

Deborah:

Hello, everyone. Since we have a quorum, I'm going to start because it's going to start with the agenda and the comments before we begin with the OCR report. If we get started a little earlier, it gives us a little more time. So is there a motion to approve the agenda for February 18th?

Speaker 2:

[inaudible 00:00:21].

Deborah:

Is there a second? Any changes to the agenda? I see none. All in favor say aye.

Quorum:

Aye.

Deborah:

Opposed? Motion carries. I have a motion to approve the draft minutes for January 14th, attachment A. Motion?

Speaker 3:

[inaudible 00:00:41].

Female:

Second?

Quorum:

Second.

Deborah:

Any discussion? Any additions, deletions, corrections? I see none. All in favor say aye.

Quorum:

Aye.

Deborah:

Opposed? Motion carries. Both President Stanley and Provost Sullivan are out of town. These were long-standing engagements that they had and were not able to cancel. So I have my comments and I want to start off by talking about one of the attachments that you have, other comments that we got from the faculty senate regarding the Minskoff Pavilion.

Deborah:

As you can see, they were not in favor of moving to Minskoff. There's a lot of comments there. What I would like to say is I would like to thank the committee for all of their work. It was a great idea and it

was a good idea to shake it up a little bit, move to a different place, and see how it worked. We'll keep looking and see if there's a better place to go.

Deborah:

Also, my understanding is that this room is going to be reconstructed in some manner. We can also see how that goes. Although while it's being reconstructed, I don't know where they plan to put us. Anyway, it's all in the works. But thank you to the committee for their excellent suggestions.

Deborah:

I received an email from the co-chair of the Strategic Planning Committee, and he requested that he have an hour at the faculty senate, an hour to discuss strategic planning with the faculty senate, plus an hour to discuss DEI, diversity, equity, and inclusion. That's, as you can all count, two hours. That would take up more than the entire meeting.

Deborah:

So rather than taking everything that we would have on the agenda and putting it off until limbo land, in discussing it with members of the steering committee, it seemed like it might be a good idea to schedule an extra meeting of the faculty senate on March 31st, which is at this point in time a free week.

Deborah:

It would obviously not be a required meeting. It would not be something that would go into your ... If you have two absences, two strikes and you're out, it wouldn't go into that, but it would be something that people who want to attend and are interested in strategic planning and DEI would be able to go to. That would give them the opportunity to have an hour for each subject. So that has not yet gone through the steering committee. But just to give you a heads-up on that, that would be March 31st is the free week that we have between meetings.

Deborah:

A recap on the meeting that the at-large members had with the president and the board of trustees. One of the major subjects was the DEI sensitivity training. This is going to become a reality. The president is looking at having this instituted in the fall, beginning of fall semester.

Deborah:

He's very serious about this and it's going to happen. It's a question of what kind of training we're going to have, how it's going to be implemented. This will be for all faculty staff, students, volunteers, grandfathers summer thing, grandparents summer thing. So it'd be for about 70,000 people. As you can well imagine, this is a huge undertaking.

Deborah:

So he's in the process with Paulette Granberry Russell and members of the committee that is looking into hiring the DEI person. We'll get back to you. We'll keep you informed the more we know about it. But I just want to let you know that that's in the works.

Deborah:

The other thing that we discussed was the role of EVP Norman Beauchamp in academic governance. This is an important thing because we have an additional provost. It seemed very significant that we have him also involved in academic governance so that the medical schools are represented and so that the medical schools see that they're represented. Just to make sure that everybody is included.

Deborah:

So we asked Tyler Silvestri, who very kindly went through the bylaws and came up with all the bylaws that include the provost, and the two provosts are now looking at those bylaws to see which ones need to be changed in order to add the executive vice president of the medical schools. So that'll be another bylaw that will be coming forward to university council.

Deborah:

From the steering committee, report from the steering committee, one of the main things on our agenda was the fall break, and that will be on the pilot fall break for next year. That will be on next week's agenda at the university council. So just keep a look out for that.

Deborah:

And Dave Byelick, talking about the budget, will be back to faculty senate in March. I've received a confirmation from him. At that point, he will have answers to the questions that faculty senate came up with, and those answers will be distributed in advance so that you have the answers and can ask questions about what it is that he has to say.

Deborah:

Anyone who was at the steering committee meeting is welcome to tell me things that I forgot to say. I think I'm okay. I'm seeing people nodding their heads that it was okay. Okay, great. So moving on to-

Female:

[inaudible 00:06:10].

Deborah:

Yes, of course.

Robert Ofoli:

Okay. Robert Ofoli, College of Engineering. So if I remember correctly, when the budget was presented, there were a lot of questions and clarification and things like that. Are those questions already been addressed before the meeting in March to discuss this?

Deborah:

I took the list of questions. Anna Pegler-Gordon took very careful notes. I took the list of comments and formulated them into a list of questions, which I sent to Dave Byelick. He has answered them and will forward the answers to the faculty senate and then will appear in March. When he comes in March, he will talk about the answers and also have more follow-up questions from faculty senate.

Robert Ofoli:

Okay, thank you.

Deborah:

Any other questions? Okay, new business. The University Committee on Curriculum, Dr. Marci Mechtel.

Marci Mechtel:

The UCC report. We met at the end of January and approved the following. New programs, seven, including graduate certificate programs in the College of Nursing effective fall 2020 and include Adult Gerontology Clinical Nurse Specialist, Nurse Practitioner Adult Gerontology Primary Care, Nurse Practitioner Family, and Nurse Practitioner Psychiatric Mental Health. Additionally, Accelerated Science and Engineering Graduate Certificate, effective summer 2020, Music Career Development Graduate Certificate, effective summer 2020, and PA in Medicine, Master of Science, effective 2021. And so, those are really meant to increase access to care.

Marci Mechtel:

Additionally, there were 10 program changes and for deletions. The deletions include English Elementary Disciplinary Teaching Minor, effective fall 2019, Design Specialization, effective spring 2020, Global and Area Studies Social Science, Bachelor of Science, effective summer 2019, and Median Information, Bachelor of Science, effective fall 2020.

