

Dr. Miksich: Complete audio of the meeting. We post also, a complete transcript of the meeting. So that if anybody wants to go into further detail on that information, we have never done this before, so we're doing it now. The minutes should not be a transcript. We already have a transcript. You should not be writing two transcripts. When we had ... Is it running?

Steph: Yes.

Dr. Miksich: When we had two transcripts, where we had minutes that were going eight and nine pages long, it became a second transcript. And that discourages people, I think, from actually reading them. So, we are going to stick, my office is going to stick to the two or three page minutes. Posting the audio, posting the print transcript of the meeting for anyone who wants to investigate further in terms of the detail of it.

Steph: This was also ... Hello? This was also something that we voted on at a 557 meeting last year. And was passed to have abbreviated minutes.

Andeluna B: With those, quick question, we do not have the policy we voted on.

Dr. Miksich: Pass the microphone. Does she have a microphone?

Andeluna B: The number two, Madison College, I do agree, I know that we voted on [crosstalk 00:01:19].

Dr. Miksich: You need to.

Cathering G: Stand by.

Andeluna B: What should I do? Okay, so I do know that we voted on having more abbreviated minutes. I think there was some confusion as to what exactly that would be. But the point of the matter is, this is such an important policy change, and we are a deliberative faculty body, the deliberative faculty body. And not knowing what we voted on, what the exact wording that we agreed to, and what our concerns are, is a problem. Because while we can shorten other things, we come in now, and I was at that meeting. And frankly, I can't really ... And I don't know for people who are incoming, what they can make of it. And I think it's really important in terms of the effectiveness and clarity of communication, particularly on policies that have such stringent implications for faculty. And that have a history, such a contentious history at this one.

We need to see, not only the policy, but the main points of the deliberation. I did look at the transcripts, and you know, Gary, that I follow everything real carefully. And the transcripts are actually very difficult to follow, because they're unedited and they don't correspond, so there really needs to be, in my opinion, more clear communication on the meeting. On the minutes. So I think we haven't hit the right balance, particularly with such stringent policy that

affects us all, that we had lots of contention about. And some important points of deliberation. And we don't have any of that in front of us. Thank you.

Dr. Miksichek: I appreciate your comments, Andeluna. We do have a policy here in terms of the approval of the minutes that we will accept any recommendations for revision of language. And I certainly would be happy with members of this committee to revise anything in the minutes that needs to be revised, and again, attempting to keep it within three pages, with difficult action items, or complex action items, I will provide more language for that.

Steph: Thank you, is there, we have a motion on the floor to approve the minutes. Are there any amendments to the minutes? If not, all in favor say aye. Opposed?

Andeluna B: Nay.

Steph: Thank you, motion carries. President's remarks, Dr. Stanley.

Dr. Stanley: So, thank you very much, and welcome everybody. This is my first senate meeting and I'm pleased to be here, thank you. Maybe I'll just spend a couple minutes saying what I've been up to in the first 41 days, I'm not counting. But, it's the first 41 days. I've really been working I think to listen and learn around the university. I just finished visiting one of our colleges, the Colleges of Osteopathic Medicine as a matter of fact. I'm going to be visiting all of the colleges over the next few months. Meeting with faculty and staff, and answering questions, essentially about the university. What I'm working on, what we need to work on together, and of course listening to people and their comments, and what's important to them. And I think that's something that's very important for me in these first few months.

I don't need to tell you that Michigan State University is an extraordinarily complex and layered place. And so the more I know about it, I think the better I'm going to be able to do my job. So I appreciate the opportunity to do that. And I think it's very important. At the same time, I'm meeting with deans and others to talk about the priorities that I think are important, as we begin thinking about how we move forward.

One of the things I think that's very important to me is that we begin work on strategic planning for the university as a whole. That's not a rush job, again, because of the complexity of the institution, I need to understand it better. But I want again, to engage people in that process, and start getting ideas of how we formulate a plan that will reflect ... And inclusive plan essentially that has a number of view points in it. But helps us really lay out what we view as what the university should look like, five, 10 years from now depending on the interval we want to look at.

And again, that's incredibly important. Those are issues as basic as how large should the university be. Issues as basic as how diverse should the university ...

What are our goals if we're looking at, what are we trying to accomplish? And so I think those are things that getting input from the campus as a whole is very important, but also I think stating the set of values for the university as well. What do we stand for? What do we care about? And again, what do we want to accomplish?

So again, I look forward to people and partnering with that. And identifying people who are interested in being a part of that going forward. I also am interested in getting a strategic plan available for diversity equity inclusion. That was a high priority for me at my previous location. I think there's work to be done as there is in every campus probably in the country, on that issue. And again, I look forward to engaging people and will be working to set up a committee to help get that started as well.

In the meantime, we have some immediate things to deal with. And these are very important, and of course the most important is probably, again, making this as safe and as welcoming a campus it can be. And that brings us to the OCR report. As you saw last Thursday, the office of civil rights and the department of education released their report on the things that took place at Michigan State University, and their view of how it was handled, essentially, and where responsibility lay. It's a very thorough report. I encourage anyone who's interested to read it. It's 54 plus pages, essentially. Complex a little bit, in terms of how it refers to people, so it takes a while to read through, and I still haven't I think, gone through it to my complete satisfaction, and I'm doing that. But what I think you see is a tale about, as they say, about individuals, about structure, and about culture.

So actions by individuals that were extraordinarily detrimental to the university and the people who depend on it. A culture that allowed those things to take place, and then structures that weren't designed to adequately detect that kind of behavior. So we have a blueprint, essentially, from that OCR report on how we should move forward. That's what I look upon it as, as a blueprint for what we need to do. There's a whole series of things that are set out. And I guess, probably the most important thing to say is that letter was addressed to me. So that letter from the department of education, their OCR was addressed to me. So I bear responsibility for implementing this, but it's not something I'm going to be able to do alone.

I'm going to need help from all of us, when we talk about culture change, we all have to get engaged. When we talk about the implementation of the facts, I'm going to need help from senior leaders and from you as well, to implement the things we put forward. And I'm appointing a special oversight committee to take a look at all of the recommendations, not just from the OCR report, from the DHA SHEFS report, and from what we've heard from clary as well. All of those things, to take a look and make sure that we're implementing as we're supposed to. That's going to be the bare minimum of what we do in this area. So what OCR said, what DHHS said, what clary has asked us to do, that would be the bare

minimum what we do. We're going to complete that. And we will be transparent about it.

We'll set up a website, essentially, on our commitment side that outlines the actions we're taking in response to those reports. Of course, there was also 4.5 million dollar fine associated from clary, with this as well. That's the largest fine ever laid on an institution. And so, again, talking to us again about the seriousness about what's happened here and how we need to improve. And I think it's as strong a message as one could see.

So I'm focused on that, I'm happy again, to take suggestions people have as we move forward on things we may do in this area. But there will be more things happening in this realm. We're not done in this area. Again, there'll be more things taking place in this realm. And again, you can follow the blueprint and follow what we're doing in response to it on our website, probably within the next month or so, we'll get that dashboard going.

Marilyn Karen, who's our chief audit risk and compliance officer will lead that group. She's independent, essentially, and that will be helpful for us in a number of ways.

I'm also scheduling meetings with survivors of sexual assault. That'll be survivors of sexual assault on the campus, survivors from Nasser, and there will be a Skype kind of video conference for those who don't feel comfortable coming in person. And those will take place in September and October. And I'm looking forward to doing those.

The other thing that happened, of course, on Thursday, was the resignation of the provost. We are in the process now of doing very quick, but I think comprehensive search for an interim provost to fill that position. It's obviously very important position for the university. The interim will probably serve, I would say between six months and a year in that position. So we want to make sure we have someone who's qualified to do this. I've had a number of nominations come from faculty, staff, and other leaders for people they want considered. We're reaching out to a number of people to take a look and talk with them about their interest in the position. And I hope to name someone by the end of this week, or early next week. And again, they will have the full authority of provost during that time, so it's a very important position.

As far as the actual provost position, we're planning a national search. We will create a broadly representational committee. I was impressed, and I hope you were by the committee, it may sound self-serving, but the committee that selected the president, I thought it was a very good committee. We'll look again to replicate that kind of committee going forward, representative again of the important constituencies of the campus. And the search again, will probably take a while. And again, we'll be consulting with shared governance as well

about that search and who we're looking for and what kind of candidate we should be considering for provost.

I also, interesting enough, wanted to thank the senate for your input over the last year on the discipline and dismissal process policy changes. For the faculty. That was approved by the board of trustees at the last meeting. And again, I want to thank for the collaborative effort that brought that policy forward. So, as I said, I'm going to be visiting every college this fall. I look forward to meeting you in that venue. And again, I thank you for your service on the senate and look forward to working with you there. Thank you.

Steph: Other questions for the president? I have a question, with regard to the search committee for provost, you mentioned that it was going to be a committee similar to the one for the presidential search. The one for the presidential search had alumni and had people from donors, people from outside the university. And this, as the chief academic officer of the university, are you planning on the same kind of committee?

