

Deborah:

Okay. I'd like to call the meeting to order. Before we have an approval of the agenda, I just want to ask everyone if they would raise their hands using the Raise Hand Function so we can make sure that everyone knows how to do this.

Speaker 1:

Deborah, I don't know how to do this.

Deborah:

You go down to the bottom where it says "Participants" and click on that and a screen will open up to your right and then at the bottom of the screen there is, "Raise Hand, Mutiny, Invite and Lower Hand."

Speaker 1:

Okay. I'm on an iPad and I'm not getting any of that. I can get to the participants but all I get is a list of participants.

Deborah:

So there's nothing on the bottom? Greg, can you be helpful with that?

Greg:

Yes, iPad users, it is across the top and then there are three dots on the very top right corner. If you press that and then there should be a button in there that says "Raise hand."

Speaker 1:

Got it. Thank you.

Deborah:

Okay. Has everyone been able to do that? We're all good?

Speaker 2:

I'm not able to either. I get down to "Participants, Share Screen, Chat, Record Reactions". Would it be in "Reactions"?

Speaker 3:

It would be under "Reactions".

Speaker 2:

Okay.

Deborah:

No, you click on "Participants".

Speaker 2:

It's in "Reactions".

Deborah:

Oh, okay. All right. Anybody else? Okay, so the next thing is if everyone... Now you can lower your hands. The "Lower Hand" function and then the next thing is everyone should stay muted unless they have raised their hand and are recognized. And the person who's going to be recognizing people is Greg because he's going to be keeping track of what order hands were raised in. Just so you're aware of that. So he'll just say, "This person has their hand raised," and then I'll recognize them. And that's the format of the meeting.

Deborah:

Okay. So is there a motion to approve if... And when I say, "Is there a motion to approve?" If you can just raise your hand so everyone... Oh, I see. Dave is already saying, "So moved." Thank you very much. That was to approve the agenda of April 14th, 2020. Is there a second? Yes, Stephen Gasteyer. All in favor, raise your hands. Opposed? Motion carries. Approval for the draft minutes of February 18th, is there a motion to approve? Stephen Gasteyer has moved. Is there a second? Derek Polischuk has seconded. Take a look at the minutes and anything to be added or deleted or changed? All in favor, raise your hands. Opposed? Motion carries.

Deborah:

President Stanley is unable to be here today. So we're going to start with the Interim Provost Sullivan's remarks.

President Stanley:

I'm right here.

Deborah:

Oh you are? I'm sorry. I thought you aren't able to attend. You're here.

President Stanley:

Originally I had a conflict because the Michigan Economic Recovery Council was scheduled to meet at four so that was going to be the conflict I had, but in fact they've changed their meeting to 6 p.m. So I'm here if that's okay?

Deborah:

I'm delighted to have you here. I'm sorry.

President Stanley:

Well I'll go ahead and give my report. And good afternoon everyone. And again, I appreciate the effort everybody's putting in, in these very challenging times and look forward to giving you a little information about where we stand right now. And then I'll mention now and I'll mention again later, I plan to have a town hall, essentially, for faculty and staff, a live town hall, probably this week and I'll get you more information about that very soon.

President Stanley:

So in Michigan, just to step back and take a look at where we are right now in the epidemic. There is about 25,000 cases now in Michigan, it's about close to 1600 deaths as of yesterday. So we remain one of the most affected States in the country. And what's really devastating, as our students reminded me in my Chorus and Cops Meeting with them on Friday, is the toll that this epidemic right now is taking on our black community. Blacks represent about 14% of the citizens of Michigan, but account for about 40% of the state's coronavirus deaths and of course that's concentrated in Southeast Michigan. This is really an emergency and the governor has appointed a new task force essentially, to take a look at disparities to try and work with this. But we're also looking at ways in which Michigan State University can get more involved and be more helpful in this emergency for our community.

President Stanley:

At this point on campus, as everyone knows that based on the governor's, "Stay Home Stay Safe" executive order, which has been extended through the end of the month, only a few employees designated as essential are working on campus and they're asked to maintain a six-foot separation and get a brief health screening before they arrive. And again, that's in compliance with that order. So that means about 88% right now, of our employees who would normally be on campus are actually working at home, and only about 12% or so, are on-campus. And so those of you who do visit campus sometimes will see, and I happen to be living here, of course, will see that it really has emptied out significantly.

President Stanley:

There's more people working on South Campus, more people working obviously in Grand Rapids and our medical facilities. And about 36% there are on-campus. So all of our on-campus research activities deemed as non-essential have been told to cease at this time. Again, we're making sure that things like cell lines and other things are supported, so lots of research is not lost, but very important research continues. Our investigators are doing work analyzing their data from home where they can, conducting peer review, working on technology transfer, applying for patents, preparing publications and more grants and so on. And several of our researchers are actually doing work on the novel coronavirus and trying again, to help in our efforts there and all of that work continues on-campus.

President Stanley:

One of the things that's been very important for us during this time has been to find ways to reach out and help the community. I applaud Norm Beauchamp, Second Vice President Norm Beauchamp. We've been working with community leaders across the state to really align business supply and manufacturing capabilities with the needs we've been seeing for the epidemic. And our own faculty and staff have done amazing work scouring the campus essentially for personal protective equipment. Again to give to hospitals, particularly in needy areas where the people on the frontline lack those critical things in the fight against the virus. And so that work has been going very well.

President Stanley:

And then some work that I think has gotten nationwide attention, that you may have seen, MSU Extension worked to develop a way to use commercial ovens, spiral ovens, to decontaminate N95 masks. There's already hospitals that are applying that and using it, that technique, and we're also waiting for approval of a system that we've been working on that uses vaporized hydrogen peroxide to decontaminate masks and gowns and other personal protective equipment. That too could be a game-changer in areas where people are running short of those vital supplies.

President Stanley:

We've opened up the Kellogg Center, which had been closed, as a hotel to health providers and first responders who may need to maintain physical distance, may be concerned about their families or may have been exposed and need to isolate. And of course, again, MSU have made national news. We're very proud of the 350 Medical Osteopathic University graduates this semester who extended their moves to their professional training location, who expedited rather, their moves to their professional training location by allowing for them to graduate essentially, a month or more than a month early. So they can actually participate in the battle against coronavirus. And many of them are starting their residencies or their clinical things early. Normally those things would start in July. So they're taking advantage of this to start early and get at the forefront. And I really admire their dedication.

President Stanley:

So MSU people have really risen to the occasion so much during the past weeks and months and I couldn't be prouder. And during this time we've really been focused on the safety and wellbeing of everyone on campus. That's been our number one priority and then as well as how we deliver our educational research and extension missions and help the community in ways I've talked about. But as time goes on, we also have to face some very impactful financial challenges that this crisis and epidemic have brought to us.

President Stanley:

The overall financial impact on Michigan State University is significant. It's driven by the elimination of summer programs, sharp declines in our auxiliary incomes, so this would be residential housing services for example, athletics for example, and those are declines that may well continue into fall. At this point in time, we're not sure. Uncertainty in our future enrollments. That's a very important issue for us, what will our enrollment look like as we come into fall. And then the current and potential impact of the significant global economic downturn on our endowment returns, our fundraising activities, state allocation, that's very important based on what state finances look like, our research funding and more.

President Stanley:

So if you look at the impact for 2020 to date, that's about 48 to \$60 million. That's the range we look at as what it's going to be and that's increased expenditures we've had to make to teach online. Again, major declines in auxiliary revenue income that I talked about and for fiscal year 2021 there could be significantly more reductions as well, in our revenue. We've looked at a number of measures to deal with these problems. Earlier this month we put in place a campus-wide hiring chill as we've called it, asking units to review planned hiring. Particularly in those areas where our current status would make it difficult for individuals to actually get onboarded or begin their work.

President Stanley:

We're reviewing all capital outlays on campus. We've set up a committee to review essentially all expenditures that are over \$1 million. Looking to postpone or defer projects where we can and that includes both construction and major IT initiatives and reviewing our contracts, our consultants, reducing travel and looking at any ways we can to save money. And nothing is off the table as we take a look at the challenges ahead. At this point of time our goal is both to mitigate the substantial effects of the outbreak on Fiscal Year 2020, which I've talked about and prepare for several scenarios that we might encounter in Fiscal Year 2021 as well. So all of these things are on top of mind. They're the source

of many discussions that we're having to try and understand where we are and what we need to do, going forward.

President Stanley:

There's been a number of things that Terry and her team, Provost Sullivan, have done to help. We've already announced a new student orientation to be offered online for all incoming students. And my kudos to the work that's being done again by the provost office in those areas related to admissions. As I said before, enrollment is really critical to us as we think about the fall and there's really been a change in style. And I'll let the provost talk about that and I'll just get very, very quickly to the bottom line, is that we're right now we're up in our deposits in every group that we have, except our international students. And that's to be expected I think for the international students to be down.

President Stanley:

Now we don't know the true strength of these deposits and these commitments. We don't know how financial situations of families and so on may change between now and when the decision is finally made to accept their Michigan State University acceptance. But at this point in time, those numbers are very good and I think they reflect a lot of very hard work by the admissions team. But the international students are a real concern. There's concerns obviously around their visas, their ability to actually come here. The fact that we have an ongoing epidemic in the U.S. may discourage families from coming as well. So there's major concerns about that and as I said before, or may have said before, international students are 18% of our tuition revenue. So that's a significant risk for us going forward. So all of this again, is things we're working on to try and mitigate going forward.

President Stanley:

On other fronts, the search for a provost continues and I want to thank everyone who was involved and thank everyone for the feedback I received on that search. We're in the process now of making an offer to one of the candidates. I got great feedback on the candidates. I'll just remind everybody that I'm not always able to recruit the person that's our number one choice. Sometimes they have other decisions, make other decisions. That happens sometimes, but we're working very hard to attract somebody to come to Michigan State and I think it will be an attractive job for someone to accept.

President Stanley:

We've heard from our DEI Planning, the strategic planning, Committees on the work they're going to continue to be doing. So they're going to continue to do some work, but they'll be slowing the pace in some areas and maybe concentrating more on other areas, based on our inability to meet in person and some of the limitations that that puts forward.

President Stanley:

We put out a lot of communications this past month or two and we're going to continue to try and communicate as much as we can. You might've seen an opinion column from me yesterday in the Lansing State Journal, which just supported the governor's Stay Home, Stay Safe executive order, and really talked about the necessity of social distancing. I'll say again what I said in that op ed, "This is working." If you look at new cases in Ingham County, the numbers are down, the pace is down in the disease and in the county. It is working here locally. I think it's working around the country in a number of areas. I know it can feel almost intolerable at this point in time to continue this, but it's really important that we stick with it. And again, I applaud all of you for your willingness to do it.