Marci Mechtel:

For courses, there were 74 new courses, 52 course changes, and five course deletions. Finally, moratoriums were placed on the following programs. Mathematics, Master of Art for Teachers, effective spring 2020 through spring 2021. And effective spring 2020 through spring 2023, it's a Public Relations, Master of Arts, linked with Advertising Creative Public Relations, BA/MA, and the link to Advertising Management Public Relations, MS/MA. Any questions? I move to accept the report of UCC.

Deborah:

Is there a second?

Quorum:

Second.

Deborah:

Discussion? All in favor say aye.

Quorum:

Aye.

Deborah:

Opposed? Motion carries. Thank you. Next, we have the slate of nominees for the at-large to the steering committee, endorsement of the slate of nominees for at-large to the steering committee, with Tyler Silvestri.

Tyler Silvestri:

UCAG has selected four to send on to Academic Congress for vote. The nominees ... The proposed nominees, I suppose ... are Stephen Arch, Nancy DeJoy, Jennifer Johnson, and Andrea Kepsel. I move to send that slate to Academic Congress.

Deborah:

Is there a second?

Female:

Second.

Deborah:

Discussion?

Andaluna Borcila:

Andaluna Borcila, James Madison College. So, quickly, did we not in the past to get some kind of a ... Like the little statement that nominees wrote, actually?

Tyler Silvestri:

Yes. I guess I can't speak to how it would be done in the past. The bylaws to require they submit one. But it says that they're submitted once they're nominees, and they're not yet nominees. So you would before it came out for Academic Congress.

Andaluna Borcila:

Okay, thanks.

Deborah:

Other discussion? All in favor say aye.

Quorum:

Aye.

Deborah:

Opposed? Motion carries. The slate of nominees for the ... Oh, I did them in the wrong order, sorry. Slate of nominees for athletic council. Tyler Silvestri?

Tyler Silvestri:

Hi. UCAG proposes six nominees for the president to select. He'll select three. The nominees are Sabrina Ford, Martin Crimp, Ronald Fisher, Jill Moschelli, Brian Smith, and Benjamin Hall. And I move to endorse that slate.

Deborah:

Is there a second?

Female:

Second.

Deborah:

Discussion? All in favor say aye.

Quorum:

Aye.

Deborah:

Opposed? Motion carries. I just heard from Gary that President Stanley asked Brian Quinn to attend, he's our new general counsel, this meeting. So if there are questions about the OCR report that you would like him to be able to answer, he will be happy to do so, I'm assuming. I haven't talked to him.

Deborah:

I would now like to go to the next thing, which is the OCR report, Office for Civil Rights report. Thank you again to the people who emailed ... I believe Juliet Guzzetta was the person who would initially emailed and asked us to put this on the agenda, and this will be the rest of the meeting. I'd like to introduce Dr. Stephanie Nawyn, who is an Associate Professor from the Department of Sociology, Co-Director of Academic Programs, Outreach, and Engagement at the Center for Gender in Global Context, GenCen, Research Consortium on Gender-Based Violence. She will be facilitating, i.e., running the rest of the meeting. So I'm turning it over to her. Thank you.

Stephanie Nawyn:

Over here?

Deborah:

Yeah.

Stephanie Nawyn:

Okay.

Deborah:

Right there.

Stephanie Nawyn:

Oh, you're fine. Hello, everyone. Thank you. Thank you for your time doing this and thank you for all the work. I've never had to serve on faculty senate, so I just want to say thank you for all the work that you do all year long. I know that the faculty senators who had proposed this want to say a few things, and then I'll go in and explain how this will work.

Male:

[inaudible 00:13:34].

Speaker 12:

Hi, everyone. Thanks again for your willingness to share this conversation. We just wanted again to share that those of us who've read the report, which hopefully is everybody at this point, how this came together, we recognize its unique position to depict the unfolding of egregious acts at our institution that occurred over decades.

Speaker 12:

While it only investigates the history of how the university handled cases regarding two individuals, even if it acknowledges other investigations, it depicts the structural and cultural practices and environment that resulted in not only continued harm by these individuals but eroding trust and confidence in the administration. So we believe that discussing this report as faculty representatives, again underlining that this is a faculty-led initiative, will demonstrate one step in our own need to take some responsibility for our culture here at MSU.

Female:

[inaudible 00:14:45].

Speaker 12:

Thank you.

Stephanie Nawyn:

Thanks. Do I come on ... Okay. So it's all right.

Male:

[inaudible 00:14:55].

Stephanie Nawyn:

I just feel a little awkward not sitting. I'm not a ... Yeah. You know what? I'm good. I'm good. Okay. So we're going to run right into this because I think the goal of this was to really have a deep conversation, to bring up as many ideas and suggestions as possible, and then actually have some time at the end to discuss what people came up with.

Stephanie Nawyn:

So the format that was decided upon was that we would divide everybody up into small groups. There are eight groups. On the back, I believe, of each of your placards is a number. So that is the number of the group you're in rather than doing the thing you do in your undergrad classes. We have people count off and somebody miscounts. You've got your number already. So we're all set.

Stephanie Nawyn:

The structure of this room obviously is not great for forming groups, so I think this would work if we treated both of two rows, if the people in the front row can turn towards the people behind you, and then collect that way. I think that is probably our best option. So I'll show you what each group, where you're going to end up.

Stephanie Nawyn:

I do want to say that we've got questions. You should all have the discussion questions here. We're going to really focus on questions one through four, which get at discussing your thoughts about the report and what the role of faculty senate could be in addressing the problems described in the report. Then we did want to have people think about how they might engage their home units about this. Going back to your colleges, what you would like to do to bring this to your faculty, and how then you might be able to re-engage them back at faculty senate at some later point.

Stephanie Nawyn:

Recognizing that this conversation can be anxiety-inducing, especially for some people who have experienced trauma, and, statistically speaking, many of us in this room have, we do have a space that you can go to and be quiet or be loud, whatever you need to be.