Dr. Stanley: No. I think similarity was in terms of trying to be inclusive, essentially, of the major constituents of the university. But this will be focused on the academic component of it.

Steph: Thank you. Anything else? Any other questions? Yes. Somebody will come to you with a microphone.

Lisa Lepides: I'm figuring this out. Lisa Lepides, college of natural science. So, are we looking outside of MSU for the interim provost?

Dr. Stanley: I have had some suggestions of names outside of the university for interim provost, yes.

Steph: Other questions?

Alyssa Dunn: Hi, Alyssa Dunn, college of education. I also have a question about the provost search, and I'm wondering if it will be closed like the presidential search, or open?

Dr. Stanley: I'm going to take a look at what the precedent has been at MSU, and how that's been conducted at the past, and that'll guide what I'll do.

Andeluna B: Andeluna Borcella. James Madison College. Welcome President Stanley. We don't know if you know this, but this senate body had, or quite a few of us on senate, had a problem or many problems with the process for the search that you came out of. And this has nothing to do with you, personally at this point.

Dr. Stanley: I don't take it personally.

Andeluna B: Okay. And so, I just really want to make the point, or emphasize that we really need a real culture change, and that as a member of faculty senate, I would do more than ask you if this is going to be an open or a closed search. I would like to actually urge you to have an open search for the provost of this institution because we've had a lot of problems with our administration, with transparency, and with shared governance. And also, with faculty voice not being listened to. So there is a dissonance here. There are quite a few people who are quite frustrated with faculty voice, and the way in which administration has listened to us. We need to change this culture, and we have been pushing for that change.

The provost search is a very important one for us, and I would urge you to have an open search for it, because it would really be important, I think. Thank you.

Dr. Stanley: You're welcome.

Steph: Other questions or comments for President Stanley? Yep.

Robert O'Foley: Robert O'Foley, college of engineering. I just want to make the comment that many of the problems we've had at this university is due to a lack of transparency, and a lack of commitment to what we say we are going to do. Now, a lot of the people are still here. You are new, and you have brought in a fresh new way of doing things, and so far I like the way you are handling things. I don't know about others, but I do. So the question is, what kinds of things do you have in mind that is going to send a message that business as usual will not work any more?

Dr. Stanley: I think accountability is very important. Again, I think I'd ask you to look at the response to the OCR report. How we deal with the OCR report is one area I think to look at. And again, there's specific instructions for me that I need to do, but I think, as I said before, would like to go beyond that as well. And I think again, just what you said. Do I do the things I say I'm going to do? And I'll work very hard to do that. But, I think in terms of very specific things, I think it's early for me to go into those details. But, thank you.

Steph: Other questions, comments, yes?

Dartha Bonnie: Hi, my name is Dartha Bonnie from the residential college and the arts and humanities. One question that I was asked to raise by my colleagues is about whether you'll be looking at some of the changes that happened under interim president Engler? And if so, if you have a plan to revisit any of those?

Dr. Stanley: So, basically looking at everything in terms of the structure of the office, in terms of appointments of people and so on. I think there will be some changes made in structure. I think there's things that I think probably based on my prior experience, would work better. I think for the university, and certainly for me and my leadership. So there will be some changes made. I don't think it's

necessary to specific things that Engler did, but looking over all at the university as a whole in areas I think might improve. But again, that'll be consultative. I think hopefully I've learned enough in my previous position to understand how important it is to get advice and understand institutions. Things that may work at one institution, may not work in others. So there's unique things about MSU that make it so a particular approach to governance or administration isn't likely to work as well. I'll take that advice as well.

But I think there will be other changes for sure.

Steph: Other questions, comments? Yes.

John Yun: Hi my name is John Yun, I'm from the college of education. And I was wondering if there has been any decision about the independent investigation that the trustees approved at the beginning of the summer, and recently said they were not going to pursue? What are your plans and how is that decision going to be made? Thank you.

Dr. Stanley: So I think that was a trustee decision essentially, to hold on that for the time being. I think in part because of the OCR report that was out. Right now, I view my job as to respond as the person who received the OCR report, it's my job, essentially to respond to that report and implement the recommendations that are made there. I do, as I said before, think that it's important step forward, essentially in understanding what some of the issues were and how we deal with them. So I think I'm going to have my hands full doing that. And I think an important thing is to really get that done, and get that done in an appropriate and timely manner. So that's where I'm focused right now.

Steph: Other questions, comments? Yes.

Dan Gould: Dan Gould, education. Two comments. First, in respect to some of our colleagues, I favored the search as it was done for the president, because I thought it would hurt if recruiting a sitting president, and so with the provost, I think we need all the transparency we can get. There's also sort of a realistic side. So I think there's some people in here that feel that the second comment is kind of switched gears. Budget wise, obviously because of all of the horrible things that happened, but we've been spending money like crazy. In the sense of half a billion here, and now this. And middle management has had to really grow to deal with some of the issues. Do you have any initial sense on where we are with the budget? And sooner or later, we're going to have to be paying for this, and how that's going to affect programming?

Dr. Stanley: Sure. So I mean, I think we are certainly paying for it already. And there's about a 26, I think, plus million dollar cost associated with the 500 million dollar settlement. So as you know, that's bonded money. But the [inaudible 00:19:41] cost is about 26 million that we're paying now. And there's certainly 4.5 million for the clary, and then there's significant legal fees as well. I think as we build up

our Title Nine office, which is very important, we've hired a number of people there, then we should be able to stop at some point in time, using outside agencies. We do want to deal with backlog, we do want to make sure that people are doing this in as timely way possible. We're still not there.

But I think that will help us in terms of reducing our costs going forward. And then of course the settlements that we'll be making going forward that'll be costly as well. So I think it does have financial impact, and it would be a mistake to think otherwise. And so it is possible down the road that there maybe some budget tightening. Right now, I particularly see it in facilities issues around our ability to kind of build new things over the next couple years. I think are going to be more limited than they've been in the past. But, the good news is to a large degree, we do have some very good facilities here, and we've done a fairly good job of maintaining, not every building, but a fairly good job of maintaining them.

So I think it's a very important question. Don't ... Still working, I've had a number of budget briefings. This is a complex budget, it was where I was before, but I think understanding kind of particularly, more than anything else, what the assumptions are going forward, that's a big part of it. So for this place, understanding what the assumptions are for enrollment? What's realistic in terms of what we're going to do? What's realistic in terms of tuition? What's realistic in terms of state allocation? Those are really the two major buckets that are supporting things. So I think getting a feel for what those assumptions are and how reasonable they are.

And then, how much is based, and this is important, on return on the endowment. So, the endowment, what's going to happen in stock markets? What's going to happen to kind of investments? So again, what's reasonable to think going forward? A recession could really change our financial situation.

Steph: Yes.

Jennifer J: Hi, Jennifer Johnson. College of human medicine. Can you say anything about the rationale for dismissed ... for the university moving to dismiss the second wave of survivor lawsuits? I was actually surprised by that last Friday in the board meeting. I didn't know about that. So what is going on with that and why?

Dr. Stanley: So it's really a response. In other words, lawsuits have been filed. There was a stay initially put on the court from any discovery and any response to those lawsuits. But at some point in time, the university has to defend those lawsuits, or else if they go to trial, we would be responsible for paying everything people are asking for. So if the suit was for example, for over 100 million dollars, the university mounts no defense against that suit, and then we lost, we would be responsible for paying 100 million. So settlements come when each side has a reason, essentially to come together. We are interested in settling those cases. We've settled more than 80. I think we've settled 83 of second wave lawsuits

already. So we really have been responsive and trying to settle these. And we're going to continue to be so.

But our failure to respond to that court order would've essentially almost defaulted us in all those areas. So it really had to be done as a procedural matter.

Steph: Other? Yes.

Jane Bunell: There we are. Jane Bunell, college of music. I don't ... There we go. We have the report from the department of education, and I don't mean to cast out on our government, but I just want to make sure that what the department of education wrote, is there a double checking to make sure that what they say and what we know, has anybody done anything to check those things?

Dr. Stanley: So there has been internal investigations, essentially, that was done early on by the university, and the law firm Scatton was involved in some of those. So that has taken place. And then of course, we have the results of the attorney general's investigation as well and some of the findings they have. So I think there's independent verification, and I think what's in there really I think does coincide with I think what was known by the university.

Steph: Other comments? Questions? Yes.

Nora Teagan: Hi my-

Dr. Stanley: You're good.

Nora Teagan: Okay, hi, my name is Nora Teagan, I'm a representative for ASMSU, and on the provost search, will there be any students present as part of the search committee?

Dr. Stanley: Yes.

Steph: Other questions, comments? Yes.

James Dulabon: I'm James Dulabon, college of social sciences. I appreciate all the proactive steps that you've taken. I know that people in my college, they've complained about thinking that because of the culture that's existed in the past, that OIE, and the offices that are responsible for investigating the things like that have tried to cover things up. And actually, the Forsyth report last December talked about a culture that would circle the wagon. And so, and I know that you've taken steps to have an oversight committee and things like that, so do you think that that will really be able to change how investigations are done, and the confidence that the MSU community has? That whether it be student, or staff, or faculty comes forward with a complaint that they'll actually be heard and they'll get an

appropriate response? That's the big issue, and that's a part of the cultural change, that I know Sateesh did a lot to start changing that.