President Stanley:

As I said, I would do a live virtual town hall this Friday and look forward to the opportunity to answer more questions you have about any of the topics you've talked about. And I also wanted to applaud the faculty members who've been stepping up in this. We've had a number of faculty members who bring expertise in this area. This is a time when people really need facts to help them cope. They don't need opinions. So having people come forward from Michigan State and bring their expertise in different areas to this, to help advise the public through news and social media about how to stay healthy, how to stay productive, how to really deal with the isolation we're facing right now. All of those informed perspectives I think are very valuable. So I thank you, faculty and staff, for chipping in this way.

President Stanley:

And then, I'm almost finished, a number of our faculty are ramping up or changing their work to focus on coronavirus research. You might've seen Nigel Paneth, one of our distinguished epidemiologists, is helping lead the development of the National Convalescent Plasma Project. This is where they're getting plasma, serum, from people who've survived the coronavirus-19 infection. That serum could be very valuable as potential therapy for people who are infected. And also maybe it's something that could prophylactically be given to health workers to reduce their chance of contracting a severe case of coronavirus infection. So both of those things may be very useful. And then a group from our departments of Pediatrics and Human Development, Pharmacology and Toxicology have developed a computational process for identifying what existing drugs are in our armamentarium that might be useful to fight the novel coronavirus.

President Stanley:

So we have some good news in our U.S. News and World Report rankings. We are, once again, recognized for having some of the nation's top graduate programs, particularly in Elementary and Secondary Education Curriculum Instruction. So my congratulations to the College of Education again for their leadership in these areas. We also again, have the leading program in Supply Chain Logistics by U.S. News as well. And eight other programs we have at MSU are ranked in the top 15 nationally. And we had a Goldwater Scholar, Isabella Jeanette, is an honors college sophomore majoring in physics and advanced mathematics. She's MSU 47th Goldwater scholar and I congratulate her.

President Stanley:

So that's a not so brief scan of recent developments here at MSU. But again, I'm interested in hearing from you particularly at this town hall on how we could better navigate these uncharted waters as we deal with this coronavirus epidemic and continue to work together to help move the university forward. So thank you and I'll stop there.

Deborah:

Thank you, President Stanley. Are there any questions for President Stanley? I see none. Let's move on to Interim Provost Sullivan's remarks.

Interim Provost Sullivan:

Okay, thank you. I want to echo the president's admiration for the faculty and what a terrific job you've all done. And I know that a lot of the faculty were not well-versed in ways of teaching online and they've adapted to it remarkably. We're offering some training in the summer to help faculty become more

adept and so far I think we have 625 faculty who've asked to have that training. That's really remarkable and I think speaks very well of all of you.

Interim Provost Sullivan:

For the past couple of weeks my office has been working hard on trying to abate the impact of the coronavirus on the careers of our faculty, particularly our faculty who are in the probationary period. Today all of you should have received through email a set of FAQs about the automatic extension for the people who are up for tenure or for reappointment. That's automatic. You don't have to take it. You can ask to opt out of it, but you don't have to request specifically to have it either. The literature indicates that an opt-in creates more stigma than an opt-out does and again, we're trying to abate the effect, not increase the effect.

Interim Provost Sullivan:

In addition, I will be issuing a set of directives to deans and department chairs about the use of teaching evaluations this semester. Basically, this semester's teaching evaluations are used for any type of evaluation only if the faculty member submits them. So it'll be entirely in the control of the faculty member. And when I say faculty here, I also mean academic specialists, TA, whatever, but the agency will lie with the person who's being evaluated, whether or not to submit those for review by others. There are some cases, teaching assistants for example, who are going on the job market. They're going to need to have teaching evaluations to submit. They may feel that they have to submit it as part of their teaching dossiers, but a faculty member who feels that it was a rocky road and isn't a good, fair representation of that faculty member's teaching ability, doesn't have to submit it for consideration.

Interim Provost Sullivan:

There is going to be a ceremony to mark the Class of 2020. It won't be like our traditional graduation. The president's been quite clear that those graduates will be invited back to the university for a real in-person ceremony, but it will be a virtual ceremony and we hope it'll be festive and it does not preclude any college from having its own program. So some of the colleges have planned to have programs of their own to recognize their graduates. Because our graduation is spaced out over a number of days we've decided that we'll have this ceremony on May 16th, which is a Saturday. That's after the last of the otherwise scheduled graduations, which was the School of Law. It's after that last one would... You'll hear more about this in the future. I do have a very good committee working on it, but I'm not willing to talk with you more about plans which haven't jelled much more than that so far.

Interim Provost Sullivan:

As you know, we would very much like to raise enrollment in the summer session. I was able to offer some financial incentives to get some additional courses. I'm pleased to tell you that there are 140 new summer courses being offered. There appears to be a great demand for summer enrollments. Students may not get summer jobs, they're looking for something to occupy their time. Nothing could be better than helping them meet their educational goals while they wait out the quarantine. So we announced this week that both parts of summer session, both session one and session two, are going to be online.

Interim Provost Sullivan:

I'm getting a lot of questions about how soon people can come onto campus and I have to say at this point, "I can't answer that." We still have, as the president mentioned, a stay at home order through April 30th, I don't know when the stay at home orders will be lifted. I think it would be prudent, in

thinking about your fall courses, to simply ask yourself the question, "What if I had to open online? Could I do that?" And to think about that.

Interim Provost Sullivan:

Admissions are looking pretty good, as the president said, except for international admissions. I give a great deal of credit to the admissions team, which completely changed its mode of operations. They could no longer have large meetings where they brought together admitted students, they couldn't have the almost rally-like events that they typically had. What they did instead, was that they turned to the telephone and they began calling and talking to individual students and parents, answering questions for people and I think it's made a difference. For one thing, it's helped to break down that image that we're this big school where you're just another number. So I'm very pleased about that.

Interim Provost Sullivan:

These numbers are still soft because even if you put down a deposit, you may lose the deposit, but some families are willing to do that, but I'm still very optimistic that we will have a good freshman class to start. I have less systematic information about graduate admissions. Not all graduate programs are doing well. Some have had a bumper crop of admissions, others have not. But I've asked deans to be alert to the fact that some of our students who had jobs lined up may find that those jobs disappear. And in that case I've asked graduate programs to be lenient in considering whether they could expand master's programs to take in some of our recent graduates who might be good candidates for graduate school, but who hadn't thought about it up to this point. And so I think I shall stop at that point and I'm happy to answer questions if you have any.

Deborah:

Do we have questions for the provost? I see Stephen Gast- [crosstalk 00:23:45]. You're muted, Stephen.

Stephen Gasteyer:

Hello. Thank you for that. For both of those briefings, President Stanley and Provost Sullivan. Those are very helpful. I was wondering from the provost if she had a sense of what, if anything, moving to online instruction in the fall might mean for TA-ships for our graduate students?

Interim Provost Sullivan:

So we're hoping not to affect the number of TA positions at all. Students need TAs for lots of reasons, if not the traditional section leadership then for tutoring and one-on-one conversation. TAs serve a lot of roles. In some cases, if they're qualified, they can be instructors of record. So although we have a hiring chill in place, we have instructed graduate programs that they can have the same number of graduate assistants in the fall that they have now and that we will consider requests for additional ones, if for example, they get an increased enrollment in a directory class. So I'm hoping we'll have just as many or maybe even more positions for graduate students next fall as we do now.

Deborah:

Thank you. We also have a question from Lisa Lapidis and I can either read it or she can read it herself. It says, "I have a question but did not get my hand up fast enough [inaudible 00:25:26]. I'm wondering about our endowment investment return, specifically why no returns have been recorded since June 2019?"

President Stanley:

So thank you for the question. We're in a little better shape obviously than we were on March 12th, when the market was dramatically lower. And we have a complex portfolio obviously, so it includes a number of... It's not just in classic equities, but it's in hedge funds and other areas as well. So the return is not directly tied, completely under what's happening in the stock market, although it certainly does influence it. I don't know what percentage we are down right now. The payout is a weighted average of the past few years and it's usually 4.5%. So we would expect to get that return in terms of what's given to the university. That doesn't change. So we've had years when we had, for example, 8% returns on investment, but we still paid out the 4.5 so that helps buffer us in times like this when things go down. But I'll find out why the June 2019 is the last time investments were listed and I'll check with Phil Zucker to find out what the most recent is and we'll see if we can get that posted.

Interim Provost Sullivan:

I'll hazard a guess that private equity is one of the reasons, just because it's hard to get a market rate for your private equity investments.

President Stanley:

Yeah, but we do come up with a return. We have quarterly results on what returns are and so on. So we can see where we are.

Deborah:

Thank you. Onto Luna Buccello, had her hand up. (Silence) I think you're muted.

Dr Buccello:

I will unmute myself. Hi everybody. Thank you so much, President Stanley and Provost Sullivan, for all these updates in the work you're doing and thanks to all my colleagues. And I do have a couple of questions for the provost. Provost Sullivan, what do you anticipate is, or what do you think is the timeframe within which the decision for whether or not we're going to start the fall semester online needs to be made? And also how will we, as faculty who are designing the curriculum and teaching the curriculum and basically in charge of the curriculum, be engaged in making that decision and in articulating what we think we need in order to make that, if we come to that, to make that the best learning experience for our students?

Interim Provost Sullivan:

Well, I don't think the decision will be totally voluntary in the sense that... You've heard it said a lot these days that the virus is making the decision. I think that is what would happen in this event too. If we were still in a situation in which it was dangerous to bring together large numbers of people on the campus, that would probably dictate that that's what we would have to do. I won't be the one making that decision. I won't even be here. So you know, it's too soon I think, to say that it will or won't happen or even to put a percentage certainty on whether it's likely to happen. But I'm simply saying that as matter of prudence, it wouldn't be a bad idea to think about how you would do your class online if you had to.

President Stanley:

That answer is perfect. And it very much is determined by what's happening in the community. And then what kind of tests do we have that allow us to make decisions. So what kind of information do we have to allow us to make the best decision possible? So in a scenario where we have the ability to test students, where we have the ability to trace contacts, where we have the ability to understand who's been infected already. It's a very different world to try and think about coming back in a world when we're still kind of flying blind, as we are right now, where we have to go on the assumption that everybody's infected essentially in the community. That's how we're behaving right now, right? By shelter in place, we're making an assumption that everybody in the community is infected so we need to avoid contact with them.

President Stanley:

So if we get to a point where we have a decline in the epidemic in the community and we have these kind of tools we might be able to open, even if there still were cases potentially being transmitted because we would have the tools to deal with that, and potentially mitigate it going forward. If, on the other hand, we haven't reached that point, if there's still lots of disease in the community and very little ability to detect who's infected or not, then I think it would be difficult to come back.

President Stanley:

So what is it going to look like in August or September? I don't know. And I think I would say most people around the country don't know. So what you're seeing is you're seeing people planning for multiple scenarios and I think that's what we need to do at Michigan State University. We need to plan for a scenario where we come back to something that's closer to what we're used to. We need to plan for a scenario where we come back completely online. And then we need to think about how we get to some area that may be between those two things, which I think is more likely, where there may be ways we can mitigate risk. Get rid of our classes of more than a hundred people in a room and have classes with 20 people in a room designed for 100, for example. And find ways to use social distancing more effectively in our laboratory for instance, to allow people to come back for that.