Stephanie Nawyn:

I think there was some problem with the reservation that was made in the Spartan room, so you can go up to the Center for Gender in Global Context, which is just on the second floor of this building. You go up the stairs or the elevator, take a left, and it'll be the first office on your left. We have tea, we have snacks. We always have food. There's a private office in there with two crisis volunteers who can just help calm you down if that's what you need, or scream. Nobody's going to mind. We're very accommodating to whatever you need to do.

Stephanie Nawyn:

We're going to spend about 25 minutes in these small groups, eight groups, discussing the questions. Someone in the group can write down what your group has come up with. Then after about 25 minutes, we'll have each group report out for about four minutes. If my math is correct, that will give us roughly 33 minutes to discuss what was shared by each small group.

Stephanie Nawyn:

We are going to transcribe in real time what your group reports out to, so that all the material will be here on the screen. Then I suppose we can do what you would normally do, come up to the mics one-on-one and say whatever additional things you want to say in reaction to what you've seen the small groups report out on.

Stephanie Nawyn:

My role is to be as minimally invasive as possible. I'm just going to direct traffic. I'm not going to comment on anything. My dream goal would be you completely forgot who I was by the end of this. I think my invisibility means I've done a great job.

Stephanie Nawyn:

So we'll try this with the group formation. Group one will be here in the first two rows to my right, your left. Group two, on this end, and then rows three and four, that's group three. On this end, group four. Then rows ... I believe it's one, two, three, four, five, and six, that would be one, two, three, four, five, and six in the middle and seven and, somewhere in the back, a group eight.

Stephanie Nawyn:

Just talk to each other. It should be fine. Professor Moriarty, I don't think you have a number on yours, so I think just jump in wherever you like. No?

Professor Moriarty:

[inaudible 00:20:02].

Stephanie Nawyn:

You don't? Okay, cool. Okay, folks. I am sorry to end the conversation. I think you could probably go on for much longer based on what I'm hearing. But I would like you all to have time to hear what everyone is saying and then have some time for people to come up and respond individually to what the smaller groups have reported out.

Stephanie Nawyn:

So the way I'm going to do this, I'm going to try to keep the mic moving. So I'll bring the mic to team one. Then while you all are talking, team two, I'll bring a mic over to you. I'll just be the person carrying mics around so you don't have to come up to the front. Please try to keep your comments to three minutes, if you can. By four, I will steal your mic, okay? Just so that we have ... I don't want to make people feel unheard, but I want to maximize how much voice can happen here. So team one, who's reporting out?

Male:

[inaudible 00:21:20]. Okay, thank you very much. So our group had a very interesting discussion. What we said was that the report is, of course, very disturbing. We really all agreed that we really found the discussion of Strampel in many ways more disturbing than the discussion of Nassar.

Male:

The reason for that really goes to the second question, which is why. The why is that in Strampel's case, there were repeated reports of what this guy was up to. They would come up, they would be documented. They would then move up to the provost and the president, and that part of his report would be disregarded.

Male:

And so, this was really the failure that we saw happen. And so, a lot of our conversation was about how does this happen? How is it that you actually document what a creep like that is doing, and it moves up and it becomes not important enough to dismiss. And so, that got us to the culture, which is really what we were talking about, and this culture of something being more important. Some of that was President Simon's laser focus on reputation and money, that goes along with reputation.

Male:

And so, ultimately, at the end of the day, if you had somebody who was increasing reputation and raising money, then personal indiscretions, smiley faces saying, "Got to watch out for this one," could be disregarded.

Male:

So the problem then leads us to thinking about the solution. What do we do? Some of it is trying to think about how do we respond to this? For us, the question was really what kinds of mechanisms can we put in place so that we are actually considering behavior, considering values, considering how we're treating people? This came up in our conversation.

Male:

And so, there are a couple of things we were worried about. One is that actually there were already mechanisms in place to document what both of these people were up to. They were documented, and they were disregarded. So we started to think about, well, yes, we need to think about things other than money and reputation, but we also may need to think about additional bodies to think about the evaluation of these upper level folks.

Male:

So something like maybe an adjudication committee to which somebody can appeal if they've gone to the trouble of documenting this or gone to the trouble of reporting, and yet that person still gets approval. So we thought about maybe a subcommittee of this body who can hear, if you will, a whistleblower's complaint that somebody who is violating the very basic principles of our institution, that they have not been disciplined and have indeed received another promotion, effectively an accolade. That's what we got. Did I miss anything, folks? [inaudible 00:25:16].

Stephanie Nawyn:

Group two?

Female:

Thanks.

Male:

So we had many of the same thoughts. Our focus was on how there could be so much information conveyed from one person to another about the things that Nassar did and the things that Strampel did and the things that people did to obstruct and how that information stayed where it was. It was almost like it was sequestered.

Male:

So, of course, there are issues with the culture about we're all a family, we're all promoting MSU, and we all want to advance MSU and don't say anything that would undermine the reputation. But I think that this idea of information is a useful one.

Male:

We talked about the relationship between MSU's external attempts to manage information, so every article that comes out on the paper. It's, "The meeting didn't happen." "No, the meeting didn't happen, but I wasn't there." "No, I was there, but I don't remember what went on." Every article contains the line, "MSU's administrators could not be reached for comment." So we think we can manage information outside and we keep information where it originates inside the university.

Male:

One other element that we talked about is we have pretty weak faculty governance. We were talking on this little committee to think about the secretary for academic governance office, and what would you do if you wanted to have weak faculty governance? You would have no resources for the head of the faculty senate and you would have a small office in a basement somewhere staffed by some sort of secretary, who would take care of whatever needed to be taken care of or not. We didn't talk about it, but it fits in with this idea of having faculty present or accessible when there are things that need to be known, like these kinds of complaints.

Male:

Then we talked about what contributes to this culture. Certainly one is the common background of administrators. We have just too many Michigan State people as administrators, and common background leads to groupthink. We need some fresh eyes, I think, from the outside. So we talk a lot about diversity and diversity among your managers, and not just racial and ethnic diversity and women and men, but you need people from outside the university and maybe even somebody from the working class who could actually be an administrator. So we talked about those kinds of things.

Stephanie Nawyn:

Thank you. Group three?