But do you have some ideas about that? I'm sure you're kind of aware of the lack of confidence that exists.

Dr. Stanley:

Yeah, I agree and it's absolutely imperative that we get there, so that's an absolutely high priority where people believe that ... First of all getting people to report is incredibly important. So creating an atmosphere where people feel comfortable reporting, because they don't feel retaliation that's one. But then second, feeling that when they report, something will happen. There will be an investigation and that investigation will be done in a professional and competent way. That's very important as well. The third component is again, ways in which we can take action and what we do in terms of the actions we can take. That's probably the most complex one, and the one you're alluding to, because sometimes it gets tied into employment conditions, things like that. What the rules are that are associated, for example, for people who are union employees and so on. What you can say and not say in public about a given thing.

We know sometimes there's not ... There's findings of ... There may be finding, but not clear cut actions that we're taking. In fact, there may have been actions taken, but they're not discussed in public, again because of some of those rules. So I think what we have to do, again, is clean up all those things where we can, knowing that there are some limitations to what we can report and so on. But I think being as transparent as possible about this. And then I think something that we're doing now that we weren't doing before is when a case comes in, even if there's not a finding of responsibility, that case is stored. So that will be stored, essentially centrally, so we know that. So if another case comes in, you can start accumulating, essentially, a trail and record. And that's something that wasn't done before. Isn't done in a lot of schools already, that's really important, I think that we do going forward. And I think that'll help us in this way.

I think that's one of the major failures that takes place. But to everyone in this room, I'd say the most important thing is we've got to get to the culture where people feel comfortable reporting. That was really a key failure was the failure to report. There were problems with the investigations that were done, there were problems with people not adequately pursuing, because someone was a great dean. Or not adequately pursuing because they were viewed as a great dean. So that's what you're talking about in terms of circling the wagons, not pursuing professional, collegial behavior. Those things really have no place in what we're trying to do. We really need, everyone's treated the same essentially. If a charge is brought forward, we should have the same processes and procedures, and those should be robust processes and procedures that people believe in so we can move forward.

Not every accusation will turn out to have merit. But we want to make sure that we're treating everyone that comes forward as reasonable and pursuing them accordingly.

Steph: Thank you. Are we ready to move on? Any other questions, comments? Chair person's remarks. I would like to start by welcoming president Stanley. It's very wonderful to have a president. We haven't had one. We've had ... It is, it's wonderful to have you as a president. Let me say it that way. We've been in a state of transition for quite a long time, and I think we can all very much thank Sateesh Udpuf for his work and his calming influence, but it's nice to have a person who is where we can move on. And so, welcome from all of us. And I am very encouraged by the number of people who are talking and making comments, and asking questions. And I hope that we can continue doing that with president Stanley, just so that he is aware of what is happening at the university from our point of view.

The first thing I want to talk about is the microphone situation. So one of the things that came up, and this is, I quickly moved onto orientation. One of the things that came up in the report from the ADHOC committee on faculties, on improving faculty senate was the fact that people have to come up and talk at the microphone. And we've been working on that and trying to find other ways to fix this, or to do something that would fix this. And so, we have two options today. We have microphones, as you see, that are floating, and we have this. Now today, we only have one of these. But if this turns out to be something that we want to use, then we will continue to use this. We will find a way to get more. I promise.

But what I would like to do right now, that we have never done before, is I would like to have everyone in the faculty senate, I'm going to start over here, and just pass this from one person to another and have everyone in the faculty senate stand up, introduce yourself. Say your name and what college you're from. And see if you like this mic. Please don't throw it, unless you have really good aim.

Abby Bennett: I just ... Oh, there it goes. Hi, Abby Bennet, college of agriculture and natural resources.

Elizabeth Benne: Elizabeth Gardner, college of ag and nat resources.

Eric Benvogue: Eric Benvogue, college of ag and natural resources. Standing in for Rufus Isaacs. Same college, but I'm also in the college of osteopathic medicine.

Sofia Sanjay: Hi, Sofia Sanjay, also college of ag and natural resources.

Brian Teppin: I'm Brian Teppin, I'm the last person from the college of ag and natural resources.

Laura Cloud: Hi, I'm Laura Cloud, I'm from the college of arts and letters.

Juliette G: Hi everyone, Juliette Gazette, college of arts letters.

Sandra Logan: Hi, Sandra Logan. College of arts and letters.

Joyce Meyer: Joyce Meyer, college of arts and letters.

Andrew Corner: Andrew Corner, communication arts and sciences.

Malia Fernandez: Malia Fernandez, communication arts and sciences.

Bree Holts: Hi, Bree Holts, communication arts and sciences.

John Zyung: Hi, John Zyung from business college.

Matt Anderson: Matt Anderson, college of business, subbing for Marilyn Johnson.

Wayne Nesbitt: Hi everyone. Wayne Nesbitt, college of business.

Yala Ruvia: Hi everyone, Yala Ruvia from the college of business.

Alyssa Dunn: Hi, I'm Alyssa Dunn from the college of education.

Dan Gould: Dan Gould, college of ed.

John Yun: John Yun, college of ed.

Phillip Eisenor: Phillip Eisenor, college of engineering.

Robert O'Foley: Robert, O'Foley, college of engineering.

Neil Wright: Neil Wright, college of engineering.

Julia Felton: Hi, Julia Felton, college of human medicine.

Jennifer J: Jennifer Johnson, college of human medicine.

Simpa: Simpa [inaudible 00:32:17]. College of human medicine, standing for Addy Olam.

Malra: Malra [inaudible 00:32:23], college of human medicine.

Galia Venitez: Galia Venitez, for James Madison college.

Andeluna B: Hi everyone, Andeluna Borcella, James Madison college.

Anna P: Anna Peglagordo. James Madison college and at large member.

Cathering G: Catherine Grosso, college of law.

Jennifer Rosa: Jennifer Rosa, college of law.

Robert Bell: Robert Bell, Lyman Briggs college.

Ekeza Leke: Ekeza Leke, Lyman Briggs college

Jane Bunell: Jane Bunnell, college of music.

Derek P: Derek Polischuck, college of music.

George Gharety: George Gharety, college of natural sciences.

Lisa Lepides: Lisa Lepides, natural science.

Milan M: Milan McLouchish, college of natural sciences.

Kyle Miller: Kyle Miller, natural science.

Greg Swain: Greg Swain, college of natural science.

Patrick Crain: Patrick Crain, college of nursing.

Joanne Golword: Joanne Golword, college of nursing.

Marcy Mectal: Marcy Mectal, college of nursing.

Yatzek C: Yatzek Cholowiki, college of osteopathic medicine.

Robert Root: Robert Root, college of osteopathic medicine.

Jill Slate: Jill Slate, college of osteopathic medicine.

Mary Tine: Mary Tine, college of osteopathic medicine.

Dave Sheridan: Dave Sheridan, residential college in the arts and humanities.

Sadartha Bani: Sadartha Bani, also residential college in the arts and humanities.

Hungar Cho: Hungar Cho, college of social sciences.

James Dulabon: James Dulabon, college of social sciences.

Erica Franz: Erica Franz, college of social sciences.

Steven Gastire: Steven Gastire, college of social sciences.

Larry Martin: Larry Martin, social science.

Andres C: Andres Contreras, college of veterinary medicine.

Mick Folden: Mick Folden, college of veterinary medicine.

Mata Cupel: Mata Cupel, college of veterinary medicine.

Ed Rosser: Ed Rosser, college of veterinary medicine.

Stephanie V: Stephanie Valbert, college of vet med.

Alex Hauser: Alex Hauser, non college faculty representing the libraries.

Amelia M: Amelia Marjek-Taylor, non college faculty, also representing the libraries.

Nicole Smelta: Nicole Smelta, non college faculty representing the library.

Mae Huave: Mae Huave, college of education.

Abdula Sohani: Abdula Sohani, I'm college of engineering.

Melanie Wallace: Melanie Wallace, I'm the academic specialist rep.

Filomena Nunez: Filomena Nunez, I'm from the college of natural sciences, but I'm here representing the facility for rare set of beings.

Terry Curry: Terry Curry, office of the provost.

Nora Teagan: Nora Teagan, ASMSU.

Steph: I think we don't need to state your names. Unless you would like to introduce yourself. Okay. And then over here we've got some other.

Gwen W: Hi, I'm Gwen Whittenbaum, I don't have a name tag, so I should be over there with communication arts and sciences.

Stephanie A: Hello, Stephanie Anthony. Associate provost of undergrad education, and at large member.

Steph: I think that's it, everybody else is a guest. Okay. So I'm not throwing this because no one wants me to throw this. Thank you all. Thank you all very much. So, for

the orientation materials, there are several things that you have. One is a sheet that shows the academic governance structure. This may be something that all of you know already. If you don't, this would be helpful in terms of realizing what committees are and which ones flow into which other ones. So it starts with the at large members of which I am an at large member. The chair and the vice chair are from the at large members, they are voted on by the faculty at large. Then goes down to the steering committee, which is 16 voting members representing standing committee chairs and other people. Then faculty senate, which includes everyone on the steering committee, plus two members from each college, and then additional members depending upon whether they happen to be on the steering committee, or whether or not they happen to be, or whether or not the college has a large population of faculty.