President Stanley:

So I could imagine a way in which we'd be adjusting these things, but everything has to be done based on safety and health. It's not a question of volition, it's not a question of what's the best way to teach. It's a question first of all, of making sure that we're keeping you and everyone else safe as we go through this forward. And so I think that's the most important thing that we're looking at.

President Stanley:

So I've been in close contact with my colleagues at Michigan State, at Wayne State and some of the big 10 institutions as well, and trying to get best practices that people were thinking about for how we would come back in the fall. So, we're going to make sure we're getting the wisdom of the collective in that. And I'm open to ideas and thoughts people have on this. And so I will be listening.

President Stanley:

We're going to set up a task force that is designed to have some people who are experts in some of these areas, so people from facilities, people from housing and so on to think about all these kinds of issues and public health, of course. And an epidemiologist from public health. But I'm welcome to think about ways in which we can get more input because I think it'll be helpful for us to have ideas on how

we do this. Nobody has all the answers at this point in time. If they tell you they do, I would look at them askance but I think this is a critically important question.

President Stanley:

But the other thing I'll say is, the more time we have to study and the more time we have to get reagents and other things assembled, the better chances we have of getting closer and closer to normalcy. So if we were to make a decision now and say we're going to come back for sure, or if we made it to now that says we're teaching online, we would take away a lot of freedom we have and we can potentially impact our enrollment going forward in ways that we don't want. So I think we really need to be careful about how we talk about it.

Deborah:

Thank you. We next have a question from Jill Slade and then we can go back to Dr. Buccello. (Silence) Do we have Jill Slade?

Jill Slade:

I'm sorry. I think I accidentally raised my hand, but I did have a comment. Given that international students make up a lot of the revenue base, I didn't know if there might be consideration of offering international students an online enrollment only, for at least the fall. If that has been discussed or if that might be something that could help us keep that important pool and diversity within Michigan State? And that's my comment.

Interim Provost Sullivan:

Thank you. That's a very valuable comment. And Steve Hanson, the Dean of International Studies and Programs, has been thinking along those very lines. There are some visa issues with having online courses aimed solely at international students. We'd have to work our way through those, but if it were a course that also had students in the United States enrolled, we would have less of an issue. We're also looking at the possibility of having some of our international partner universities host some of our entering students for a semester to give our students an opportunity to get visas and come into the country but not lose that time, still be able to take courses.

Interim Provost Sullivan:

So there are a couple of different options that are being looked at and we hope we're going to be able to find one that is satisfactory. At this time, however, U.S. embassies and consulates are still not even accepting appointments for visa interviews. So that makes it pretty much certain, I think, that at this time there won't be any visas granted in time for the fall semester and that's not just for MSU. That's for everybody. International students already here will be all right.

Deborah:

Thank you. And Dr. Buccello, did you have another question?

Dr Buccello:

I just wanted to just follow up real quick, and I appreciate and thank the provost and the president for their answers, and that there are a lot of unknowables that obviously we have no control over and a virus we don't have any control over. But what we do have some control...

PART 1 OF 4 ENDS [00:35:04]

Dr. Borcila:

... over and a virus we don't have any control but about what we do have some control over is that we move on this collectively. So my question was really a question about process. As these decisions are being made, they need to be made expeditiously, but also that faculty need to be engaged as these decisions are made, and also we do know a lot about what happens in the classroom spaces and what happened with these Zoom online transition so we can begin to articulate what it is that we might not in and ways in which other stakeholders in the institution might not. So I think it's really critical and crucial, even as decisions are made fast that faculty are engaged and that we think ahead of how that's going to happen. Thank you.

President Stanley:

I certainly agree that getting input on what's been working, what's not been working, how we optimize online if we need to do it is going to be really important. So I think you'll get no argument from me [inaudible 00:36:07] try and do this as well as we can. again, creativity in some of the options and how we might teach safely in other ways, I think is going to be more than welcome. We certainly will work to find ways for faculty to get that input into the process. I will say, to state the obvious, that when it comes to an issue of public health and safety, that ultimately resides with me and I won't abdicate that responsibility. We won't be a democracy from that point of view, but I think everybody recognizes the importance of that in terms of those kinds of decisions. But no, I think we need to have input and I think that's incredibly important.

Deborah:

Thank you. I think we can move on to all remarks from executive vice president for health sciences, Dr. Beauchamp.

Dr. Beauchamp:

Thank you very much. I have, I appreciate that much of what was talked about, President Stanley reflected on, or the provost, perhaps I'll share an aphorism [inaudible 00:37:09] characterizes a lot of the work by Desmond Tutu, which is, "We're each made for goodness, love and compassion. Our lives are transformed as much as the world is when we live with these truths." what I'm finding is I meet with health college deans and the dean of veterinary medicine. We meet daily and we continually are trying to confront the challenges that come and how do we serve our students, protect faculty and staff, and serve the community as the best ideas are mobilized from the colleges and leaders in the college and the transformative effect is really how this is bringing people together in rewarding ways to respond. It's been really inspirational.

Dr. Beauchamp:

A lot of effort, as was mentioned, to help our fourth year students reach their goal of trying to help. A lot of amazing work by the faculty because of the need for in-person, working with patients for training and yet having that vehicle not accessible to students to find ways to supplement their education so that we can continue to advance them towards their goal of being care providers. Then, the incredible mobilization of our research community as they've come up with new ways, whether to diagnose, or to treat patients.

Dr. Beauchamp:

So just similar comments but great appreciation to the staff and faculty of our community. I do think our path forward will be, as was mentioned, mobilizing the strengths across our campus. They're remarkable.

Deborah:

Thank you. Any questions for Dr. Beauchamp? Steven Gasteyer you have your hand up.

Steven Gasteyer:

Actually I was just noting Deborah, that there are a number of questions in Zoom that didn't get addressed, in the Zoom chat that didn't get addressed, and we may want to make sure that those folks are able to get their questions aired.

Deborah:

Okay, I did not see those. So I have a question from, I'm not sure if I can ... from Dr. [Ruvio 00:00:39:40], a question from a student and from a faculty member, the student asked about financial aid for graduate students that their tuition was covered by their working place and now it has been canceled and the faculty member asked about refunding some of the dorm costs. I'm not sure who would be answering that. I know that some of the dorm costs have been refunded. That's come up before.

Speaker 5:

Yes. So what's been refunded to students on a pro rata basis is their room and board if they were living in a residence hall, or if they'd bought a meal plan at the university and their parking for April, and if they had bought an intramural recreational sports pass, they could get a refund for that too. The other issue about tuition that was being paid by an employer who's now not paying it, I'm not familiar with this situation. I don't know who the student is or what school they're in, but that is a case of a changing financial circumstance and as a rule you can reapply for financial aid when there's been such a change. I hope that's helpful?

Deborah:

Thank you. A question from David Ewoldsen, "Will we have time to discuss the reappointment policy later?" I'm assuming he means the policy that you talked about?

Dave Ewoldsen:

The policy that we got the late email about and I believe there was a comment period later on. So I'll make my comment then.

Deborah:

Okay, thank you. Robert [O'Foley 00:41:30] has a question for the president.

Robert O'Foley:

Thank you. Thank you, Deborah. So I really enjoyed both of the updates we got from the president and also from Provost Sullivan. President, I know that we have a lot of really, really good people here on campus and they are doing a lot of things here in the US but I also remember a little comment from CNN

earlier today that the number of ventilators in some foreign countries don't even add up to ventilators one of our hospitals here in the US. So I was hoping that I could ask you if you have any information to give us a little bit of an update, not only on what our beautiful faculty are doing here on campus and in the US, but if we have faculty members who are in remote locations who are also working really hard to make sure that people are helped through this really, really unfortunate situation that we are dealing with now.

President Stanley:

So Robert, that's a great question and I don't have at the tip of my fingertips. I think details on that kind of information. I think you know, most of our faculty and graduate students who were working abroad as part of our policies were kind of called back to come. But we do have a number who stayed, some in Africa for example, in Malawi who continue important work they're doing in malaria research and so on. So I think there are people who are continuing their work that are over, we called many people back. I think probably something that would be really worth looking at of course is our alums over there. We've trained number of individuals at Michigan State University who've gone on to a number of countries around the world and make a difference.

President Stanley:

I think so one of the things we're working on is trying to compile, and I've been talking to our alumni association about this, is trying to compile the ways in which MSU alumni are making a difference both in our country and around the world. So hopefully we'll have some better news on that. But I don't have other particular details at this point in time, but I appreciate the question.

Robert O'Foley:

Thank you, I appreciate that.

President Stanley:

Sure.

Deborah:

Thank you. And another question from [Kin Sing Lee 00:00:43:57]. "Thank you very much for all the updates to the work and leadership from both president and provost. I have a question from several faculty regarding the new international graduate students. Because the visa application has been stalled, if by fall the new international graduate students cannot get a visa and arrive by MSU at the beginning of fall, what will be the plan for those students as well as the support for those new graduate students? In addition, when the rule is lifted, is it going to be a stepwise approach to let people come back to campus?"

President Stanley:

So maybe I'll let the provost talk about the visa application for graduate students and she may be a little more in touch than I am on that. I'll go to the second question, which is certainly, that's one of the things we're looking at and as we think about again, how one comes back to campus, that we might not be able to do everything all at once and there might be ... For example, the research enterprise might be one where it's easier to adjust to new rules and regulations again with social distancing and so on to that

might be an area where we could do it. We've talked before about laboratories and the need to provide those kinds of courses, which may have been more challenging in the past.

President Stanley:

So again, I think those are areas where we may develop techniques. So I think there would be ... My guess is there might be a stepwise approach to what happens, but again, everything will be dictated I think, by what's happening in the field at that point in time. So I don't want to make any promises, but I think there probably would be some type of stepwise approach to coming back.

Speaker 5:

So with respect to international graduate students, we know we've got maybe 43 who've been admitted for this fall. These are not graduate students, but they're undergraduate students who are currently going to high school in the United States. So they're already in the United States. If they stay in the United States, they don't have to worry about a visa. Similarly, there's probably some number of graduate students, although I don't know how many, who did undergraduate work in the United States and so they're already here. So they've already got a student visa and that's much less of a problem.

Speaker 5:

What we don't know is what the timetable would be for them getting visas in whatever country they're located in. And that's not, well it's maybe partly a public health matter, but it's a political matter as much as anything. It's when the US government decides to start issuing student visas again and I can't predict when that's likely to happen. My advice to a graduate program would be if you made a commitment to an international student, try and honor that commitment whenever they can get here and don't pull their assistantship just because they couldn't get here for the beginning of the fall semester. But that's the best advice I can give right now because there's a lot of uncertainty about what's going to happen with our international students.