Female:

Hello? Yes, I'm on. Okay. Again, many common issues were talked about. With regard to the meetings that occurred and known information, one of our suggestions was you had to have written reports. If you have a meeting, there must be a record. There weren't records, and looking for something big in changes and having them visible.

Female:

The president's family has a place where he has a website where he reports things, but we can tell you how many burglaries there have been, how many break-ins there have been, but we don't know how many reports of sexual harassment. We know there are certain reports that don't get ... The information is not shared widely, and that would probably be something that would be helpful to feel that things mattered.

Female:

Fear of reporting, retribution, whistleblowing, of course gender-based, policies that were held for faculty, but not necessarily held for administrators. There are many policies in place for faculty, but they don't seem to work for administration/sports people. Pattern in vetting upper administration results versus empathy, old boy culture, winning versus other things. Winning is all. And, again, the inbred culture. That brings protectionism and blindness toward what's happening.

Female:

Some of the recommendations were how are these things being addressed, best practice review, which we've talked about, helping to change members of the board as we go into an election cycle. Use your vote and talk to people. Bylaw changes were ... Well, I guess it's the faculty ... I hate to say versus the board, but the faculty wanting to be included in conversation with the board and not necessarily being

taken as an important institution, the faculty, and just going along with the faculty being a weakened body. There's not a lot of power here. Did I forget anything? Okay, that's group three.

Stephanie Nawyn:

Thank you. Group four?

Female:

Four.

Stephanie Nawyn:

I'll get it from him.

Female:

I got it. I got it. So we certainly need more time to talk about solutions. I think we agree this in our group. We've started identifying the failures and the root problem of the failures. I'm not going to go into people's reactions because they ranged from disgust to confusion about has anybody taken responsibility here or actually found to be guilty here. We don't really know what's going on, for instance, with June Youatt at this point, actually.

Female:

But basically we agreed that there's been multiple failures, individual people's failure, a structural failure, that sets up administrators in a position of no or little oversight and with lots of power that is not checked by contracts either. They have contracts where if they really majorly screw up, they can fall back and become just a lowly faculty member. It is a failure in leadership of administrators and a failure in culture overall, a failure of culture structure and people.

Female:

The failure in culture has to do with lots of things, with the kind of values we have at MSU, and that we value money and we value competition over funds, over the mission of our teaching and learning institution, and that we value a particular kind of leader, almost like an authoritarian type of leadership, and that in this inbred culture that values that, it's really difficult for people to actually speak up. But then when they do speak up, we don't value the voices of faculty and we don't value the voices of students. Linked to this culture, we're back to the structure, where we have a structure where faculty don't really have much power.

Female:

And so, we also have talked about how the culture is very symptomatic of the problems with the structure as well, and the personal failures of leaders and administrators at this institution exacerbate that. What else? What else should we add?

Male:

Unwillingness to discipline those who are accountable.

Female:

Yes, unwillingness to discipline those who are accountable in upper administration, not the same with faculty. Policy for faculty that is not applied to administrators or people in athletics. We've talked about that as well. We could go on and on, but these were some points on that we've come up with. I think we need more time to come up with a solution, but we do need to have the people accountable who have failed here.

Stephanie Nawyn:

Thank you. Group five?

Female:

Great. Thank you. We started our conversation with could this happen again and is this happening again and we just don't know about it? We agree that it's probably unlikely that there is another Nassar in our midst right now, but we thought that there were probably Strampels in our midst, and mini Strampels and Strampelites, and that it seems that we have not gone far enough to really identify and find ways to root out those folks.

Female:

We felt that MSU is continuing to say things that protect itself legally. We're thinking just even in the most recent legal response to some of the court cases recently that it seems like there are still administrators here that were involved in some of the judgments in the report that we still don't understand their thinking, and we're not sure that we're ever going to really understand their attitudes and opinions behind why they took these actions. But having more discussions would be helpful to start to shine a light on that.

Female:

We thought that fear is playing a major role in perpetuating a lot of this. There's fear of not knowing what happened. So both as the reporter of something, Title 9 can be a little bit of a black box in that you file a report and we're not sure what happens. Also, there's a lot of fear around like, "Am I tanking somebody's career?" and then that's, "Am I right? Did I understand this interaction correctly?" et cetera.

Female:

Then also a lot of fear of retribution still seems to be present. Fear of saying something wrong. We need to potentially lower the bar for reporting while also continuing to have a lot of respect for everyone. We think that the power structure is inherent in MSU, even at the levels of tenure versus fixed-term faculty. It perpetuates some of this fear and serve to keep this culture of silence. We talked about how people are afraid to report things even at the tenure level because it can impact your budget. It can impact your bottom line and things at the departmental level. So we talked a lot about that. We did not get to a lot of solutions. But we needed five more minutes, and then we would have.

Stephanie Nawyn:

My apologies for that.

Female:

Yeah.

Stephanie Nawyn:

Group six?

Female:

All right, so group six. Being toward the end of the groups, I think a lot of what we have discussed have been said in the fact that there was a wide variety and range. We had people that have been in the university a long time versus newer people, and just how things unfolded, especially the fact that President Simon resigned, but then June was here for another 18 months afterwards when you go to read the report.

Female:

And so, I think although it was interesting because it said a lot, but it didn't say a lot in terms of the report. It starts to tell you something, but it doesn't get you all the way. In our group, we felt that that was a bit of a hindrance, especially when you're trying to talk about solutions to the problem. It's just in terms of when you're thinking about, yes, we have this outcome that we want to be this very inclusive, inviting university, but how are we going to get there, how are we going to measure we're getting there is some of the considerations.

Female:

Again, we saw that systematic failures, specifically more so with the dean because of the fact that there were the three-dean reports or the three-dean reviews, and it was still persistent behaviors that were being ignored.

Female:

We were just starting to get to possible solutions and talking about where the university was going, because again when things start to emerge, then everybody had to take the RSVM training, and the fact that people were saying out loud that they didn't really feel the online format was very effective because people were just clicking through and in terms of where that's going.

Female:

I think in some ways we're trying to get there in some of the discussions surrounding our bylaw changes, was really looking at how are we evaluating upper level administration, and trying to get more faculty and outside perspective may help with that problem. But again, and with President Stanley, with the Strategic Planning Committee Diversity and Inclusive Committee, where are they going to help us go?