Then down to university council, which is the largest group that meets regularly. And then academic congress. Academic congress is scheduled to meet twice a year, it normally does not meet, because it normally does not have an agenda. The last time I believe it met was when we had the controversy over moving the medical school to Grand Rapids. But there is always a date on board for academic congress.

The other thing is acronyms related to academic governance. We talk about acronyms, we have acronyms all the time, and sometimes we just use the acronym and we have no idea what it stands for. NASDAQ, I don't know what NASDAQ is. But this tells you the ones that are related to academic governance. Obviously the university has many, many, many more than this, but I don't believe they are so ... They are completely related to academic governance. So if you can think of others that are not on this list, please email me and let me know, because I would like to have as comprehensive a list for this group of people since we use them all the time.

Let me go next to Jennifer Johnson, who's going to talk about the quick guide to academic governance at MSU. And I would like to thank the ADHOC committee, who met and came up with this particular guide, that was, it's been very, very helpful, it's an excellent guide and Jennifer is going to talk a little bit about it.

Jennifer J:

All right, thank you. We created this, I was part of Dr. Nunez's group that met over the summer to try to make academic governance more efficient and more effective. And I was a new member last year to the faculty senate, and it takes a good couple months to figure out what's going on. So we wanted to put together this document to jumpstart that process, so that we can start to work efficiently right away. Briefly, this is in your guides, or in the printed materials. I'm going to go over a couple of things. One, bottom of page one, purpose of the faculty senate. Why are we here? There's 77 of us for two hours. Why?

Well really, we want to make good use of our time. So, our job is to represent faculty members ideas, suggestions and concerns for the president and provost. Consult and discuss with one another and channel the information and actions

from the senate back to their constituents. So there's essentially too lines of communication in the university. One is ... And in the colleges. One is up through the formal channels, through the chairs, deans, provost, president. But then the colleges have the college advisory committees, where there's a faculty representative who communicates with the dean also to share information to the faculty back and forth, and we're kind of that in terms of the president and provost, in terms of the faculty.

So, this time is best made of use if you know your other faculty senators, if you're talking to your faculty members, if you know some of their questions and concerns and bring them. And then take the information back. Really there's 77 of us, I think there are 5700 faculty and academic staff. So about one of us for every 74. And we really are representing their thoughts and concerns, and that is our purpose.

If you go to page four of that, under the expectations for faculty senators, here's what you can do. And Dr. Nunez will present some of our thoughts about how to make good use of this time, but as individual faculty senators, here's what you can do to really, I think, make good use of your role. You have responsibility, we have responsibility for three way communication. We bring questions, concerns, suggestions to the attention of the faculty senate. And we can bring them to the president and provost. They disseminate information back out, and you engage with other faculty in the senate to create bridges within and across colleges.

Again, we have 5000 plus people with advanced degrees in almost everything with a lot of knowledge, with a lot of expertise, that can be bring to bear in solving university problems. I think of it almost like crowd sourcing university problem solving. So, here are the expectations. Please know the faculty you represent. It's really interesting because the colleges have a few faculty senators in each, so you may coordinate among you. As a faculty senator, personally I like to try to know as many people in the college as I can. But as far as at least I'm concerned, that's kind of up to you guys and how you want to do that. But, talk to your faculty. Know what they need, know what their concerns are, know what their ideas are, and have them know who you are. A lot of faculty don't know who their faculty senators are.

So talk to them and have them know who you are. That's number two. Expected to introduce themselves to your constituents. So that when they have a thought, or problem, or suggestion, they know how to reach you, they know how to reach us. And they know how to get to the right people.

Your expected to relay information to your constituents. Dr. Swain did a great thing, showed us a prototype we use for the at large members, which is to type up a summary, just a quick summary and send it out to folks in your college. You don't have to do that, it may be college specific, the best way to get the information out. But, we'll have a lot of people throughout the year from

university administration talking to us about a variety of things, and it's good to educate the 77 of us, but the real goal is to educate the 5000 of us, right? So, pass the information along in whatever way you see fit.

It can be done a few different ways. There are faculty senate minutes, they're posted online. There are university council minutes, in the electronic copy of this, I actually think the links are there if you click it. There's upcoming agendas, university council agendas, there's actually a tracking system that talks about what the senate has covered before. You can look at issues on that, and as people raise issues, encourage your faculty to submit them to that tracking system, or email us or there's a few different ways. acedgov@MSU.edu. We want to hear people's ideas, we want to hear people's concerns, and thoughts, and suggestions.

Faculty senators are expected to encourage your people to bring issues and suggestions to us. There's three different ways. They can tell you, they can email academic governance, they can submit the issue online. But encourage and empower your faculty to be active in this and other participatory governance processes. They're only as good as the ideas that come in, and to the degree that they're representative. So please do that.

You're expected to attend senate meetings. This was interesting because I think some folks were surprised last year that the mechanism by ... If you can't come to the meeting, please send a representative. And I think a few people were surprised last year, because the method of dismissal is if you miss more than two meetings, they send an email to your dean. Which I actually did not know, and that's not a particularly pleasant way for that to happen. I don't know why it's that way, but it is that way. What? That's not true?

Steph: That's not going to happen.

Jennifer J: Okay, all right.

Steph: So if you miss meetings, then you will be sent an email, first of all asking if you're okay. And if you're aware of the policy. Because sometimes people miss meetings because things have happened. I mean, there's lots of things that can happen in this world that could cause you to miss meetings. And to let you know what the policy is when you miss a meeting. So this will just be an automatic email that goes out. But be aware, that if you miss two meetings, that at that point in time, that is in the by-laws that you are no longer a member of faculty senate. However, if you have a replacement who takes your place at the meeting, then that's fine. If it's an emergency situation, and you can't. You have a flat tire, and you're in Onendega or something like that, and you can't get here. Then there's nothing we can do about it. Nothing you can do about it. That would not count against you.

So it's a question of somebody who just isn't showing up at faculty senate meetings.

Jennifer J: Yeah, and so, and then the last one is comment, engage, and participate. And like I said, governance works, and I think the university works to the extent to which there's free and open flow of communication. We're talking about transparency, we're talking about wanting to be in the loop. So we can be part of that important link by knowing our faculty, by bringing our ideas here, by encouraging them to participate and everyone to be as engaged as possible as making things better. And that way when we get ED, MD, and PhDs, and DOs and all the things we are in a room together for two hours, we can really work on moving the university forward.

Steph: Thank you. Any questions about this? Any comments? Thank you very much. So before we go to the clarification of rules for academic governance, back to the microphones. We have the option right now of getting microphones as they are doing them, and I don't think we need to have humans handing the microphones around. We will have more microphones that we can pass from one person to another. Or we have the option of the green catch thing. And we will get more of those. So, please let us know which you would prefer. If you have a preference for one or the other, we can, I think go either way. I don't think there's ... I think that either is possible, is that correct? Yes?

Barb Crans: Thank you, I need the mic. Barb Crans, facilities planning space management. So, as Steph said, today we've provided the mics that we are bringing to you just to try, and also the catch box. So it'd be helpful to know if that works. We are also looking at the ability to have a mic at the table, probably one for every three or four people to share, is another option. We just didn't have the time to have that ready for today. So, the WKAR team and the IT services team are going to work on that. Targeting your next meeting. So, if there is a preference, it would be helpful to know, and we're trying to help facilitate your meetings as best as we can.

Steph: Okay, so let us know if you have a preference between the catch box, and the mics that would go from one person to another.

Barb Crans: Do you want to do a show of hands?

Steph: Yes.

Barb Crans: At this point.

Steph: Are people ... Do people have an opinion about this right now? Or would you rather wait for a little bit and see how it works, yes? Of course. Do you want to try tossing.

- Juliette G: I like the catch box, because it's like a crystal ball that we're looking into. Juliette Gazetta, college of arts and letters. This might be coming up later with Dr. Nunez's, so I don't want to preempt anything. But I really like the suggestions and appreciate, really like the introduction and appreciate these efforts. But I wonder more about a space like the UN, when we can see each other, that's circular. I think that would take it to a whole other level.
- Steph: That is coming up.
- Juliette G: Okay.
- Steph: That is going to be coming up.
- Juliette G: Okay.
- Steph: Other?
- Wayne Nesbitt: Is there any difference in fidelity between the two?
- Steph: I think the difference is, is it possible to turn the catch boxes on all at once? If we had a ton of them.
- Wayne Nesbitt: They're Bluetooth. So there could be interference issues, especially in the sound system. That's what we are trying to bring out. There's feedback even as it is.
- Steph: So that was a kind of non-answer, sorry. Other comments about the ... yes.
- Galia Venitez: Galia Venitez, James Madison college. I disagree with the catch box. Totally against it. I actually have tried it, and I think it is \$800, it's like \$790, that's because we find it on the internet also with my students. And it's very fickle, it doesn't really work. All the time, you have to change the batteries. So, it's very problematic. So I vote no for the catch box.
- Steph: Thank you very much for letting us know that. This is like reading Amazon reviews, right? We need to know how many stars does the catch box get. All right, other comments? Yes.
- Andeluna B: Thank you. See, we have to imagine ourselves.
- Steph: This is Andeluna Borcella.
- Andeluna B: Andeluna Borcella, James Madison college, thank you. So we have to imagine ourselves in a different setting with the microphones, and then imagine what it would be like. Because, right? Not in this setting. This is what we're working for.