Deborah:

Thank you. The other thing is from Dr. Jennifer Johnson to everyone just talking about international efforts and how they can access some information. Okay, onto my remarks. This is the final faculty senate meeting of the year and it's my final meeting as chair, although I will be chair until August 16th. I want to say that it's been an honor and a privilege to serve as chair of this committee and I also want to congratulate Jennifer Johnson who will be the chair next year and Anna Pegler-Gordon who will be the vice chair. I want to start off by talking about some things that happened at the steering committee this week. Actions that were taken. There was a resolution from COGS, from the council of graduate students, regarding including DEI in the promotion tenure, and tenure and annual faculty reports that has been sent to a subcommittee of UCFT, which is the university committee on faculty tenure and UCF, a university committee on faculty affairs.

Deborah:

We are following up on retirement options. The committee is still meeting to consider these options. Impacts of block tuition was brought to the steering committee and has been raised by Steven Gasteyer and has been referred to UCUE, university committee on undergraduate education. Another thing that came up was the missed classes for athletes, this was a report from UCF and UCUE. They have come up with a statement which will be included in the faculty handbook and you're welcome to read it when it

is in the faculty handbook, which will be very soon. I could read it to you now, but it's modeled after the religious observance policy.

Deborah:

The other thing I wanted to report on is the search status for the secretary for academic governance position. Terry Curry has forwarded to human resources the job description and we have a search committee and the search committee will consist of me as the president chair, Jennifer Johnson as the chair for next year. Martin Crimp, Lawrence Martin and [Ran Spiro 00:14:17]. I think we have a very good committee. I think we have a very good job description, I think, and hopefully things can move forward very quickly.

Deborah:

The at-large members of the steering committee met with President Stanley, Provost Sullivan and Provost Beauchamp. At that meeting we talked about online teaching, which is on the agenda today and we talked about the difficulties of online teaching in certain specific areas. I can tell you that teaching piano one of them. So we discussed areas that are not sustainable for online teaching if stay-in-place continues and what kinds of things can happen. As I say, that's on the agenda today. The other thing that we talked about that actually, both President Stanley, Provost Sullivan and Provost Beauchamp talked about the fact that the administration is seeking faculty expertise and input in the areas of budget, international students, mental health and reinforcing a culture of safety for all.

Deborah:

President Stanley talked about the town hall. I encourage people to be part of that and we have a huge reservoir of expertise in our faculty. Lots of times in the past we've been in a position where we get outside consultants and the three people that I mentioned are particularly interested in getting faculty expertise. So if you have expertise in these areas, then please be in touch with President Stanley, with Provost Sullivan, with Executive Vice President Beauchamp because this is something where the faculty can be incredibly valuable. That concludes my comments, unless someone from the steering committee can remind me of something that I didn't say, didn't report on.

Dr. Marcy McTell:

Can we thank you for your service?

Deborah:

Oh, thank you. Yes you can. Thank you very much. Thanks. Okay, onto new business. Let's start with the university committee on curriculum report. Dr. [Marcy McTell 00:16:36].

Dr. Marcy McTell:

Hi Marcy McTell, college of nursing. So UCC continues to have a busy agenda. We met on March 26 and approved the following. For new programs, there's one a graduate certificate in human medical research that's going to be effective summer 2020, along with 29 program changes. For courses, we approved 33 new courses, 33 course changes and eight course deletions. There are no more [inaudible 00:52:07] to report at this time and no discontinuations. Any questions? Then I move to accept the report of UCC.

Deborah:

Is there a second?

Robert O'Foley:

Seconded.

Deborah:

Is there discussion? All in favor? Raise your hands. Got to find the raise hand thing again. Opposed? Motion carries. Thank you, Dr McTell. Next is the faculty salary recommendation. This comes from the university committee on faculty affairs and this is Dr. Mick Fulton.

Dr. Mick Fulton:

Thank you. I would like to make a few comments before I bring this up. President Stanley, Provost Sullivan and Madam Chairperson, before bringing in the faculty raised memo to the senate floor for consideration, I wanted to provide some background information. At first glance, the ask of a 4% merit salary increase appears unfounded and inconsiderate of the current events and budgetary challenges that MSU is facing due to the COVID-19 and concern about state funding. It was extremely difficult this year to develop this memo and determine what was an appropriate ask to bring forth.

Dr. Mick Fulton:

Much discussion within the budget subcommittee of the university committee on faculty affairs centered around the unforeseen effects of COVID-19, the state economy, and the difficult decisions that must be made. It was finally decided that it was important to focus on long-term goal of having MSU faculty salary be located in the middle rather than the bottom of the big 10. The reason for this goal is to ensure that MSU hires and retains the best talent.

Dr. Mick Fulton:

Please note in the memo that it has been common practice to ask for more than what is actually received. From 2014-2015 budget through the 2018-2019 budget, the UCFA has recommended a 3% general merit raise once, a 4% general merit raise four times. In fact, the faculty received a 1.5% raise once, a 2% raise twice, and a 2.5% raise twice. In spite of recommending a 4% general merit raise for four budgets, faculty has never received greater than 2.5% general merit raise.

Dr. Mick Fulton:

Finally, the committee understands the budgetary difficulties facing the administration and respects the difficult decisions that must be made. However, the committee desires to be included in conversations about this subject. So I would like to bring the letter to the floor for consideration.

Deborah:

Thank you. This is an action item. So is that a motion to approve?

Dr. Mick Fulton:

Yes, it's a motion to approve the memo for the faculty raise.

Deborah:

Thank you. Is there a second?

Robert O'Foley:

Second.

Deborah:

Second, okay. Discussion. I'm not seeing any hands for discussion.

President Stanley:

Couple have come up.

Deborah:

Oh, I see. Okay. Dr. Nunes?

Dr. Filomena Nunes:

Hi. So I appreciate the work of the committee, but my question would be why this year of all years? Given the difficulties, why this year?

Dr. Mick Fulton:

The budget subcommittee of the university committee on faculty's affairs is required every year to come up with a raise letter. So this is one of the things we do routinely, it's a requirement, and so that's the reason why it was brought forward.

Dr. Filomena Nunes:

Sorry, perhaps I wasn't clear. Why would you suggest the 4% this year? I understand you do this every year, but given the situation and the financial difficulties that we're likely to see, why would the committee be pushing for this this particular year?

Dr. Mick Fulton:

Well, if you noticed they have asked for 4% for many years. In fact, they have never received that amount, so they're still trying to maintain ... or try to get the MSU faculty salaries to be in the middle rather than the bottom of the big 10. So that was again the reason why it was brought forward and done as a routine basis.

Deborah:

But I also comment on in reading the letter itself, there's a paragraph in the letter that states that this is not necessarily a consideration for this year, but could be considered for next year, for 2021. So I think that the university committee on faculty affairs was not assuming that they would be a 4% raise immediately, but thinking that this is something that should be put on the books as a consideration for the following year.

Dr. Mick Fulton:

Correct.

Dr. Filomena Nunes:

Okay, so the understanding is more just to make the point that this continues to be an important topic even if it can't be implemented this year?

Dr. Mick Fulton:

That is correct.

Deborah:

Yeah, that is my reading of the letter. The letter is a quite actually a ... It's what? A three or four page letter and it talks about the COVID-19 pandemic and is I think, very understanding of the situation that the university finds itself in at the moment. But also realizing that it is important, that as everyone has been saying, that the faculty be recognized and that this be put on the books as something to be considered in the future. I believe the letter is an attachment to the agenda?

Dr. Mick Fulton:

That's correct.

Deborah:

Dr. Johnson?

Dr. Jennifer Johnson:

So one thing that helped me in clarifying the letter, I think President [Ingler 00:58:53] set a two year budget so the salaries for next year are set unless they get changed. So the next year we would be looking at is two years out. I guess my question is, and this may not be an answerable question, but from what I can tell the history of MSU is that every year the faculty asked for a 4% or 5% raise. Every year, it's unclear that the administration pays any attention to it and things just happen the way they happen. So, I think one of the requests in a letter was more of a conversation and like I said, this may be a bigger question for a different day, but is there a better way than us just always saying 4% or 5%, the administration always just doing whatever it wants and no real conversation?

Deborah:

I think I can respond to that to some extent. The first thing is is that we have a very different administration now than we did before. So I think that is a significant thing to think about. In the past it has not always been ignored. There have been times when we have gotten that raise. I was on the budget subcommittee, I was chair of UCFA at one point and that was something that at that point in time, we were given the raise that we asked for. I'm not really sure ... I think the other thing that the letter articulate is that they would like to be engaged in a conversation about the raise before decisions are made. I think that's essentially what you're talking about, Jennifer, is just having a further conversation rather than submitting a water and then having other people do things?

Dr. Jennifer Johnson:

Or having it be an empty exercise. I don't want to be completely cynical, but the sort of cynical read on the history is that ...

Deborah:

Yep. I see Megan Donahue's hand.

Megan Donahue:

Yeah, I'm going to be blunt. I don't really like the cynical exercise. I mean, we all do fake political dances and I think that treating this letter as evidence that the faculty didn't blink and still ask for 5% raise in the face of one of the most traumatic episodes of our life is it's a little tone deaf. So I'm going to vote against it because I think it's bogus. It's not a conversation starter, it just doesn't acknowledge the severe situation we're in.

Deborah:

Thank you, thank you. Anna Pegler-Gordon.

Anna Pegler-Gordon:

I wanted to know that the letter also emphasizes the extraordinary amount of work that we have had to put in. I really appreciate the president and the provost acknowledgement of that work, but I think that ... and I understand again that there are significant financial impacts this year, but I also think that there have been significant exertions that individuals have been involved in to cope with this situation and also ... So I just think that's important to acknowledge and I agree with the comments about making this into more of a conversation and a discussion.

Anna Pegler-Gordon:

I also want to remind us of the conversation about this as not just a faculty issue, although it comes up as a faculty issue within faculty senate, but have this more global issue that we had when we were talking with Dave [Bilick 01:03:05] about the budget overall. I know that that conversation got interrupted but I think it's important for us to understand not only where the faculty salaries lie within the big 10 but also administration, are the increases for staff and administrators comparable to what's happening with faculty and just to sort of have this be yes, part of a conversation but also part of a larger conversation that just doesn't focus on this narrow slice of just faculty. Although that is what we're discussing and deciding here. Thank you.

Deborah:

Thank you. I see Filomena Nunes' hand.

Dr. Filomena Nunes:

Yeah. So I stopped short in my comments because I really want to be respectful to the work of the committee, but I have to say that I would like this group to take leadership exactly in the opposite direction. I think we're facing a huge crisis, the president presented some of the numbers that we're going to be seeing. It's possible that it's going to be even worse and we are pretty privileged in comparison was many people in the state. I would like to see the leadership in the opposite direction saying, "Yeah, we're okay with even taking a budget cut in our salary because that will affect us less than it will affect many of the people that are essentially without an income."

Dr. Filomena Nunes:

So I understand that this committee had a different purview in their work, but in our discussions, I want to make sure that we consider that 4% is not just tone deaf. It may just not be showing our true color.