Female:

But again, in some ways, we agree that while, yes, Nassar may not exist on this campus, that I think we're all pretty confident to say that there are still issues in terms of how we are communicating. And so, that was our key thing is we're still siloed, so how can we really communicate with one another to really totally understand the problem? I think that's it. Did I miss anything?

Stephanie Nawyn:

Okay. Group seven?

Male:

Group seven. Our group's reaction to the OCR report was a series of questions, beginning with if this happened elsewhere, would the response be different? Probably not. The institutions of all kinds are hardwired to cover things up and sweep them away, and that's not unique to MSU.

Male:

With the president of Penn State, why was our administration not aware of potential consequences and why was MSU unwilling to take them on? Does money from athletics cloud judgment? How often do we hear of tenured faculty being involved in something like this versus athletes or others? Why does our institution think tenure is a reason not to dismiss someone? How different is MSU than other institutions in that regard? How might long-term friendships and trust to be a factor in the institutional failure? Why do we have a perception at MSU that tenure equals immunity?

Male:

The group seem to conclude that the mechanisms for investigating these things failed. The survivors aren't believed, tenured faculty tend to be believed more. We found it shocking that the IRB process is independent, but the investigation of sexual assault or claims rely on a colleague physician and colleague trainer. Conclusion that personal relationships probably biased the investigations and there was a failure to perform the basic duties of the office in many places.

Male:

The root problems we came up with are concluded to have to do with concentration of power, a circle of wagons mentality that exists in probably every organization, but seem to exist here. The process of internal or colleague review is biased. The review processes that seem mandatory, like the three-dean reviews, and required are often not acted upon, and the possible solution that was suggested is have an independent external review board.

Stephanie Nawyn:

Thank you. And group eight, the last group?

Male:

Our group had similar reactions. I'll skip over those. Failures described in this report. We talked about Strampel in particular. The provost was aware of it for a very long time. Investigations were incomplete. There's a term called stereotype blocking, sort of, "This guy is good. He wouldn't do this," or, "He's done some bad things, but he's not a bad man."

Male:

The value here at the university is image first over all things. There's a top-down management style. These are problematic. Moreover, there's a disincentive for faculty to speak out. Regarding root problems, there's a sense that this could have happened in any college, and has happened in other colleges, not just a problem with one or two.

Male:

A common theme was why did they only talk to this group or to that group? There was a lot of private damage control. It all goes back to covering up and defending. As an example, from this weekend, that was shared among this group, there was a swastika painted here on MSU campus or off-campus.

Male:

Fraternity.

Male:

Oh, fraternity. Has there been any mention of this from the administration? No. No. Possible solutions, this is a tall order. We offer some humbly. It was suggested that there could be, for instance, a dean of faculty, like there is at some other universities. This is a voice for the faculty from a position of power.

Male:

The structure here is that the provost can overrule all the decisions of the colleges, and the provost decisions are funneled through the president's office first. It is hopeful, we are hopeful that the president will give the next provost more leeway.

Male:

Something we could do, will it have an effect? Hard to tell. We can give the incoming provost, when one is identified, a list of the things that this body thinks need to be changed. We need to go back to our units and tell faculty to be less passive. We talked about some other things. Anything else? That's some of it.

Stephanie Nawyn:

Thank you all, everyone, very much. So this is an opportunity now for people just to speak individually. I am not all that skills at Robert's Rules, so I'll just ... Whoever would like to come up to a mic. This, I think, is especially ... Yes, we have mics in the middle of the room. That might be a little easier. Yeah, okay. Well, why don't you grab that one and just go for it?

Female:

[inaudible 00:45:41].

Stephanie Nawyn:

It should be on. Is it not on?

Female:

Is it on?

Male:

Yeah.

Stephanie Nawyn:

Yes.

Filomena Nunes:

Okay. So as I was hearing all this, it occurred to me, some other idea that perhaps you don't like, but I thought was really great so I'm going to share it. Like I said, it was great. So one of the problems that we heard again and again is that it wasn't that women weren't speaking out. It is not that sort of stereotype

that women just don't talk. This is not the case. Women were talking, but they just weren't being heard. There weren't people listening.

Filomena Nunes:

And so, it occurred to me that perhaps we need to recommend listening training to the upper administration, because it is an art. It's really difficult, once you get at a very high level, to be able to put away all your assumptions and actually listen to what people are saying. So I think that might be better than the RSVP training, I think would be listening training to the upper administration.

Stephanie Nawyn:

When you [inaudible 00:46:50] mic, please introduce yourselves.

Filomena Nunes:

Filomena Nunes. I'm representing FRIB.

Jennifer Johnson:

I'm Jennifer Johnson, Human Medicine. I have a comment and then a couple of suggestions. The comment is that having just gone through the bylaws, and it looks like the president and provost can fire a dean-tier director pretty much at will for-

Female:

[inaudible 00:47:18].

Jennifer Johnson:

Right, minimal reason. And so, it's inexplicable to me why that didn't happen or why ... It wasn't like it was going to be a big fight. So I don't understand why that doesn't happen more.

Jennifer Johnson:

But my suggestion is this. Completely acknowledging the reprisal, the silencing, all of that that happens, I have a couple of thoughts about things that we can do. The first is it was really noticeable going through the report how some of the comments, even of the faculty, had these minimizing phrases in it, "Oh, but he was drunk," "Oh, he was just joking," "Oh, he didn't mean it."

Jennifer Johnson:

I mean we were getting some from the administration, but even the faculty that were reporting were minimizing it. So I think we can refuse to tolerate this from each other and we can call out our peers. It's hard in the case of a bad dean who's above us, but still I think we can do some self-policing with us. This is unacceptable we don't do this.

Jennifer Johnson:

The other is ... So I'll tell you a short story. I will tell you my interpretation. You can think it's naïve, but I'm just going to share it. The short story is they said that at-large members met with the president last week, and among the things we told him was to thank him for efforts to address diversity, equity, and

inclusion, that the faculty supported that and that we were strongly for that in terms of mandatory training and anything else he cared to do.