Steph: I think we are working for a different setting for sure. Yes. This is not going to happen with any ... It's not going to happen, I think this semester is what I understand. There's nothing available that would ... Barb Crans will talk about that when we talk about the report. Or maybe it would be best for you to talk about it now, yeah. Maybe right now would be good.

Barb Crans: As Steph was saying, I'll just- Is that going to be better? Thank you. For fall semester and spring semester, there are very few rooms that we can actually accommodate your current meeting day and time. So I'm going to show you a couple, some slides of some area rooms on campus that could potentially work. If the senate is open to my suggestion, it might be worthwhile that we, if you had maybe three to five people that would work with us as an idea, to explore some options going forward. One of which may include a redo of this space. Again, we couldn't get that done during this semester, but it is coming up on our renovation list. So I'll just put that out there.

This room is at the union, it would be a very different experience. More of an active, what we would consider the active learning in terms of both for group interaction and we have multiple, again, for presentation, your meetings are a little bit different than some of our courses that we do. The room I only available on Friday for both the fall and spring semester, so from a scheduling standpoint, we're making good use of the space, but in terms of accommodating. But it may be something, again, a small group might want to go look at, sort of have some conversation about how this room might work, how it might help facilitate interactions amongst yourselves. And with the group.

This is a space, it's actually two rooms at Ericson Hall that can be opened up to one room. Again, similar in terms of like the union room, the shape of the tables is a little bit different. The only, for fall semester, is on Tuesdays from eight to 10, but if this is something to explore, we'd be happy to do that and then look for spring semester if we might be able to get in that room for the faculty senate.

Then there'll be a few rooms, again these are university classrooms. So in terms of capacity, we could set this up, we'd have someone, a moving crew or setup crew, come in and rearrange it to a different setup so that you could be facing each other. There is parking in the neighborhood in terms of access to the space. Again, we do have the challenge for the upcoming academic year, you'd have to look at an alternate time.

This is in human ecology building. So location, on campus, somewhat centrally. Again, we'd have to rearrange it for your meetings, but wanted again, just showing what we have available. And again, for fall and spring, we do have our schedule challenge.

This is a new multipurpose room in the Menscoff pavilion that just opened, we're showing it in a chair arrangement that's 160, but it can be configured with

tables and chairs in the 80 to 90 range. And we would work with the college of business in terms of access to that. So if that's of interest, we would follow up and see if that's a possibility.

This is at the veterinary diagnostic lab. It does have, in terms of capacity, again, the room would have to be set up for your meeting, so that you could have the face to face interaction. I would anticipate that given its location, most folks would be driving there, so we would want to make sure that their parking lot holds about 70 cars. So we do have staff out there working, that may be a challenge. But, I wanted to share that as well.

This is a new space, so we don't have it ... it's under construction right now. It's in Wonders Hall, it will open spring semester. This would be an option in terms of, again, even if wanting to try it. We haven't scheduled it yet, we're working with the registrar right now. So there would be the ability to schedule at least one of your meetings, if you wanted to try, or perhaps a couple of them.

And this would give you, it's more similar to the union in terms of tables and chairs. I would say it would be a challenge when we look at our ... The spaces that are available size to get a full circular, in terms of having for 80 people roughly. But again, happy to meet, if a group would want to work with us, we'd be happy to do that. Or if any of these look at something we'd want to consider.

Steph: So is the business, Menscoff Pavilion, is that something that would be available this semester?

Barb Crans: We will check if this is of interest with the college.

Steph: Because that looks like it might be the best possibility. Is there a group that would be interested in ... I'm sorry, let me just ... Is there a group that would be interested in going there and checking it out, is what I'm asking? So just thinking about that. Yes.

Filomena Nunez: Sorry, Filomena Nunez. We already looked at these places. So there's certainly some comments about that in the report. And in particular the Menscoff, there are rooms that are actually circular or semi circular that are at the lament of very close to what we need. And the spirit is really not to have separate tables. The spirit is to generate a space that creates one conversation. Because what we're doing here is having one conversation. We just want a conversation that flows, rather than ... You know, all directions, rather than just from the panel to the students in the typical format of a lecture. And so it's really important to have concentric circles or things like that, to generate the one conversation. Not multiple tables. Because these are not break up sessions, where everybody now goes and does some homework.

Steph: Yes.

- Mata Cupel: Mata Cupel, college of veterinary medicine. You made a comment about the veterinary diagnostic lab, we actually often have large meetings from the DNR with the public there. So we open up the parking space in the back. So it's actually probably the most convenient place on campus to park. It's very easy to have the numbers of people parking there. So that's probably one of the main advantages there.
- Steph: Mm-hmm (affirmative). Yes.
- Yala Ruvia: I don't know if this things ... Oh, it does work. So Yala Ruvia from the college of business. Not that I'm trying to market our space, but it is a new building technologically wise. I think it will be less challenging there. There is a big parking ramp just across the pavilion. And there is a Panera and Starbucks there. I don't know.
- Steph: There is, indeed. I was, when I went there the other day, I felt like I came from the ghetto into a super place. It's beautiful. Yes.
- Anna P: Anna Peglagordo, James Madison College. I would just say about someone who is on south campus that parking around Wonders is going to be very difficult. I think there's not enough parking over there.
- Steph: Other? Yeah.
- Lisa Lepides: Lisa Lepides, college of natural science. I actually supervised the course in Hubbard 132 that meets Tuesdays at three. So you can come talk to me if you want. But you don't want that room. It's awful. It's not air conditioned. So, can we make sure we get rid of all the ones that aren't air conditioned?
- Steph: Good point. Anybody else? So it sounds like if we can check into, is everybody seem ... Yes, please.
- Alyssa Dunn: I'm sorry, I just have one more question. I'm Alyssa Dunn from the college of education. And in the report, it mentioned the Kiva, which is a circular room in the college of education, but I didn't see it up here. So I wasn't sure if ... Since none of these are available, I'm guessing the Kiva is also not available. But I think it's a really strong one to consider, because it does have the circular arrangement.
- Barb Crans: We can certainly, we have three Kivas on campus, Ericson, Wonders, an I' going to draw a blank. I said three. McDonald, thank you. One of the, I guess question for the group, those rooms hold two to 300 people. So you may be in a circle, but you may ... You'd have to think about how far apart you are from your colleagues. So it's just my observation. We'll have to check the schedule for this academic year.

Filomena Nunez: So we looked at the Kivas, they are way too big. We want a room that is nice and snug for the senators to talk to each other. If we end up in a room that has a lot of space, we will end up far from each other again, and with a conversation that does not flow. So the idea is to really try to match the size of the room to the needs of the senate meeting. This is not for the university council. This is just for the senate meetings.

Steph: Other comments?

Andeluna B: Andeluna Borcella, James Madison College. I really appreciate this and hope to get the substance of the report as well. But I do want to mention that as we saw last year and the previous year, in a faculty senator open meetings. Our meetings are open meetings. And I think if we use a larger space, we can arrange the table, I'm imagining, the table in such a way that we're not all dispersed, but can also if other people want to attend our meeting, because they are open meetings, and we've had senators, we've had faculty attend our meetings. Sometimes we have students attend our meetings, they can't talk unless there is a motion to let them talk, but that way we can accommodate other people who might want to come into the meetings. Thank you.

Steph: So I think right now we have two issues. We have the one is the microphone issue, can we just simply decide whether or not we want to use the catch boxes? Or whether we want to use microphones? So all in favor of microphones, please raise your hand. It looks like we're not using catch boxes. Okay. Thank you.

The other issue is the space issue. If you can check into whether or not the college of business is available, if that room is available that sounds like that might be a real possibility. Is everybody okay with thinking about moving into there, if that is available? Somebody is saying, a business person is saying no, shaking his head no.

Barb Crans: I might add, Lisa Sudes from my office, she actually worked very closely and Steve Doubt from IT on the project, I don't believe there is power and data in the large room.

Jennifer J: In the multipurpose room there might be a couple locations, but not many. It's not set up like a classroom. And the classrooms that were mentioned that were sort of in the round, the capacity of those rooms are only 60. So it wouldn't accommodate a group of this size.

Steph: Okay. I would suggest that the first thing to do would be to find out whether or not that room is available, and then to send a group over there and see what the pros and the cons would be. Send a-

Nora Teagan: We'll go ahead and check it and I'll let you know. Thank you.