Deborah:

Thank you. Another hand raised is Dave Ewoldsen.

Dave Ewoldsen:

I would echo what was just said as somebody who studies decision making and human cooperation, I think what we would want to do in this instance is to say we want zero raise this year, but we want a very strong commitment from President Stanley that in the future he will push hard for a raise that will make up for a year where there's ... I mean, that we're willing to sacrifice this year, maybe two years because of what's going on, whatever it takes, but then I expect it to reciprocate that behavior, a strong commitment on the part of the administration to push for higher raises to get us back towards the center of the big 10.

Deborah:

Thank you. And Dr. Borcila.

Dr. Borcila:

It's off. Okay. So I think that ... I mean I think we're dealing with a couple of different issues here and I think that for some of us maybe, the issue of not getting a raise for a couple of years depending on how much money we actually make might be less of an issue than for others and that we need to be mindful of the fact that there is a big salary differential between faculty at different ranks and across the university and between tenured and untenured and so forth. So that's one issue. We are all in the same boat within this institution and yet we are not really all paid in a way that's actually comparable. So that, I think is really important. I also think that many faculty and staff, but we're just talking about faculty here, has been working, like other people day and night, and that they are also impacted, particularly those of us who make less money but also those of us who are close to retirement, by the financial hits that our retirement plans are taking as well as by the fact those of us who are at the beginning of the career based on their discipline are making less money, by other aspects as well.

Dr. Borcila:

So, while I understand that it is very important that we appear and that we are concerned about our community and our students, issues of faculty salary are about how budget is prioritized as well. I think that it's really important that the institution acknowledges also economically the work that faculty are doing and also that we are included in terms of what is prioritized within the budget. I don't think our students are the ones who need to have this ... that they need to be at the receiving end of this and that we should think about budget distribution, but also about acknowledging the impact of the economy on individual people who work in this institution, faculty and staff alike. Thank you.

Deborah:

Thank you. And Tyler Silvestri.

Tyler Silvestri:

Dr. Fulton, just a quick question. I noted in the reports one of the justifications for the proposed increase was the interest of remaining competitive and keeping leading researchers. I'm curious if the committee looked at if other big 10 institutions have done something similar in their increases this year. Is that a data point we have at this point?

Dr. Mick Fulton:

Excuse me, that was information we did not have but if you look in the memo, you'll see where we've ranked in the last few years among the big 10. The smallest group were those that were assistant and associate professors and so again, it's an ask. It was very difficult. We knew if we asked for nothing, we would get nothing. We also knew that we had to represent the entire faculty and so what's the number you could put out there? We know it's a very difficult time. There's lots of budget issues. We would like to just be involved in the discussion, both now and in the future.

Deborah:

Thank you. And Daniel Gould.

Daniel Gould:

Yeah, thanks. I just, as a similar person said, I vote this down. I think it would be really ... the optics of this are terrible right now. I think faculty deserve to be paid more, but right now, given what's happened in our economy, I mean the president already said 48 to 60 million. No cap money's coming into the state. The Feds are bleeding money. The economic reality of this, the next couple of years are going to be pretty bleak. For us to come through and say, we ...

PART 2 OF 4 ENDS [01:10:04]

Speaker 6:

The years are going to be pretty bleak. For us to come through and say, we should be asking for money right now. I just think, what would that read in the local paper? From a political and the moral argument right now, I'm worried just about people losing their jobs and taking pay cuts. I've also attended a lot of the LEAD seminars the last couple of years where a lot of our administrators go, and it's not an us versus them. They're always complaining about not getting enough money to the faculty because we end up dropping in the big 10. But the discourse today is like, they're trying to screw us over. I've had the opposite experience. I think they're trying to get us more money. But right now I just am totally against this. I just think it's just a bad idea. Say, in the long term, we'd like more money. Right now we realize we're going through a financial hell for the next 18 months or two years, and we've got to batten down the hatches and support people the best we can.

Deborah:

Thank you. Open to discussion. Martin Crimp.

Martin Crimp:

There we go there. Deborah, I've had a question posted for quite a while in this discussion that hasn't been addressed, and that goes to, I'm curious if any consideration is given to what is the cost of living in East Lansing versus places like Ann Arbor, Evanston? I think we're probably similar to Iowa city and Lincoln and places like that. But if we don't consider cost of living, which I believe is relatively low here, it's somewhat disingenuous for us to just flat out compare ourselves to the rest of the big 10. And so I'd like to know if that's even on the radar when this memo was put together.

Nick:

This is Nick again. Yes, it was taken into consideration. That information is actually provided by David Byelick. And so yes, we did look at that and consider that.

Deborah:

I'm sorry Marty, I thought that yours was just a comment. I didn't realize it was a question that you wanted... So thank you.

Martin Crimp:

I would say that the memo does not indicate that this is taken into account when we're asking for raises. And so I think the memo in the very [inaudible 01:12:32] should address that in the future.

Nick:

Duly noted.

Deborah:

Anybody else with comments that they wish to be read? Or questions? Discussion? Are we ready to call the question. All right. I'm calling the question. So Greg has a poll ready to go. And Greg, you want us to raise our hands for the poll?

Greg:

Only because I believe that maybe this may be a contentious vote here and it may be close, that it would be easier for us if we do a poll like we did for university council this week. I have that all set and ready to go.

Deborah:

Okay, super.

Greg:

So just let me know when you want to launch the polling and I'll launch it.

Deborah:

Launch it right now. It would be great. And only faculty senate members vote. Only the voting members of faculty senate vote.

Greg:

I'm going to plan on leaving this open for 90 seconds. So we're 20 seconds through right now.

Deborah:

Okay.

Greg:

15 seconds remain.

Greg:

And here are the results.

Deborah:

So this does not pass. We have 66% against and 22% for. 12% abstain. So I would assume from that, that that means that there is no faculty salary recommendation from the faculty senate.

Deborah:

Okay. Next we have the strategic planning committee moving forward. Dr. Johnson.

Dr. Johnson:

I was just so interested in the faculty salary issue. So, the strategic planning steering committee has kept meeting. We had a lot of engagement sessions planned for the spring, all of which got canceled. As a matter of fact, I think the strategic planning committee and the DEI committee were going to meet with faculty senate within the week or 10 days of when we all needed to stay at home. So, what the strategic planning steering committee has decided to do is do as much online as we can for now. Some of that will have to be done in person in the fall. We're still very committed to getting input, gathering as many perspectives as we can and using online. Personally, I think there are good things about in-person conversations. Online may help reflective people or quiet people.

Dr. Johnson:

So I don't think it's all bad. That being said, there's an opportunity for the faculty, staff, students, alumni, community partners, whoever, to contribute online to this discussion about our values, the values that will guide Michigan State University going forward. So I wanted to call your attention to it. It's in the agenda and the appendix. Please respond to it. Please have your colleagues respond to it. Make sure that they know about it because the values piece of it closes April 30th. So we both really genuinely authentically want feedback from as many people as possible. And that is real. So, like I said, anyone you talk to in the MSU community staff, we'd love to have their input on this. But also to bring it to your attention that this really is for the spring, at least, an explicit reach out to the faculty senate to have input.

Dr. Johnson:

So your feedback is being sought, but it's being sought in this online way. So please respond and please know that we are seeking faculty input and everyone else's input. So thank you.

Deborah:

Thank you. So this is attachment G on the agenda. And if you don't have the agenda in front of you right now, you can just go on the website to academic governance. Click on faculty senate agenda and this will be attachment G.

Dr. Johnson:

And to add to it, to put a little bit of a finer point on it, we really do authentically want the feedback. By putting this on the agenda, by bringing it forward, I also don't want anybody to think that they were not included in the process. This is the best we can do at the moment.

Deborah:

Thank you very much. Okay. And then we have online learning with Jeff Grable.

Jeff Grable:

Hi. I'm here.

Deborah:

Oh, there you are. Hello.

Jeff Grable:

I am. Hi. How are you?

Deborah:

Doing fine. Thank you for being here.

Jeff Grable:

Happy to. So, there's a lot in that bucket, particularly now. So Deborah, what's the particular request from this committee for me to address?

Deborah:

Well, I think the original request was the online graduate learning. And the other request was just to facilitate a discussion. We've had a lot of discussions about online learning, and it keeps coming up that it is completely different from one area to the next. That for some people the shoe may fit. And for other people the shoe is an apple that doesn't go on your foot at all. That there are certain places where it works and certain places where it doesn't work. And just starting a discussion about that and what kinds of things can be done to facilitate it for the people where it doesn't work and what can be done to make it even better for the people where it does work.

Jeff Grable:

Perfect. So let me walk you through the strategic conversations as they've existed on this campus for the last 18 to 24 months, and then I'll pause to see what sorts of questions people might have about the present moment, because those are two distinct areas. When I started the position that I'm in, one of the asks of me was to facilitate conversations on campus that might move the institution towards a strategy with regard to online education, which we haven't had previously. And to be perfectly frank, we don't have today. So the hub was the facilitation function for that. And, what we ended up with... And I can walk you through it in detail in terms of our engagement with people's expertise on campus and certainly with different stakeholder groups was a draft framework for what a strategy might look like for MSU as MSU existed and as MSU was led roughly a year ago.

Jeff Grable:

And that framework focused on post-baccalaureate online education, which the previous administration had drawn a line with regard to online programs at the undergraduate level and online programs in the post-baccalaureate space. So one was viable, post-baccalaureate, and one was off the table. So at the moment in which we had significant executive leadership transition, that draft framework was ready for even more substantial conversations with campus about who we are as an institution with regard to online education. And frankly, the related question of why do online education if you're Michigan State

University, which is a question we still need to answer as we move. Since President Stanley has arrived, he has made this question of online strategy and our identity as an institution with regard to online education, part of the strategic planning process. So it is a question that is actively being taken up as part of that process.

Jeff Grable:

So, that is the short version of where we exist now. We've done a great deal of thinking as a campus about who we might become as an institution with regard to online education. That conversation again has focused exclusively on post-baccalaureate online program, but the present moment has forced a lot of people's hands. You guys all have experiences with, if not precisely with online education, you have some experiences with some pretty abrupt remote learning. And the strategic planning process itself has put a number of questions on the table about our institutional identity. I'm happy to entertain questions about process and where we are with regard to the prior work on the online program framework and where the strategic planning committee is currently with this issue. And of course I'm happy to entertain questions that you all have about what's been happening on campus over the last six weeks, which has been some version of extraordinary.

Deborah:

I have a question from Steven Gasteyer.

Steven Gasteyer:

I'm actually part of a chorus of people who raised hands actually connected to the last conversation. Concerned that we didn't quite finish that conversation about the budget. We were asked for an up or down vote. And I think a number of people would like us to think about what we might do with a down vote.

Deborah:

I think we can maybe go back to that if that seems like something that we would like to do. But for right now, do we have questions for an online education? We can go back to that when we get to comments from the floor. I have Filomena Nunes.