Jennifer Johnson:

Friday, at the board meeting, in front of the cameras, he said, "I'm addressing this mandatory training with the support of the faculty, et cetera, et cetera." I do believe that there is a genuine motivation there to address some of these issues, and my interpretation of that is to the extent to which the faculty sent a very clear message. We support diversity, equity, inclusion. We support this, we support that. We want to clean house. We give him some political cover to do that.

Jennifer Johnson:

I understand all of that, but I'm not completely unoptimistic because I do think that he moves with more confidence when the faculty endorses something very clearly. So for what it's worth, that's what I think.

Stephanie Nawyn:

Yeah, sure.

Jane Bunnell:

Hi, Jane Bunnell from the College of Music. I hear the gender cry. I mean I'm interested that Dr. Strampel trumped Larry Nassar. That was interesting to me because the College of Music, I think, is sort of similar to sports in that we have one-on-one, where you're with somebody in a room by yourself. We're a vulnerable institution just like sports are, and we have to be very careful.

Jane Bunnell:

But if any one of our students was in peril, we know it. And not only I know it, three other people know it. Our associate dean is on it. We're over at Olin. So it just boggles my mind that all these young women weren't read in some way, even by nonverbal means. When somebody's falling apart, they're falling apart and you can see it.

Jane Bunnell:

We have many top administrators that are not with us anymore, but many of the people that were in the trenches, the people that were able to read the faces of people that were in trouble are still there. This report, I had to write this last night, was gut-wrenching and it demands great change and a new ethos, not scapegoating but a new deep sense of accountability in every area of the university, visible, hidden, rich or not.

Jane Bunnell:

This is a crucible we're going through now and we should come out of it, and back President Stanley and back the changes that need to be and be vital in the ways that we ... I don't want to say aggressively, but impassioned, impassionedly work to have this educational mission brought back and the light brought back.

Stephanie Nawyn:

Thank you.

Andaluna Borcila:

Andaluna Borcila, James Madison College. So I'm just going to say a couple of things that I guess are still daunting to me. I'm not going to give all my reactions here. But I understand backing President Stanley for diversity initiatives, at the same time I also understand the need for faculty to demand accountability and a change in culture, because we also have people who are identified in this report.

Andaluna Borcila:

When you mentioned many have been found accountable, who has been found accountable? Who are the people who are named in this report who have not been found accountable? Many, many of them have not been found accountable. So I would say that. Some of them are advising on diversity.

Andaluna Borcila:

I mean let's say it for what it is. I am here to support initiatives, but at the same time if we don't want to be complicit with this institution anymore, we should call for full accountability here, and that is the first step for the culture to be able to change. Where are the people that are identified in the report? Have they been held accountable? How?

Anna Pegler-Gordon:

Yeah, Anna Pegler-Gordon, James Madison College. So something that really struck me in our group was this comment about the budget and how some people are fearful because they're not on the tenure stream or they don't have tenure, but even among people who should be, I think, more confident, that should stand up more, that they're concerned about budget-related issues.

Anna Pegler-Gordon:

It seems to me that the exact people that Andaluna was just talking about together cost the university, in addition to obviously we tend to prioritize, I think, the trauma and the harm and the violence and the terrible working experience that people had to go through as a result of both employee X and Dean Strampel's behavior.

Anna Pegler-Gordon:

But there's also a massive financial cost to the university, and yet those people are being rewarded massively and financially. I think that actually thinking about a really clear statement ... And I think it goes to the comments people made about the friendships, the relationships that you build, and then you can't believe or you don't think that person is really fully responsible individually, but together they are responsible.

Anna Pegler-Gordon:

So maybe a sort of policy that says if your unit has a major problem that you overlook, like in sexual harassment, that's when your budget gets cut because you're going to be costing the university money in terms of money coming in and in terms of payments going out. If you don't report these things and if you're not showing yourself to really be following the policies, then there's going to be a financial hit for you. If you are a person who has been involved in this and not doing a good job, then you don't get a big payout.

Anna Pegler-Gordon:

We can set that up as something that we say this is standard policy, because right now with everything that's going on, it's standard policy that if you're an administrator and you were responsible for hundreds, I mean, what, 250 women during the investigation period, sort of being assaulted and raped, then you might get ... Dean Strampel gets impacted, but other people who are responsible for that, it's like, "Oh, you can go back to the faculty and we'll just say no problem."

Anna Pegler-Gordon:

We can take away someone's tenure for refusing to teach a class and for sending harassing emails, as was done at the most recent board meeting, but we won't take away someone's tenure because they allowed hundreds of women to be assaulted. That seems like an imbalance.

Stephanie Nawyn:

Is there anyone else who would like to ... Okay, there we go.

John Jiang:

John Jiang from Business. I was thinking is it possible to have term limit for upper level administrators?

Stephanie Nawyn:

It could always be proposed by the faculty senate, I suppose. We'll have somebody over there and then here and then right there.

Galia Benitez:

Galia Benitez, James Madison College. One of the things that ... Also, I have been here for a year or two years in faculty senate. One of the things that all of you have talked about is the power that we have as faculty, and this is our space to gain that power. Sometimes when people have brought certain initiative, has taken us two years sometimes to actually move to do anything else. So if you really mean it and you really are in your groups, and all of the groups actually mentioned this idea that we do not have power, we're also constraining ourselves and we are constantly limiting ourselves because we don't vote for things, we just keep changing it, and we don't do radical changes to anything of our initiative at all. That's all.

Stephanie Nawyn:

[inaudible 00:57:30] go ahead.

Female:

So I just wanted to make a remark about this us versus them sort of thing that I see emerging in some of the comments. So while, Andaluna, I agree, accountability is important and perhaps consequences for the college is important, ultimately we change the culture. It's us.

Female:

And so, I really think it's important, at least when we have conversations about this, that we don't make this mistake of us versus them, the good people and the bad people, because it catches us. I can't say that if I wasn't in the provost's shoes, I wouldn't have acted this way. I cannot say that. I do not know that I would not do the same because you do get into this mode where you already have your idea

formed and you're not listening to the information that is contrary to the idea that you have. I mean these are psychologic traits of humans.