Steph: Thank you very much. All right, the next thing on the orientation is the clarification of rules for academic governance. So, we have operated rather loosely under Robert's Rules of Order. And this is a clarification of some of the things that we have maybe not taken into account as strictly as one might think that we would. And I have put in red some of the things that I feel are things that we may want to be aware of. And we also, this is an action item, so this is something we need to vote as a body if we want to use these rules. We do not need to use these rules. Robert's Rules of Order are not necessary, it's just what we have always done.

So one of the things, you can all read, but the one that is most interesting to me, is the one that suspends the rules, which is at the bottom of page, of the second paper. And we've come up with many times with people wanting to put something on the agenda that's not on the agenda, and then we go through a long conversation about it has to go through the steering committee, and it becomes very convoluted. So this is something with a two thirds majority of the body, wishing to suspend the rules, we can suspend the rules.

So I think that's actually very important and for us to ... For me to recognize that and for us to recognize that also. So that this is a definite possibility and if two thirds of the body, wishes to do that, then that is what we can do. So what I need is a motion to approve the clarification as the operating procedure for faculty senate. Is there a motion to approve it? Is there a second? Discussion? Yes?

Anna P: Anna Peglagordo. It's my understanding under the academic bylaws that 8.1 says academic governance bodies established by these bylaws follow the current edition of Robert's Rules of Order unless otherwise specified in these bylaws. So, I think that this is not actually ... I didn't think this was going to be an action item, because we actually currently in our bylaws-

Steph: Are going to do that.

Anna P: Follow Robert's Rules, that's what our bylaws say, except in places for example, when we have a-

Steph: Suspend the rules. Right.

Anna P: Or I was going to say, actually, when Robert says, as someone who is substituting can't vote, and we allow in our bylaws specifically that someone who is sitting in for another person can vote. So there are some places where we deviate, but I think that that is already in the bylaws. I thought that this was just informational.

Steph: I actually had thought that too, but it apparently ended up as an action item. So if it's informational, then we can move onto the next thing. All right. So the report from the ADHOC faculty senate committee, Dr. Filomena Nunez.

Filomena Nunez: Excuse me? Okay. Gary would you mind bringing up the recommendations of the report? I think it's accessible form there, so I don't have to plug in my computer. So I didn't really get a sense. So I'm Filomena Nunez, I'm representing a firm here. I'd like to get a sense, how many people are new in the faculty senate, can you just raise your hand? Okay. So I think I should introduce why we're having the meeting the way we are so that all of you can come up to speed with what's going on. Otherwise you'll find this all very strange.

Actually I found the first senate meeting very strange as well anyway. And it wasn't like this. But last year, by the end of the year, I had took to several of the senators that were serving, and I was feeling rather frustrated with the way the meetings were going and I felt like I wasn't alone, others that were talking to me were also expressing the same frustration, and I decided to bring that up in the comments from the floor, as you will see every agenda has as the last item, comments from the floor. And I decided in that moment to come up and actually ask, "Is everyone okay with the way we've been doing our faculty senate meetings?"

And it turned out that no one was. And so, that generated a conversation around how can we improve. So Deborah, as chair, suggested that a group get together over the summer and consider what could be done. I agreed to lead this effort, and I asked for volunteers. And there were a number of volunteers that emailed me, or came talked to me. And I want to take the opportunity to actually recognize those that are here today. So perhaps Brian, Abby, if you don't mind standing up. Steven, Jennifer, do you mind standing up? Just so that people know the faces. Am I missing? I think the other person, there's two missing, but they're apparently not here. So I really appreciate that we got together and got things rolling. So thank you.

And so what you are going to see as a result of this effort is really not my effort, I'm just standing up representing this group. Gary, are we?

Gary: We are on the MSU academic governance website.

Filomena Nunez: So you've got it in the agenda? So if you go to the agenda of the faculty senate, and today's agenda, it should be there as a link to the report. So at the end. Exactly. Thank you. Thanks.

So, I'll just scroll to the recommendations, and I will be fast, because it's already 4:30 and a number of people still have to take the stage here. So, I have had the opportunity to present this already to the steering committee, so the steering committee is aware of this and of course has decided to have it presented to the whole senate. I'm going to summarize the recommendations only, and I'm going to actually fly over some of the recommendations that have been already discussed. So some of the recommendations on here are redundant, because we've already been discussing them. So the first one had to do with an orientation for new senators. And I think the steering committee tried to

implement that in some form. In the future really, if you read this report carefully, you will realize the idea really is for a small, informal meeting where these new senators can get to know the steering committee. And can have all the sort of questions that may come up in these informal interactions.

So I understand this year, this was what was possible, but in the future, our recommendations are for there to be an orientation meeting specifically for the new senators and that allows for interaction. So that the new senators can already feel part of this body by the time they come to the first meeting. And it wouldn't rob from the MSU faculty senate meetings, so this meeting would still be used for normal business, it's just prior to this meeting, everyone that wasn't part of it, would've had the opportunity to get to know how it works.

The second recommendation has to do with the space and we've had the fortunate situation where we've got the experts of space on campus. I walked a lot, the campus, and tried to look at many of these rooms, Steven also spent some time on this issue. So some of us took the lead on that and just try to find the spaces. Of course scheduling, I understand is an issue. It's not a problem that we don't have spaces. We have plenty of rooms. They are flexible, and we can put the ... So there's circular form, prior to a meeting and have meetings that are much more effective that way. The question is, can we find the schedule? Can we actually free these rooms up for the sake of having a senate meeting. And so in that respect, it's the Mencofofski space is very appealing, because it's new and perhaps not over scheduled yet.

One of the things that we had in mind, and that's why we suggested Ericson Hall instead, was that it would be nice to have this very close to where we're having the meeting now. Some people have to come from other meetings, particularly the president and provost, and the closeness to the administration building is an advantage to make sure that the administrators can be here in a timely manner. And I think that if everyone can make it to the Mencofofski building, that's great. But if it's going to be detrimental to participation, then we have to revisit this, right? So there's a number of things that have to be in place, of course we have to have the right room. I think there's many available. We need availability in the schedule of classes, and then we need central location that will not hinder from participation.

So I'm sure that the experts in space will be able to solve this problem. I am absolutely sure. In addition, so item two, also contains the microphone. And the spirit really is that people will participate in a seamless way without having to stand up, without having to worry about who's switching the microphone on or not, the normal situations in large groups like this, when there are meetings in circular form, is that you just have a button, you press it down, and you talk. And it's pretty seamless, so that a conversation doesn't get cut. And this sort of solution is not really the one that we've tried here today. But again, I'm sure that the technical experts will be able to solve this problem. We're not the technical experts, so I don't feel like I can really solve this. But I am sure there

are people that are working at the university, that are very able to solve this problem.

It will require a modest investment, that actually, I don't even know that it will require a modest investment. Because it may be that we've got the materials somewhere that can just be used.

The third recommendation is perhaps the one that hasn't been discussed yet, and that I should spend some time on. So, the senate controls in some way, has some control over the items that it wishes to discuss. The faculty should really have the initiative of determining what are the important things that we should be discussing? At the same time, if you fall into this meeting, you might not have the broad perspective to cover all those items that you must discuss as faculty, as representing your faculty. And so, what we talked about is how can we ensure that our agendas over the year, cover all the relevant topics and still have the flexibility to allow people to come forward and present topics in a sort of flexible way? In a fast way? So, we propose item three and four of the recommendations are related to the agendas. And it has ... So the first one has to do with these standard topics that you would want as faculty to discuss in the faculty senate, typically every year.

There are things that are very important, like promotion, like dismissal, cause of dismissal that we were just discussing. Like the new policies so to say. Issues of budgets, post docs, students, et cetera. So there are items that you'd think a faculty senate should always have a chance over the year to discuss. And you'd want to discuss them, not after the fact. You wouldn't want to just be recipient of some information that oh, the university has just done this, and this is what has been decided. You would want to discuss this at a time when you can still have input. When you can contribute to the discussion, and perhaps help the administrators make the best decisions.

So, in that spirit, we discussed with Terry Curry, he was extremely helpful, thank you, Terry. In what would be the right timeline for the various topics that you'd expect to have in the agendas of the faculty senate. And so we came up with a proposed calendar. A calendar that could be followed, or it could be used just as a starting point for a future calendar. By having a set calendar, you would know, for example, in our calendar, we suggest that we discuss budget right in September. What was the approved budget? What are the plans for this? So right in September, you'd have that discussion. You would know this in advance, you would speak to your constituents to find out are there issues? Are you concerned about this? Did the budget that got approved for the college of whatever, nat sci, are there issues?

You would be prepared to address that discuss, to participate in that discussion. And then you would have a chance to provide feedback to your constituents. Later in the year when budgets are being made, you would discuss budgets again. So that you could contribute to that discussion too. So, you can see that

we have identified a number of topics that I think probably are not controversial. We may have missed something, but I think that having a calendar that is set that covers the wide array of things that faculty senate should be discussing, is an advantage to all. It allows us to prepare, and it allows us to not forget any important topics.