Filomena Nunes:

It's the same topic.

Deborah:

Okay. Sandra Logan.

Sandra Logan:

Sorry I was taking a note. Same topic and I had one to follow up on the strategic planning conversation as well.

Deborah:

Okay. So that comes from when we do comments from the floor.

Deborah:

Jennifer Johnson.

Jennifer Johnson:

Yes. And I think part of our goal in inviting Dr. Grable... Thanks for coming... Is to see if there's any feedback from the faculty quickly about what is working really well and if there are things that aren't working really well. So I don't know if there is burning feedback anyone has, but that was part of our goal.

Jeff Grable:

That's a great question. And the honest and simple answer is, we don't have great feedback at present. We built a lot of architecture to facilitate this. But some of the architecture we didn't build was getting really good feedback loops from faculty and students. So what I know, I know anecdotally from the work that we've done with faculty, individually and in small groups, and feedback that we've gotten from my colleagues in colleges that were working on more intently with their colleagues in those colleges. And I would characterize it as, we have the full range of expression right now on the pivot to remote instruction. I think we have some colleagues who have truly struggled for all sorts of reasons, which are completely reasonable, to make this pivot to remote instruction in a way that they feel comfortable, in a way that they've been able to execute with some fidelity. And we've had some people who've done it elegantly and quickly. And we have everything in between.

Jeff Grable:

The feedback that we have from students has been reasonably positive. I think that the students recognize that faculty have made by and large their best efforts to be caring and be attentive and to meet their needs and that this is an extraordinary circumstance. So I'll be honest with you, I'm pretty modest with regard to where I set the bar. I think we've done about as well as any large university has done with this pivot. But I wish we had more time and I wish we had done it better and I wish we had more support for people at the present moment.

Jennifer Johnson:

And I partly meant from the faculty senators if there's anything they wanted to let you know about what's working or not working.

Jane Bunnell:

Jane Bunnell here. I think that one of the greatest frustrations... Of course, it's tough with music... But I think the inequity in what the students have available to them has really made it a challenge because it's easy to say, let's all Zoom. But if their internet isn't up to the capability of Zoom, or they don't have Skype, it's really, just as the virus has exposed great inequities, it has exposed us to that too. Just so you know, I called the provost office at the beginning when one of my students was having great difficulty, and I got great response and compassion and the guide that you could go to eduroam if you're in Detroit. We have access. MSU pays for Wayne State. Use the hotspots at Wayne State. But if you don't have a car, and if you can't get to Wayne State, you can't get to the hotspots. So it seems to me that if we're heading in this direction, we have to find a way to provide equity to the people that we're trying to teach.

Deborah:

Thank you. So if you raise your hand using the raise hand function, then we get everybody in order in which they are asking questions. So next on the list was Anna Pegler-Gordon.

Anna Pegler-Gordon:

Yes. So I had a couple of questions, then comment. You mentioned, Jeff, the difference between online and remote learning and my understanding is what we're doing to a large extent right now is remote. I wondered if you might just expand more on those distinctions. Partly, I'm asking that because I noticed in the supplementary SIRS forms, we actually use the term online for what we're doing at the moment. And I'm not sure if we want to look at that and change that. I wanted to comment on that, but I think maybe I should have done it after the provost's comments because I didn't realize that we hadn't had that discussion yet.

Anna Pegler-Gordon:

There's a question that we don't currently have, which relates to what Jane was just saying. I think we need to ask for that supplementary SIRS form. Do you live in a household with reliable internet? I know not just in Detroit, but also I have had students in the UP who've had to drive 40 minutes to a library to park outside the library for six hours a day to take their classes so that they could do their work with their siblings in the car and sometimes a dog. That's also a big issue with the reliable internet. And I know it asks about urban versus rural, but I think that just reliable internet, we need to understand that. On the remote learning, typically, I think when we're asking about SIRS we have an assumption that the education is going to be excellent.

Anna Pegler-Gordon:

And in that supplementary series it asks has there been a kind of negative impact? And in some ways, even though I know that we're all doing our very best, I would hope in a way that there has been a negative impact because otherwise that doesn't say a lot about my classes when I'm in the classroom because my expectation is they're a lot better. So the first question was about online versus remote. And then my last question is also about, in terms of the online part, which you were talking about, the longterm strategic planning, what is the mechanism for faculty input there, given that's a curricular issue in part? And faculty are obviously responsible for the curriculum. So those were my sort of two parts. One is the short term question, and one is the long term. Thank you.

Jeff Grable:

I'll give it a shot. The simplest way to think about what remote means... What we've done with remote and what remote is intended to signify is that most faculty members have tried to replicate and reproduce what they do in a face to face, physical learning environment to online. That is not desirable necessarily, and that tends to result in students having to sit in a parking lot for four to six hours to attend four to six hours of lectures. We would never do that to students if we were designing intentionally around their needs and around them with regard to an explicit and intentional online environment. So I think that's the simplest way to explain it, that online is intentionally designed around student needs, student expectation with a clear understanding that students are learning online and not necessarily co-located at the same time and space.

Jeff Grable:

And so we would probably have much more of what we would think of as asynchronous learning experiences for students. And what we've done with this remote pivot is we've largely replicated the

classroom experience online. And I think most faculty have understood that to be what they're capable of doing in a short period of time. And also implicitly they understand that to be the way it's supposed to work. But it's probably not the best thing that we could do for students if we were designing more intentionally. We just didn't have the time to design more intentionally. So hopefully that's useful for everyone in terms of simple explanation of the difference. I have lost your second question. I apologize. Can you ask that again? Forgive me.

Anna Pegler-Gordon:

That was about the longterm discussion that you had originally planned to talk about. You were discussing how we're thinking about as a campus who we might become and what role online learning plays in that. And I was just wondering how we're going to structure that discussion so the faculty are essentially involved in that curricular discussion.

Jeff Grable:

So from my perspective that was never going to be structured in any other way. I don't think we're imagining any campus strategy with regard to online learning that doesn't understand that faculty on the curriculum and need to continue to do that.

Sam:

This is Sam. Back to Jennifer's comments, this is one of the areas where we do think that there might be a working group created in strategic planning. And again, that's why we would want the opportunity to get input in, just for that reason. I think as Jeff said, this has driven home both potential benefits when you need them of online and not the remote things we're doing. But where we've had online courses, that's been very powerful. So it's benefits. But also we're realizing some of the shortcomings and some of the challenges associated with it. So I think the opportunity to have a more robust discussion on this is going to be critically important to us. But there are some advantages in certain kinds of classes, I believe, and we can have a debate about that. But I believe in certain kinds of classes there are already advantages to online, particularly with AI components to it and core courses like statistics and things like that and others can be very powerful.

Sam:

So how we use those to educate more people, if we will, or to educate the number of people we have better and more effectively. I think those are important issues we need to talk about. And again, of course faculty need to be engaged in that. And again, we're excited for people to get engaged in the summer, where you might have the opportunity to really design an online course that really did reflect maybe some of your talents in the classroom, because we may need it. Again, I'll put a plug in for what the provost is doing with Jeff's help and a number of other people's help, is to really develop some courses over the summer that might do a better job of conveying some of our strengths.

Deborah:

Thank you. The next question is from Alyssa Dunn.

Alyssa Dunn:

Thank you. Hi everyone. My question is about Zoom, which we are obviously on right now, and I've really appreciated the provost's emails and all of the things that we, as a university, are attempting to do

to protect ourselves and our students from some of the things, the security issues that are related to Zoom. And yet, just yesterday, my doctoral student was in a workshop that got Zoom bombed, and pornography was broadcast to everybody in the workshop. Even with the password, even with the waiting room, even following all of the recommendations that have come out. So my question is on behalf of my students about what else the university is doing, or can do, and if there are any other potential platform moves that we can expect that are more secure and safe.

Jeff Grable:

Alyssa, thank you for bringing that to my attention. Can you follow up with me and make sure that we can run this down? If our existing security protocols were in place, and they didn't work, then we need to know that immediately. We will follow up with you both with regard to the technology, and we'll also make sure we follow up with you and your students with regard to the experience. That is not acceptable. One of the things that this moment has also made visible to us is, we've pushed the limits of technologies. We've pushed the limits to what human beings will do with the core technologies that we use as a campus. And we've learned a great deal about how they work, and we learned a great deal about what sorts of security and professional development we need to arrange around those technologies. So trust me, we're revisiting these issues all the time, and once we have a chance to take a deep breath, we'll probably revisit all of our vendor relationships, take look at those contracts and make sure that they are doing what they need to do for the institution.

Deborah:

Thank you. Next question is from Steven Gasteyer.

Deborah:

Steve, you're muted.

Steven Gasteyer:

I've had some conversations with folks over at Student Services about students disappearing as we move into the online world. It is related to Anna's question about the difficulty of students getting to technology. I'm wondering, Jeff, the extent to which you all have been interfacing with the parts of the campus who are trying to work with those students who are underrepresented and would be prone to disappear and figuring out ways to get them online. I will note that I did reach out specifically to one of those students who had disappeared and discovered that she was trying to do everything through her Android, and therefore wasn't able to get into class very well. And we were able to scramble around and get her a computer. And I raised a little arm of victory today because she turned in the first draft of her final paper just this morning. So she's clearly in the loop now, which was a victory. But to what extent are you trying to systematically address this, especially for low income students?

Jeff Grable:

That's a great question. And the short answer is we're doing everything in our power to systematically address these issues for those students who need our help. The provost's office is communicating very tightly on these issues. So Academic and Student Affairs are routinely in communication. The team that we stood up to facilitate that pivot to remote instruction for faculty and for students is composed of people that work for me, a group of people from IT and appropriate professionals in colleges. And in building a team that way, we've been able to really shorten the communication loops and be able to provide resources to students pretty quickly. I'm want to call attention to the associate deans in your

colleges who deserve some hugs when this is over because at the level of student need, they've been on point.

Jeff Grable:

And so our ability to provision hotspots and computers to the students, we've exhausted our supplies. We went to salvage and took every single computer that was on the shelf and tried to re-jigger it and repurpose it. We pushed on the supply chain as hard as we could push it to get computers to students that we had to buy on the fly. So, rest assured that from faculty members reaching out like you did Steven, which is the most efficacious and loving thing that could happen. So thank you for doing that. To associate deans in colleges, to IT, to everybody working on this. We bent over backwards and did everything in our power to make sure that every student we were aware of got what she needed to do her work. And even there, as people have noted, this pandemic has exposed access issues and inequalities, and, at some level, there were some things we probably weren't able to do.

Deborah:

Okay. Thank you. Next we have Lisa Lapidus.

Lisa Lapidus:

Hi. I want to say personally that my experience going online has been better than I expected. But I want to note that the entire College of Natural Science has made a lot of noise and has been pretty vocal about the issues of cheating. We just can't give an exam where we think that people have actually followed the honor code and not looked up their answers online. Even when we've tried to make efforts where the answers couldn't be online, they've shown up online. And I'm rather frustrated with the lack of best practices that we didn't get. I know there are no good options out there, particularly for things involving math because if you don't want a multiple choice question and you can't write an essay, there are not a lot of good options. But there should be more guidance given to the faculty before exams start of what we should be telling the students and what we should do if we know cheating has happened. It's just impossible, to get rid of, and if we can't solve this problem by the fall, we don't have a way to test our students.

