not getting any votes in here so this is concerning to me as well. Of course, right, technology. Hold on. Let me ... stop the voting here. Let me just restart the program and be back here in a second. Go ahead and try voting again now.

Moderator: A to table, B to not table, C to abstain. Are they coming in now? They're not.

Laura: Oh geez.

Moderator: No votes coming in? Nope.

Laura: Do we have to do something like put it in the AA mode or something?

Speaker 2: They should all be defaulting into AA mode. That is the way that they were setup when we left the shop today. Let me grab.

Moderator: For tabling while he's working on this. Shall we just show up hands? Okay, Laura.

Laura: The idea is would you be okay doing a show of hands to vote? On the tabling. All in favor of tabling or approve tabling.

Moderator: We should both count.

Laura: Okay.

Moderator: Those who vote not to table please raise your hands. That's a majority, there's visual majority.

Speaker 1: I don't know if this motion is in order, but I would like to move to refer Reclaim MSU to the ad hoc committee on Academic Governance.

Moderator: Unfortunately, that is out of order.

Laura: How are we doing over there?

Moderator: Not so well, I don't think.

Laura: Are you not having a big feeling?

Moderator: I would suggest that there either, Laura, that there either be a raise of hands, or if you wish it to be anonymous. You got it?

Laura: We got it. We got it. It took you to say it wouldn't work to get it to work.

Moderator: Hey that's magic isn't it. Okay, if you would please, turn on your clickers and then proceed to vote.

Speaker 1: Can you just tell us again what the differences?

Moderator: The difference is is that A you approve, B you disapprove, C you abstain.

Laura: Okay. 29 approve and 18 disapprove.

Moderator: 2 abstain.

Laura: 2 abstain. It support, that's enough right?

Moderator: Yes it is.

Laura: It's supported.

Moderator: We need that motion for adjournment.

Laura: Okay. This was the resolution call. What? Now, we have to do a resolution call for-

Anna: I think we should refer that to University Council because University Council if it votes also can call a meeting of the Academic Congress, correct?

Laura: Okay, so we could do that at University Council? Is there a motion to adjourn? Or we could stay here. All right. I'm assuming you're all in favor, you're moving around. Have a good evening, thank you.