Then you'd still want to have the opportunity for people to bring up topics that need to be discussed that aren't in this list, in this predefined list. There may be occurrences that are important, like some big office had a major scandal. Then you might want to have to discuss this in faculty senate. There was some serious issues with some students. You might want to discuss that. And so you also want to have the flexibility to bring up topics in a timely manner, and currently there are weeks in advance that you have to bring up topics. And this is detrimental to allowing the agenda to be formed with the hot topics if there are any. Ideally we have no more crises, but we all know that's not the way it works. And there's going to be situations where you say, "We must discuss this now. And so you want to have the possibility to bring that up and put that in the agenda in a timely fashion.

So we suggest that the rules be changed I respect to how much in advance do you need to put an item into the agenda. So the agenda then would have both those overarching calendar items, plus those that were suggested by the faculty senators. Or the president, or any member of the steering committee.

So I'm coming to the end. There are two topics still and one of them perhaps requires some background. So we use the faculty ... So for the new people, you might want to peruse the agendas from last year to understand what I'm going to say. But we have very much used faculty senate meetings to provide information to the senators. And whilst that's okay in a sense, it really isn't the best use of face time. So when you are actually here, physically, the best use is to actually have those discussions, those whatever conversations that you need to have. And to provide so that you can generate useful feedback both to your constituents and to the upper administration.

So in the past, that often came when we had open discussions from the floor, or in some situations when there was a motion on the table to discuss some particular approval of, I don't know, a new policy, whatever it was. So what we suggest is that the agendas be reorganized so that the discussions are the highlights. The discussions are the things that really matter. The informational items, and I always give the example of teller doc, but it could be just a difference in whatever travel plans, or we've had a whole number of different informational items. If it turns out we don't have time to get to those, it's not a big deal, because we can have the Power Point presentation anyway, and go through it afterwards, and share it with our constituents if we feel it's relevant.

So our suggestion is that the agendas be reformulated to utilize the best, in the best way, your presence, your physical presence here. And finally, the sixth item

is a recommendation that when I presented it at the steering committee the other day, I understand is already being acted upon. And so that's to provide better support, a higher level of support to the administrative functions that go with the academic governance and the faculty senate in particular. And so that involves teaching relief for the person that is chairing the steering committee, we feel like this is a big job, and it would be really important that those people that are leading these efforts actually have a lot of time to dedicate to this. And then the other has to do with actual administrative support that can go beyond the sorts of tasks that are provided at the moment, so that we could explore more than what we do with the current level of support.

So with that, I think I'm done. I'm happy to answer any questions if there are any. And I thank you all for your patience on this long meeting already.

Steph: Questions? Yes.

Juliette G: Working? Oh yes, oh great. Okay, Juliette Gazetta, college of arts and letters. I couldn't find it here, and I know we've discussed this. Was there conversation also about the attendance being restricted to faculty senators, at least for the majority? So that we have the pleasure of interacting interacting with upper administration during university council? But maybe the faculty senate focuses just on the senators while it still remains open and anybody can stay, but to facilitate conversation without the sort of hierarchies that come with those guests?

Filomena Nunez: That topic didn't ... No we didn't so this is not included in the report. We didn't discuss that. We were envisaging continuing with the participation of those members that have been traditionally part of the senate faculty meetings. So this is something that would go beyond what our group worked on.

Steph: Other questions? Comments? Yes.

Hungar Cho: Just a quick question on clarification. Aren't you supposed to have open meetings? Are our meetings supposed to be closed?

Ekeza Leke: No, the faculty senate meetings can be open, they're public in the sense that other people can come and attend. They can't participate, but they can come and attend.

Hungar Cho: So how do you prevent administration from coming in? That's what it sounded like to me, that you wanted one meeting with mostly faculty and another with administrators.

Ekeza Leke: No, I don't think that's the spirit, of course. Not at all. I think the question was more whether it is a requirement, whether we would want president Stanley to be sitting here through the whole meeting, or whether we'd give him a break

and then allow us to have conversations that were not perhaps relevant or whatever.

Dr. Stanley: I vote, aye.

Juliette G: Right just to follow up with what she said, essentially. They're still open and president Stanley or the new provost or whomever is welcome, always, of course to stay. But we're talking about changes of culture and hierarchies and we're trying to essentially facilitate people's comfort level, bringing issues to each other to have actual discussion. And some might be intimidated if they feel the eyes of the highest administrators constantly around them. Or at least if we kind of clarified, this is supposed to be for the senators to discuss openly and working towards structure here, is what I'm getting at. If that clarifies.

Andeluna B: Andeluna Borcella, James Madison College. So I think that, first of all, so I really appreciate all the work out colleagues did on this. And I strongly support what they've done, and I think that we need to do more on the next step. But I firmly support what they've done and I'm all for it. And what I see them as doing is an important way to start shifting the culture here. And so I actually heard Juliette's, Dr. Gazetta's statement along those lines. So this is really about recovering the space as a space of deliberation for faculty and faculty voice. So I see the spirit of the report moving in that direction, and that's why I see what you are saying, as moving us in that direction as well.

So this in not about who do we allow to come at the meetings, they're public meetings, this is about who "presides the meetings" and what is this meeting about. So I heard, I really appreciate what Dr. Johnson was saying. I do think that the whole discussion deliberation, part of our duties as senate, we're kind of subdued maybe in that presentation, but that is an important role that we have. I think that this report is trying to address, and does address very well, some steps we can take fast. And that there are other issues also that we could consider, which is this is a space of deliberation that faculty need to be comfortable and primarily about deliberating and discussion, not so much about top down information being given to us.

So then that's the spirit I read what you wrote in. And finally, I do want to bring one other aspect up and I apologize for talking so much. Perhaps we can do this better when we have a round table. But I think we also need to think about who sets the agenda for the faculty senate. Students don't have their agenda set by a steering committee that include faculty, but also administrators and students. I think that faculty senate should be able to set our own agenda, and I see a way in which this report is moving us towards that. But we will also have to deal with this in the future, beyond this point maybe. With shifting some policies too, so that faculty senate can appear, we can set our own agenda. Thank you.

Filomena Nunez: So policies is one of the items on the senate calendar.

- Amelia M: Amelia Marjek-Taylor, non college faculty. So I have a question about kind of where we go next with this. So it seems like we've implemented some of these suggestions already. And I guess I'm kind of unclear, how many of these we can just implement, and how many we maybe would require change to our CR bylaws or operating procedures. Do you have a sense of that? And do you have a sense of kind of how we even go forward with these recommendations?
- Filomena Nunez: So I was asked this question in the steering committee. And I said the first three are no-brainers. In my view. And in fact, I should say all six are no-brainers. In my view. So I'm biased of course. But it turns out that the one that really involved investment is number six. And I believe that's the one that there's already action on. So all the others involve no investment, it's just willingness. And if there is agreement from the senators that this is the way to go, I would see that this, we can definitely implement it. But, I believe the steering committee felt they couldn't make that decision without consulting with the senators. That's, I guess why I'm presenting this.
- Steph: First of all, thank you for the report, and thank you for all the work that the committee did. It was a huge amount of work and it's much appreciated, and we have been, the steering committee has been very happy to implement these suggestions. Orientation next year will be separate from the first faculty senate meeting. But in order to try and do something this year, the only option was to do it at the first faculty senate meetings. And as you can see, a lot of things take a lot of time at the university, getting space is not simply a matter of getting space. It seems easy to me that you would just take one of those classes and put them in this room and put us someplace else. Evidently it doesn't work that way.
- So I understand that things are much more complicated than they often seem. So we have in terms of the calendar, we have not the next agenda item, but the last agenda item, is addressing that. But first we need to go to our next agenda item, which is the university committee on curriculum. And if we could just simply ... Yes.
- Filomena Nunez: I know we need to move onto the next agenda item, but to respond to your question, I think at the steering committee, we sent recommendation four to UCAG, right? In order to be considered. So that's the only one that requires a specific sort of change, and requires a vote. So that is being considered, then we'll come back, and then we'll vote on it.
- Steph: Right, thank you. Yes.
- Dr. Miksich: In the interest of moving this along, I wanted to thank the ADHOC committee for making this report and giving the thought to it. I don't think we have an endorsement or consensus for the faculty senate. So I'm wondering if a motion is in order?

- Steph: To endorse the report?
- Dr. Miksichek: The motion would be to endorse the report, but to do it in a granular fashion. Point by point, and see if there's a consensus to charge the steering committee with implementing as expeditiously as possible, the individual recommendations of the ADHOC committee. That would be my motion.
- Steph: Is it possible for us to move to the university committee on curriculum first? And get the other two agenda items done? Because right now we are almost at five of five. And I think that this is something that we need to get these other. I think some of this might be clarified in terms of what we're doing next.
- Dr. Miksichek: I'd be agreeable to that.
- Steph: Are you okay with that? Okay. So, Dr. Mectal?
- Marcy Mectal: Marcy Mectal, college of nursing. UCC met in April and approved the following. Four new programs effective fall 2019, highlighted with a computational data science bachelor of science, data science bachelor of science, and a data science minor. And the difference between the computational and the bachelors is the computational is really about the computer science with large datasets versus just working with the datasets. And then also a media photography minor. There were an additional 15 program changes, and no program deletions to report.
- For courses, there were 32 new courses approved, and an additional 28 course changes and no course deletions. And that ends the report.
- Steph: Okay, and that is an information item.
- Marcy Mectal: It's an information item just for the new faculty senators. According to the bylaws, UCC had it's final full committee meeting when it approves the items, then it becomes part of the academics catalogs, just so that it does not get held over through the summer. So it allows people to start making those changes. So it's an informational only item this month.
- Steph: Thank you. Dr. Johnson. And this is in response to the calendar of agenda items that was put forward in the report.
- Jennifer J: Next month, our topic is going to be the budget. So, go to your people, ask them for questions, suggestions, are the assumptions of the budget correct? I realize a lot of you don't know yet, but right, we're trying to be proactive. So go back with questions, suggestions, if you could email them to acadgov@msu.edu and bring them to the meeting. We were also going to talk about undergrad enrollment and success, but we are provost-less, so for this month we're going to focus on the budget. So like I said, please bring items for discussions, suggestions, questions for next meeting. Thank you.