Female:

So I think it's a mistake to start thinking about us versus them and I think it's better to think about what can we do to ensure that we collectively act differently when situations like this occur.

Bree Holtz:

Hey, Bree Holtz from Com Arts. Just some thoughts that I had about why Penn state was different and maybe listening. So I've read some studies that say that when women get abused, it's normal for us. It's something that happens every day. It's something that ... Whatever. That's why we have, "She was asking for it," "She was wearing this." For men, when men abuse boys, that seems to bring more attention and more action.

Bree Holtz:

And so, I'm not saying that we can't do anything, but we should also recognize that we're living in this societal, systematic structure of thinking that when something happens to a young woman, there's alcohol. That's reported in there, and that's why. So not only do we have to think about changing these narratives, but understand it's going to be harder since it's a universal reaction that people have. So thank you.

Male:

[inaudible 00:59:57], Department of Median Information. I agree with everything that Dr. Holtz just said. I'd also add the other thing that Penn State did is they came out and embraced it, and so [inaudible 01:00:05] happened. We call that in the crisis communication literature stealing thunder, and we don't do that here. How long did it take before there's a statement about the warden incident? Why do I have to have a student come to me in the morning this morning and say there was a swastika painted on a fraternity across from Hillel this weekend and we haven't said a damn word about it?

Male:

The university needs to be more proactive. We need to be out immediately saying this is something that is against our values, not waiting for two weeks until we come up with exactly what's going to be done. We can come out and say painting a swastika ... And the fraternity's already expelled the student. I don't even know if the university knows this is happening, and I find that very frustrating. But that was one of the big differences with Penn State is they embraced and said, "Yeah, this is a screw-up and we're going to move forward."

Robert Ofoli:

Robert Ofoli, College of Engineering. This report is very frustrating. I think faculty need a new kind of empowerment. I came from a university where a full faculty were very engaged and they would not take any nonsense. Here many of our full faculty, they go to sleep. They don't come out and complain. They are willing to allow what is going on to go on. And so, I don't know, maybe we need a re-education.

Robert Ofoli:

But it's very frustrating to me because we have these great ideas about how we're going to change things, and I'm trying to figure out how do I personally do it, because you're supposed to have a carrot and a stick. I might be able to come up with the carrot, but I don't have any idea how I'm going to get that stick.

Robert Ofoli:

So if somebody in administration is doing something that you don't think is right, perhaps this idea of having a dean of the faculty, perhaps that's something that we need to pursue because I need to have some place to go and say, "This person is doing so and so and it's not right," and have somebody who actually has a stake who can try to make things right. But right now I'm very frustrated because I don't see how we're going to get there.

Robert Ofoli:

Unfortunately, a lot of the people who close their eyes and close their ears and wouldn't talk, they are all over the place and they are still here. I don't know how we're going to get past those people. So I'm very frustrated.

Stephanie Nawyn:

Juliet?

Juliet Guzzetta:

Juliet Guzzetta, Arts and Letters. I actually thought I would feel more polished and relaxed, but honestly I'm feeling really raw and sweaty palms and racing heart, so I'm coming to you from a strange and surprising place of rawness. I have a question for Counsel Quinn and then I have a question for all of you.

Juliet Guzzetta:

My question for the council is one thing we discussed and one thing that I just didn't understand in reading the document was why our own attorney was investigating. This was employee X. It seems like a conflict of interest to me. Besides the fact that it was a small circle then, our own employees. There was no outside doctors consulted about employee access method. So why was it our own attorney investigating? My understanding is they're also supposed to protect us, MSU, right? So I don't understand that.

Juliet Guzzetta:

Then for all of you, one thing I'm really trying to work through is a mentality here. This is mostly in respect to Strampel and how after continuously all these times, five years, another five years go by, more reports, same stuff right, how he's continually reappointed.

Juliet Guzzetta:

I actually want to hear, just like a diary entry almost, like just a raw what some might call come to Jesus, like, "This is what was going through my head," from the people that made those decisions, that made those re-appointments. I don't actually know who they all are because I'm at the bottom here. So I don't know who they are because they're at the top. I mean I know some of them, but obviously people who aren't even here, Lou Anna.

Juliet Guzzetta:

I'm just curious, like what was your thought process? Did you feel pressured? Is it because you're a woman and there's cultures that I don't even know of? I mean if there's some way perhaps we as faculty senate might ask, "Would you mind sharing with us these many occasions in which you turned your back what you were thinking?" That's just something I would like to hear.

Brian Quinn:

So to answer the first question-

Stephanie Nawyn:

[inaudible 01:05:26].

Brian Quinn:

Yeah, Brian Quinn, general counsel. The answer to the first question is that the attorney who investigated 2014 was not an attorney in the Office of General Counsel. At the time she conducted the investigation, she was an investigator in I3, which was then doing Title 9 investigations. After she was an investigator is when she moved into our office. As a matter of course, my office and the attorneys who represent the university do not do Title 9 investigations. That's the Office of Institutional Equity. So she just came in later.

Lisa Lapidus:

Lisa Lapidus, College of Natural Science. So it's really clear that everybody is very much in agreement of how damaging this report is, but that doesn't get us moving forward. I think that the best way we have to make culture change is to get in the face of the new provost, whoever that is, and give them a very clear agenda of the kinds of culture change we want.

Lisa Lapidus:

Now getting a clear agenda from anybody in this university is difficult, and this body has shown that we can't always come up with one, but maybe that really should be our focus from now until the summer, whenever the provost is announced, so that when the provost shows up at the first faculty senate meeting in September, we actually have something that the provost can work with.

Lisa Lapidus:

I'm willing to make the assumption that the provost is going to want to make changes. I think that that's going to be made perfectly clear to the provost. But if the provost is getting all of their information from the people who talk to them directly, they're not going to find out what we think. The only way that we're really going to have a voice is if we actually speak with one voice, but we've got to get organized on that, and that has got to be a priority for faculty senate.

Stephanie Nawyn:

Yeah?