Jeff Grable:

Lisa, thank you for that. I think that you named a really hard problem, and we did our very best to stand up resources on a dime to support faculty and rethinking how they might approach exams. We had office hours for faculty to drop in with some people, some expertise. We ran online sessions available to faculty just on the subject matter of assessment and exam design. My forward looking response to you on that is that this is something that we address with really good learning design and really good pedagogical practice. And so I think this is a problem that is solvable, actually, and there are lots of places that do really high quality online education in the mathematics and natural sciences in which they solve for this with really good design and we can deal with it. So I see this fundamentally as a design and pedagogical problem not [inaudible 01:42:45]

Jeff Grable:

I agree with you. I think this is something that we need to work on this summer so that we're prepared for this issue this summer, but we're also prepared for it throughout the entirety of next year in case this is something that we need to move to again. So I do think this is a solvable problem. It's going to take some real intentional work on the part of faculty to design experiences that are appropriate for this

particular problem. But also rethinking some of how we design exams and some of our implementation practices. So I'm confident we can deal with it. It's going to take some work. I agree with you, Lisa, it's a real issue.

Deborah:

Okay. We've got two more questions, and then I want to move to comments from the floor so that we can get back to the other issue. The next one is Richard Miksicek.

Richard Miksicek. :

Yeah, I just wanted to reemphasize the point here that we're doing a huge collective experiment campus-wide, lots of different experiences with a remote asynchronous and online teaching here. If we don't already have it, I hope we are developing a mechanism that is designed to effectively collect those collective experiences and identify best practices, what works and how we can move forward.

Jeff Grable:

Yeah, I appreciate that, Richard. We are. We're doing precisely that. You're right, we've had an interesting institutional moment that's put a tremendous amount of pressure on everyone, and we're trying very diligently to live and learn from that so that we're more elegant in the future.

Deborah:

Thank you. Next is Martin Crimp.

Martin Crimp:

Yes. I teach our senior design course, which requires me to have meetings with small groups on a regular basis with these students. I've had three students who are in the process of going back to China and have to be in quarantine when they get there, and they have a lot of internet issues with that. And I'm not sure what it will be like when they leave quarantine. They have all suggested that the Chinese government slows down the use of Zoom and Skype and things like that and would like me to have discussions with them using the WeChat video.

PART 3 OF 4 ENDS [01:45:04]

Speaker 14:

... have discussions with them using the WeChat video. But what I read about WeChat is it is not secure at all period, but second of all, it often contains malware. So where is the line between trying to accommodate our students and putting ourselves and possibly our networks at risk to try to accommodate these students? And do we have a university level statement on this?

Jeff:

That's a great question. I'm hoping that you'll follow up with me on that after this session because we have given a great deal of thought to that. And one of the reasons why we were trying to encourage international students stay in the country was, that was the only way that we could guarantee that they could access our core learning technology.

Jeff:

I think Zoom is more than slowed down in China. I'm pretty sure it's locked. And so I do know from my home department writing rhetoric American cultures that we've been teaching online courses, online writing courses with students substantially in China. And we actually do successfully use a mix of platforms that are accessible to Chinese students.

Jeff:

So this is also a solvable problem, but it requires to be thoughtful about which technologies would we recommend doing our due diligence on those technologies and trying to make really thoughtful decisions about safety, security and access for our international students.

Jeff:

But the larger question of how we meet the needs of students as they're distributed around the world is a really complicated problem for MSU in particular because we don't really think about it systematically. So this is the first time in this institution's life in which we've had to come up with systemic answers to questions, because it's a concern that the entire campus now has.

Jeff:

So please follow up with me so that we can understand your specific needs and make sure we get you good answers. But I agree with you, we need to have very visible public answers to the questions like this with the campus.

Deborah:

Thank you very much, Jeff. I just want to say that when you get feedback from the faculty as to how this is working, I hope that you don't neglect the college of music because it is virtually impossible to teach the piano on Zoom.

Jeff:

No. Debra, I'm actually trying very hard to ignore the college of music on this question because you're too darn hard to deal with. But yeah, I hear you.

Deborah:

Okay, thank you very much.

Jeff:

Yeah, you're welcome. Thank you everyone.

Deborah:

So we have comments from the floor and I think we want to get back, so please raise your hand if you would like to make a comment. I have a long comment from Juliet Guzzeta. I don't know if she would like to. I bet Philomena is that a new one? Philomena? Yes.

Philomena:

Well it's basically the comment that I wanted to do before, but we were discussing the online.

Deborah:

Right? I have hands raised that I think are raised from the previous discussion, so I'm going to move down starting with Philomena. So I have Philomena, then Andaluna Borcila, then Sandra Logan. So Philomena, go ahead.

Philomena:

So if you look at situations where there's major financial crises and you look at what universities have done in those cases, it involves getting rid of fixed faculty, it involves furloughs, it involves a lot of measures that are very different than a 4% raise. So in other words, requesting a 4% raise to me just shows if we as faculty understand the committee did what it was supposed to do, but we as faculty now, we have the data already that we are going to have a serious financial crisis.

Philomena:

So I'm of the opinion that we can't ignore this and go with the number. And that's why I think the majority of the people voted against this, not because we don't value their work and we didn't value their careful crafting of the memo, but that now we have this information that makes it very unlikely that this could even be considered at all, because the consideration will be how to make ends meet in the situation of a financial crisis.

Philomena:

So that's why I think that we voted what we voted. However, we value the committee and the committee could probably now go back and come up with a different memo that represents the current circumstances and that takes into account the discussion we had today. So I think that no recommendation at all may not also be the best solution to the problem. Perhaps a mute recommendation on this year, taking into account the difficulties and the fact that whatever the president ultimately, is going to have to make ends meet.

Philomena:

He's going to have to balance the books in some way. And I am sure that it's not going to be easy, right? There's going to be cuts and I'm sure between him and the deans and the provost, there's already some conversations in connection to that. So I know the president had to leave early, but the provost is still on. I assume that those conversations are not to be shared yet with the faculty, but my guess is these conversations are being had to already prepare for the financial difficulties.

Philomena:

So I think it makes more sense to just acknowledge that situation rather than make a request of 4% and just ask for a longterm commitment that will get us back on track when the times are better. That would be my suggestion.

Deborah:

Shall I go the next question or provost Sullivan, did you want to respond to that?

Provost Sullivan:

Well, I can certainly say a few things and I'm happy to do that. The position in my office has been that teaching and research is the core of the institution. That's what we have to preserve. And you don't

preserve that by mindless cutting and so on. So that's the reason you haven't heard any plans for that yet. The things we're planning to do have a moratorium on building buildings, for example, which means that longterm projects get put off instead of spending money on them.

Provost Sullivan:

So as we look to save money, we're not looking to save it off the backs of the faculty. I don't know how else to say it. It's not in our interest to do that. We work hard to recruit faculty here. We work hard to try and help the accomplishments of our faculty and to treat them well. Why would it be in the interest of the administration to do something that would deliberately hurt the faculty?

Provost Sullivan:

If I've been disappointed in anything in the faculty Senate this year, it's been a really strong we versus them that I hear from some people about the faculty and the administration. We're on the same team. There may be other teams that we consider ourselves in competition with, but we're working together, not against each other.

Deborah:

Thank you.

Philomena:

I actually don't mean to say that we're not, I'm just saying that understanding there may be financial difficulties that will impact everyone at MSU. Demanding 4% increase at this given time, clearly isn't what we want to do because we voted it down, but we may still want to have the committee go back and reconsider a memo that would reflect the discussion we had today.

Provost Sullivan:

Well, I don't disagree with your comment and certainly if you want to give the committee instructions, that's fine. I was making a more general comment about the tenor of conversation, which sometimes seems to me a little unfairly suspicious of the motives of the administration.

Deborah:

Thank you. Dr Borcila? You're muted.

Dr Borcila:

I want to try to keep it real short. Provost Sullivan, I appreciate your comment. We, the faculty at this institution, dealt with an administration that did not listen to us and that made mistakes that we're paying for, all of us now. And I think that the culture, we will need to work together for that suspicion that was founded in truth to change and to give way for to trust.

Dr Borcila:

And I understand you're in a very difficult position in which you've come here and made all of these attempts to change that. But the thing is, that's what you came here in. This is the context. And so I didn't intend to comment to that, but that's the context. And so we as faculty need to be more involved in governance at MSU, even when the situation is in crisis or particularly then.

Dr Borcila:

That's when basically even in the best of institutions that have a history of shared governance, that's when it disappears and we need to make sure that in this institution, that it does not have at least in the last 10 years, or 15, or 17, how far a history of shared governance, this shared governance starts happening.

Dr Borcila:

And so in terms of this point with the salary, no recommendation is not really a recommendation. I do want to draw attention to the fact that a number of people have expressed concern about faculty freezes. And again, to draw our attention to the fact that we don't all earn the same amount or even an amount within the same even range in this institution, and we're talking about some faculty and we're just talking about faculty or who may be our single household, one person earner, and have kids.

Dr Borcila:

We're talking about faculty that have multiple types of health conditions. We're talking about people that are near retirement. We're talking about faculty on different levels. Now there are unions that were present particular interest of some groups, but we need to be mindful of the fact that each one of us here might not be paying attention to this range of disparity, and while it might be way easier for some of us to say, "I don't need a raise," or, "I will make that gesture."

Dr Borcila:

And other people are commenting on this and so whatever goes back to the committee, I think that we need to be very aware of the fact that some of us are hurting and will because of the economy here.

Deborah:

Thank you. Sandra Logan?

Sandra Logan:

Here we go. Hi, thank you. I want to reiterate that and what I said earlier, which is that I don't think we want to put forward a no recommendation on the raise, but that as others have been saying, that letter needs to be revised with some of the comments in mind that have been made here today. I won't say anything additional. I think enough has been said about that, but I do have other comments about things that have happened since that was on the table. I would like to request an extension on input on the strategic plan.

Sandra Logan:

I think having this input by April 30th is an unnecessary burden on faculty who are already intensely overburdened trying to juggle and manage their online courses. So it would really be helpful I think for faculty to have an extension on that to possibly after grades are due. And I just think that would be really helpful. And I have a question about that as well, which is whether this invitation for input has gone out to all of the faculty in the college or whether we as representatives need to distribute that invitation on either take and put ourselves that we can pass on, or encourage faculty to participate in the actual meeting?

Sandra Logan:

And I have another question or two after that.

Speaker 15:

Yeah so I could answer the first two. I can speak from my position in the committee. I find it amazingly difficult to get out. It's essentially impossible unless you're the provost or the president to send an email to the entire university.