- Steph: Okay, so back to Dr. Miksich. Could you repeat your motion?
- Dr. Miksich: I move that we take a voice vote of the faculty senate to achieve some consensus or not on the recommendations put forward by the ADHOC committee on changing the organization and deliberations of the faculty senate with a separate vote on each one of the six items to determine whether or not we have essentially, consensus to move forward. And that would be to charge the steering committee with implementing it as expeditiously as possible, the six recommendations.
- Steph: Is there a second? Discussion? So, yes.
- Galia Venitez: Galia Venitez, James Madison college. SO, why do we have to divide it in point by point? Why can't we just do it, endorse it all together or not? What is the whole point?
- Dr. Miksich: My concern would be for example, if there isn't a consensus on item two to move as soon as we can to Ericson Hall. While we're exploring some of the other rooms, then we wouldn't endorse them as a block. We would endorse them point by point, and I think we can move through this fairly quickly.
- Andeluna B: I'm sorry for clarification. Andeluna Borcello, James Madison college. Today, you want to vote on all the six items today? Now?
- Dr. Miksich: I've placed a motion on the floor and it's been seconded. So that would be the motion, yes.
- Andeluna B: All of them, today now? One by one. I mean we could make a friendly amendment to item two. And it could just be in a room with flexible arrangements, and take out Ericson Hall from there. Could that be a friendly amendment to item two? Would that be acceptable? Okay, thank you.
- Robert O'Foley: I'm trying to see which number it is, but there was something about the agenda items. Now, I know that usually Gary sends out a request for agenda items. Usually about a week or two before the meeting. So is that recommendation because agenda items are being sent that are ignored? Or not put on the agenda? What is a reason? Because our question is already, that we have already been asked. To send in agenda items. So, what happens to the agenda items after we send them? Have they been ignored?
- Steph: Yes.
- Filomena Nunez: Sorry, perhaps I was not clear. I'm back here. Hello?
- Robert O'Foley: Oh, okay.

- Filomena Nunez: Sorry, I might have not been clear, but this item has to do with accelerating the pace at which we can get items on the agenda. So currently, there are several weeks in advance, Gary send the message, we might think without, perhaps three weeks before, we haven't quite figured out what needs to be discussed. We are talking about a few days before the meeting. So that we can act on things that need prompt action. Right, so we can discuss those things that need prompt action. Because by the time three weeks pass, perhaps that item is no longer, you can't discuss it. Something already happened. So that's the spirit of that. It's not that we would change the possibility of faculty submitting items for the agenda. It's we want to change the timeline for doing that.
- Steph: So I have a concern in that many of these recommendations are very specific. And I am not ... And I think that most of us, maybe I shouldn't speak for anybody else. But I certainly accept the spirit of the recommendations. But I'm not sure that we want to go point, through each one and accept the specific recommendations, because they are actually quite specific. So I'm wondering if there is a way to frame this so that we can accept the report, and then accept the spirit of the report. That sounds very, very vague.
- Dr. Miksich: The original motion needs to be withdrawn.
- Steph: No, I understand that. I'm just trying to, as a matter of discussion, I'm just trying to explore if that is a direction that people might want to go in.
- Dr. Miksich: If it's the sense of the senate that we're not ready to vote on this, then I withdraw my motion.
- Steph: Do you need a second to withdraw your motion? No, you can just withdraw it? How nice, okay. Thank you. All right. Comments from the floor? Yes.
- Mick Folden: Mick Folden, college of veterinary medicine. I would ask that we have better microphones in the future. It's very frustrating for people to start to talk and they don't have amplification. And then all of a sudden it kicks in.
- Steph: That has been happening forever, and I'm not quite sure why that is. I'm not sure why we can't have the microphones on all the time. But that's ... is there a reason for that? But there are other places where you can? So if we ... There are other rooms where it happens. The physics laws are different here. That's good to know. But yes, I completely agree. Yes, other comments from the floor, yes?
- Filomena Nunez: Yes, it's a follow up on the discussion we were just having. So, is it my understanding then that the steering committee will take the lead, and in principle, the steering committee doesn't need input from the faculty senate to arrange some of these items, whatever way they please. But what I want clarity on, is what's going to happen? Is that the idea? We don't vote on it, because the steering committee will just take the lead in implementing these without a

vote? Or is the idea that we will sit on this for another month, and then perhaps vote it next time?

Steph: No, the idea from my perspective, in terms of chairing the steering committee, is that we are already implementing many of these, as many as we have been able to implement. In the short time that we have been able to contact people and do things. We are working very hard on the senate calendar, and that is something that I think we all feel is important. And if it is something that the actual faculty senate does not want to implement, then that can happen as we implement the senate calendar. Other recommendations, most of the recommendations have already, are already in process. So no one is sitting on this. I can promise you that.

As soon as I met with you, and I met with the committee in the at large members met with the committee, it was we were very interested in the ADHOC committee's report, we were very interested in the depth of their concerns, and the reality of their concerns, and we have been working on doing something about it, and we will continue to work on it.

Yes.

Filomena Nunez: [inaudible 01:44:51] that it's not that we could. [inaudible 01:44:58].

Steph: I think that from my perspective we have already done things without a vote. So I don't think that ... but when you said are we just going to sit on it for a month, that is something that is not going to happen, and I don't think anyone should think that.

Dr. Miksich: In an effort to add a little clarity to this, I would like to move that we accept the report from the ADHOC committee, regarding deliberations of the faculty senate.

Steph: Is there a second? Is there discussion?

Sandra Logan: Sandra Logan, college of arts and letters. I'm concerned about the process here. And I understand that this is a positive move, and I'm really happy about what is being suggested, and I'm actually really happy that the steering committee wants to jump on it. But I'm concerned about the process. I do think that the faculty should have a chance, the senate should have a chance to discuss these points, and to broaden them as necessary or address issues as necessary. So I'm torn here, because I would like to follow through with this vote, but I feel as though perhaps broadening the language of the vote would help. Specifically to say that we approve of the spirit of the suggestions, and that we approve of the faculty steering committee's ... I'm sorry, the senate steering committee's intention to act on them as rapidly as possible to the extent that they can address them. That would be the nature of the amendment I would like to make to the motion.

Steph: Is there a second? Is there discussion? Yes.

Andeluna B: Andeluna Borcella James Madison college. So just to clarify, shouldn't we talk about what in the spirit means? I mean, I'd be either for doing, for endorsing this report, but and we on senate should do that. I just worry that anything can become in the spirit. Like when you shift from here to the steering committee, I'm not saying I don't trust the steering committee, I'm just saying that one of the things that has been happening too is we've had discussions on the senate, and then we don't know how decisions are being made about what we've discussed on the senate. Or about what we've agreed on the senate. So I think that we need to be really clear as to what happens from what we're talking about here, to the next step, and how this returns to us.

Not to make matters more complicated, but we have a problem with some clarity. Thank you.

Steph: So, if I could make a suggestion. It seems to me that we are not ready to vote on this at this point in time. I would suggest that we put this, a discussion of the report, since we just heard the report, and we just heard the rationale behind the report, that we put a discussion of the report on the next faculty senate agenda. In the meantime, the kinds of things that can be implemented from the steering committee, can be implemented. Faculty senate orientation does not require a vote of the faculty senate. For instance.

Dr. Miksich: So that needs to be withdrawn.

Steph: Right.

Dr. Miksich: Because it has been moved and seconded.

Sandra Logan: I withdraw the amended motion.

Steph: Thank you.

Sandra Logan: Sandra Logan, arts and letters.

Steph: Okay so the motion has been withdrawn and I don't think we need a motion to put it on the faculty senate agenda, but I think with the steering committee can put it in. I can guarantee that it will be on the faculty senate agenda for next time. A discussion of the report from the ADHOC committee. Please think about what sorts of things you think we need to discuss, and at that point we will probably have more information also about space. And whether or not we want to move, and what kind of space we want to move to. We will have more information about a lot of different things. Okay.

This transcript was exported on Sep 13, 2019 - view latest version [here](#).

Other comments from the floor? Is there a motion to adjourn? Second. All in favor, say aye. Thank you very much.