Sandra Logan:

Sandra Logan, College of Arts and Letters. I really appreciate the suggestions and comments and concerns that have been voiced here today. It's the first time I've had a chance to talk with others really in any depth about this. It wasn't very much depth actually because it was so fast, but at least a chance to start talking about this document and about the culture that we're dealing with here.

Sandra Logan:

I just wanted to take a couple of seconds toward the end of this meeting to say that it's really important for us all to carry this conversation back to our units and to figure out how we can do that to make sure that we're not the only people who've read this document and that we're not the only ones outraged by it. It makes things quite visible and quite visceral in ways that none of the news accounts and nothing else really did for me. So I think it's really an important document to spread around.

Sandra Logan:

Those of us in the college, several of us here in the College of Arts and Letters, haven't yet created a strategy for how we'll approach our college, but I think we will be talking about that very soon. I really just wanted to encourage others to do the same sort of thing, to find allies and to find supporters and collaborators to make this into a conversation in all of your units. Not to take away from anything that's been said here, but the more support and the more strength we have behind those ideas, the more likely we are to have some success.

Jill Slade:

Hi. Jill Slade, College of Osteopathic Medicine. Of course, in a meeting like this, it's hard to hold your head up when you have to say you're from the College of Osteopathic Medicine. We've had different ways of approaching that and dealing with that.

Jill Slade:

Anyhow, I just wanted to raise the point about how much we value ethics and how we should go about evaluating someone's ethics. And so, I know at the departmental level, in some departments, they're now required to submit ethical statements. If this is really something we value, shouldn't this be considered on a top tier with other benchmarks? How much grant money do you have and how is your ethical performance? Because if your ethics stink, guess what? There's no balance, there's no place even to review this, and this has come up in committees. There's no place to put that information in. It's not considered.

Jill Slade:

And so, my suggestion would be to think carefully about having that be a component, not just for faculty reviews for promotion and re-appointment and tenure but also for administrative review. We're not looking at it and we're not taking it into account as far as I know.

Jennifer Johnson:

Jennifer Johnson, Human Medicine. To follow up on the taking this back, would it make sense for us to maybe take these questions back to our faculty and have them email and answer somewhere and/or set up a website where people could respond to it? I'm just trying to think of what's the best most efficient way to scale that and get the information back.

Female:

I don't have an answer to that question, but it seems to me that it's really important for our units to actually read the report, have a conversation about it, and then answer questions, because that seems to me to be really formative and as a way of faculty actually basically facing the partial reality as it is, as this OCR report's about our institution. So not reckoning with this, just for people to send emails I don't think is a good way to go. So I think we really need to figure that out.

Female:

I also am thinking about a follow-up meeting to this one in which we can talk about the ideas we have that we might press for change. I've heard a whole range of things here, including, well, how do faculty get more of a voice and what should happen for the next steps and so forth? We might even want to look at some of the bylaws changes. We just put a motion to them. Does that give more overview for faculty of administrative issues?

Female:

This has opened a lot, but it seems to me that we need another step here on senate before we get to that agreement, Lisa. I think that having a place to deliberate, which is faculty senate, is a fine thing. We need to be able to deliberate what we think is important moving forward.

Female:

Then the other part is us thinking about how do we take this back to our colleges and having some kind of accountability built in. Like after we do that, can we come back and report here?

Stephanie Nawyn:

We have about two more minutes, if there's one other comment, or two very short comments, anybody wants to make.

Female:

[inaudible 01:13:14] is going to be [inaudible 01:13:16].

Stephanie Nawyn:

These notes certainly will be shared with faculty senate. I can't speak to how it gets shared beyond that, but the idea was you can see in real time what's being said. It's very hard to see even from the front row let alone in the back. I don't actually own these, but I would assume and hope that these can be shared with all of the senate. In fact, I don't think there's any problems either with sharing them with your units. So we've got one and a half minutes and you're good.

Tyler Silvestri:

Very briefly. Hi, Tyler Silvestri, UCAG. I just wanted to say for the bylaws effort, yes, it absolutely addresses that. Indeed, the whole point of the Committee on Administrative Review is reviewing the administrators and releasing as part of that public reports. This was one of the things our group talked about in reading the report.

Tyler Silvestri:

The Committee on Administrative Review, the idea predates the report, but it is designed exactly for this, and actually an even higher level than dean. So I already made the sale to you, so I guess I can stop pitching because you already passed it. But remind the board, I guess, right the board, because that's who's going to have to pass this.

Stephanie Nawyn:

And with that, I want to thank all of you. This was like no academic conference I've ever attended. I didn't have to tackle anyone or steal a mic. No one was overtime. It was the most amazing thing, I think, I've witnessed as a faculty member. I'm assuming, Deborah, you do the official adjournment.

Deborah:

I just want to say the [inaudible 01:15:10] is saved and they will be sent to all the faculty senate. [inaudible 01:15:13].

Stephanie Nawyn:

Except for individuals who came up to the microphone. But, yes, all of the-

Deborah:

[inaudible 01:15:36].

Female:

For those [inaudible 01:15:39]. So this will be sent to faculty senate [inaudible 01:15:40]. Then we'll do an email both to see [inaudible 01:15:43].

Female:

[inaudible 01:15:46].

Deborah:

As soon as [inaudible 01:15:50].

Stephanie Nawyn:

So for those of you who can't hear, the notes are going to be ... Once they're typed up and completed, they will be sent to all of you. Please check them for accuracy. Then email back your affirmation that these are accurate and can be shared widely beyond faculty senate.

Deborah:

Correct. And so, they will be sent. Since they're already typed up, they're there, and they should be sent out [inaudible 01:16:22].

Stephanie Nawyn:

Did you have-

Deborah:

[crosstalk 01:16:25].

This transcript was exported on Feb 27, 2020 - view latest version [here](#).

Male:

Yeah, a quick question about if we can send the report right now?

Stephanie Nawyn:

The OCR report can be sent to everyone.

Deborah:

And it has been.

Stephanie Nawyn:

Yes. Everyone should have it, but please resend it.

Deborah:

Thank you, Stephanie.

Stephanie Nawyn:

Thank you.

Quorum:

Thank you.

Deborah:

Again, everybody say aye.

Quorum:

Aye.