Speaker 15:

The DEI and strategic planning committee sent out an update. But for me at least, I need a really finer point. "Hey, click this, respond by this date." But there was pushback because they think there's too many university wide emails. So in my own position, not as a Dean or I don't own an email distribution list, all I can do is give it to people and encourage them to send it to as many people as possible.

Speaker 15:

You could send it to your Dean, ask them to send it out, but it's amazingly hard and this decision was made actually two weeks ago to do this. And so the fact that it's even taken two weeks to get this to you here. I guess my point is saying, use whatever influence you have to distribute it to whoever you can.

Speaker 15:

And I'm sorry, I don't have the access to the email list. The timing is an interesting issue. I can give that feedback back. Part of what happened is there were some people that said, "Okay, well we need to move on with the strategic plan." And then other people who said, "Well wait, we really don't have input yet. How are we going to get input?" And then some of us said, let's do it online. And they said, "Okay, but it can't go on forever."

Speaker 15:

So that was an internal sort of debate within the committee. But I will give back the feedback. I will send it to the chairs right now.

Sandra Logan:

Okay, great. Thank you very much.

Sandra Logan:

The next issue teaching online and since we now have a clear definition of the difference between remote teaching and teaching online, I think that we recognize that it takes significantly different kinds of planning and significantly different kinds of approaches to teach a legitimate online course versus simply attempting to do what you normally would do in a classroom in a remote context.

Sandra Logan:

That being the case, I think just to go back to the president Stanley's comments at the beginning of the meeting about the unpredictability of our situation on whether or not we will eventually have to make a decision about fall. I just want to say that the earlier we know that, the better so that faculty can actually effectively choose different approaches rather than simply being in a position of having to translate what they would've been doing in the classroom into an online context or the alternative,

which is to plan two completely different courses basically. One, in case you're teaching online and the other, if you're teaching in person.

Sandra Logan:

So just a thing to consider as this goes forward. And finally, I have comments on the online survey. There's some wording issues there and the way the questions are presented is kind of strange in certain ways. So I would really like to provide that feedback, but we didn't have an opportunity to talk about that survey. So let me know where I can send those comments. Thanks very much. That's it from me.

Deborah:

I believe you can send those directly to provost Sullivan. I think there was a committee that was working on that and she's amazingly fast at answering emails and very responsive. So I think if there's concerns, I would send them to her.

Sandra Logan:

Right. Thank you very much.

Deborah:

Michael Crimp. Sorry you're muted.

Michael Crimp:

I don't think my hand ever went down from my last question. I apologize.

Deborah:

All right. I'm seeing no other comments, but what I'm hearing is that the salary recommendation should go back to UCFA for a second version of the letter. And Nick, are you still there? Yes, I see you there.

Nick:

Yes I am.

Deborah:

Yes. Is that a possibility to reconvene the budget to Zoom in to the budget subcommittee and...

Nick:

We can do that. Based upon the discussion I heard today, we'll give money back till we need to ask for something. So I need to provide some guidance. As you can see, based upon the feedback from the Senate today, it's not an easy decision and that's exactly what the committee had found and we did not want to misrepresent the faculty and let them know and say that we're not going to take anything, but would something like we'd be willing to work with the administration to resolve this issue? Something like that work?

Deborah:

I think that that's probably as close as you're going to get to getting all of these diverse opinions together because there are many diverse opinions.

Nick:

Okay.

Deborah:

We've got a lot of people saying different things. So I think that having where we were talking before of having a discussion on a conversation with the administration and that was what you, I believe had asked for in your letter in any event...

Nick:

Exactly.

Deborah:

... was to have that, although in addition to saying that the 4% raise was sort of the aspirational goal, but that you would like to have a conversation realizing that that might not be possible. So maybe a letter that said what you just said essentially.

Nick:

Okay.

Deborah:

Should we make that a motion and see if people agree with that? I believe we still have a quorum. Do you want to make a motion, Nick? Is Greg still there? Can you get a poll together?

Michael Crimp:

Yeah. Stand by. It'll be a minute or so.

Deborah:

Okay. So Nick, could you make a motion?

Nick:

I'll make a motion that the budget subcommittee of the UCFA reconsiders the faculty raise memo to provost Sullivan to work with the provost and the president to determine appropriate salaries, salary increases based upon our current economic conditions. Is that good?

Deborah:

And Mike, we want to add to that because I heard several people say that there should be a commitment to the future.

Michael Crimp:

Sure. And a commitment to the future. I'll take that as a friendly amendment.

Deborah:

Okay. There was a second. Okay. Tyler, I see your hand? Yes.

Tyler:

Thanks. I would just, I guess question the appropriateness of sending it back to UCFA. They exercise their judgment and people are welcome to disagree with it. I do. But it strikes me that directing them to sort of write a report that reflects the will of this body makes less sense than simply passing a resolution through faculty Senate.

Tyler:

As I look at the bylaws, all UCFA is required to do is make a recommendation and report it annually to faculty Senate. If faculty Senate feels differently, faculty Senate could express it, but I'm just not convinced of the wisdom sending it back to them to tell them to get in line with what the faculty Senate wants, when we could just say that.

Deborah:

So your suggestion is that faculty Senate having not accepted the letter from UCFA would make a recommendation that the administration work with faculty Senate to make the appropriate, I forget what exactly the language was?

Tyler:

More or less. I mean, I would note that UCFA is obligated under the bylaws to work with the president in doing that. But we could pass our own resolution saying what we felt rather than directing them to make a statement reflecting our opinion.

Deborah:

Okay. So Mick, can I bring it back to you again? Would you be willing to withdraw your motion and in favor of a motion of something from faculty Senate?

Nick:

Most certainly. I'm willing to withdraw my motion.

Deborah:

Thank you. So would someone like to make a motion to the effect of what Mick just said, except it comes from faculty Senate? Steven?

Steven:

What's being bandied about in the chat expresses my concern with that it's not actually clear to me if we make a recommendation what we're calling for. Are we then going to form a sub committee of the faculty Senate to work with the administration on what should happen with the budget?

Steven:

Are we simply saying that the administration should come back to us with whatever their recommendation is? It's just not clear to me. It sounds to me like this is more complicated. We've stepped into something that's much more complicated. If there's an easy way to move forward, then that's great. But I'm not sure what the mechanism is.

Deborah:

Nor mine. I do not know what the mechanism is. I do not see an easy way to move forward besides, we did not accept the recommendation from UCFA and asking UCFA to reconsider in light of the conversation to make an additional recommendation.

Philomena:

So if I may, I raise my hand. Is it okay if I just?

Deborah:

Yes, please.

Philomena:

Okay. So given that Dr Falton participated in our discussion and he was willing to take it back to the committee, as much as I understand Tyler, your comment, it seems to me like this committee is really the body that looks at this aspect and that provides the information, and that would be the natural body for the administration, both the provost and the president to work with.

Philomena:

I understand that if the committee might revisit this and say, "No, we stand by what we did before," and that's just fine. But to ask them to reconsider given our discussion is in my view, perfectly reasonable, especially given the fact that they participated in this discussion.

Deborah:

Thank you. We're losing participants and shortly we will no longer have a quorum. So can I get back to Mick and see what his response to that is?

Nick:

Yeah, I mean I think that it may be appropriate for the Senate to direct the university committee on faculty affairs to work with the administration so that it's not specifically them redoing the letter, it's actually having the UCFA work with the president and the provost to negotiate salaries.

Deborah:

Is that a motion?

Nick:

Certainly.

Deborah:

Is there a second? Second. All right. Is there a discussion?

Robert:

I have a question. So it seems to me that there are two different things going on here. It is very clear that Michigan State is not very competitive if you look at it big time and eventually, that noncompetitive situation needs to be addressed. I think what we need to do as the Senate, is to acknowledge that we

are in tune with the recommendation, but we also feel that we are dealing with a situation which is so, I don't know how to put it.

Robert:

We are dealing with a very, very difficult situation that will not allow this recommendation to be carried forward. So we are depending on our leadership, the provost, and the precedent to do whatever is best. So it's not that we don't support the recommendation because the recommendation is there to address a very needed situation, but that we do recognize that this is not the best time to do this. So that's the way I see it.

Deborah:

Okay. We have three more people. I see three more hands, so I'm going to go through those and then we're going to call a vote. Martin Crimp?

Martin Crimp:

First of all, Robert, I appreciate your comments and I think they're right on target. I'm a little bit concerned with things going on that people are saying, "Oh well, we want the letter or updates to reflect the discussion that has gone on here."

Martin Crimp:

To be quite frank, the discussion has gone a lot broader than whether or not we recommend a 4% increase or perhaps I think most people would agree to a 0% increase to something that says, "Oh well we have a lot of disparities in salaries and those things all have to be fixed." That is a much deeper conversation that I don't think we want to authorize the committee to bring into the discussion.

Martin Crimp:

I think that that is something that can divide people. I think it is something that gets us off track. I think most of us are probably very comfortable with saying we recommend no increase this coming year.

Deborah:

Thank you. George Garrity?

George Garrity:

I think that Martin's point of view is correct. I think at this stage of the game, we don't know whether or not we actually are representing our constituents because they've not been pulled on this matter either. I think that what we're discussing is something that is a moral issue or an ethical issue, but I think it's also one that if we move forward on this, we could also leave ourselves open in the future where we lose a potential negotiating position when things get better and we haven't defined what that means.

Deborah:

Thank you. So the motion on the floor is for UCFA to... Mick, you want to restate the motion rather than having me make it up?

Nick:

This transcript was exported on Apr 15, 2020 - view latest version [here](#).

Certainly. I believe it was for this faculty Senate to direct the budget subcommittee and the university committee on faculty affairs to work with President Stanley and Provost Sullivan to discuss salaries for the upcoming year and in the future in light of the dire economic situation.

Deborah:

Thank you. Greg, do we have the poll?

Greg:

We do.

Deborah:

Excellent. Can you put it up?

Philomena:

Sorry. We're missing in that, the commitment, the longterm commitment to bring up the salaries from MSU is a big 10 universities, which was the intent. So I think that still needs to be there in the motion.

Nick:

Certainly, you can add that.

Deborah:

Okay. So that has been added, the longterm commitment. So here's the poll. Only faculty Senate members vote. I think we can do 60 seconds on this.

Greg:

Sounds good. 30 seconds remain. 10 seconds.

Deborah:

All right, the motion passes. And thank you all very much. Is there a motion to adjourn?

Robert:

Still removed.

Deborah:

A second?

Nick:

Second.

Michael Crimp:

Second.

Deborah:

This transcript was exported on Apr 15, 2020 - view latest version [here](#).

All in favor, say aye.

Robert:

Aye.

Nick:

Aye.

Michael Crimp:

Aye.

Deborah:

Thank you all very much. See you next week at university council. Thank you again.

Robert:

Thank you. Be safe everyone, please.

Deborah:

Yes. Bye bye.

Robert:

Bye.

PART 4 OF 4 ENDS [02:16:24]