

Debbie: ... hearing none. All in favor, raise your hands. You can also use the raise hand function at the bottom of the participant list. Okay, so the agenda is approved. So we start with the president's remarks, and I don't believe that he is here yet, or I'm not seeing him. Okay. So let's move to the provost remarks, Dr. Sullivan.

Dr. Sullivan: Okay, thank you. We have a busy agenda today, I'm going to try and keep this fairly brief, but I'm glad to have this opportunity to tell you one last time how much I've enjoyed working you this year. My term as interim provost comes to an end this week. And as I think you know, Thomas [inaudible 00:00:50], to the Dean of graduate school will be the interim for the month of July. And then Teresa Woodruff joins the university August 1st. But before I depart, I wanted to take an opportunity as we're on the verge of a new fiscal year, to tell you a little bit about how I spent the money during the past year.

And so I think if Greg can get my slides ready. Just a couple of slides, not a lot. I wanted to talk to you just a little bit about this. I think there's a general sense that the provost office has money to spend, but it's not a vast amount. And the pie chart at the top shows that the largest portion there is gray and it was previously committed some \$50 million, or 72% of it before I got here. And that's because many commitments made by the provost office are multiyear commitments. So the amount any provost has to spend from year to year is not large.

The orange part, which says human health colleges is about 3%. And I allocated it this year to Dr. [Botchnet 00:02:04] because his new office was started with no funding at all. And he has three colleges represented in his portfolio. So that was a share I allocated to him. And then remainder is what I've committed during fiscal year 20, which is about 15%. If you drop down to the bottom pie chart, this is how that 15% got spent. The biggest chunk is listed for Deans and Chairs. So this comes for all kinds of things. The Dean requests in new GA line, there may be an unexpected renovation needed in the laboratory. The Dean may need money to top up a recruitment package, or there's all kinds of ways that that money gets spent. The next orange segment, which is about 10% of the money is partner support.

I think you know the provost office supports partner hires. You pay one third of their salary for three years. And to some of the spree committed money from when I arrived was already committed into provost, into partner support, and I committed a little bit more. The next 12% is in gray and that's program support. That is support that's going to particular programs because they perhaps have an unanticipated need or an unanticipated opportunity. For example, I gave some money this year to the Asian Pacific American program. The gold heart is a retention. That's about 6%. This was typically to help Deans who need assistance in retaining somebody who's been recruited from another institution. And sometimes that is straight salary support, but more likely it represents support in terms of travel or research support, something like that. And then finally, 20.9% of the light blue shading, that is salary support.

And that salary support again, is given for a variety of reasons. One important reason this year was diversity hires. Sometimes there is a target of opportunity for a Dean and the Dean doesn't have enough money to support it. I can sometimes help with that. Also, equity increases and market adjustments may come into that category. So I thought that you deserve to have some idea about how the money got spent this year. There are many, many more requests than I can handle. So I had to say no a lot more often than I said yes this year, but I wanted you to have some accountability for that.

You know, it's a little poignant for me to be saying goodbye to you. And yet I have to say it's been a great adventure this year. It wasn't the adventure I expected. It went many different directions, particularly because of COVID-19. I want to tell you how much my admiration for you grew watching how you adapted to a very difficult situation and didn't complain about it. Basically people ask questions, but they were instrumental questions about how do I do this? How can I help there? It was really very impressive. Anybody who thinks that this is... That you guys aren't just absolute world-class, you just haven't spent enough time here. So thank you for the opportunity you gave me to be with you this year. I'll always remember this with great fondness and I wish you all the best next for next year. That's it Debbie.

Debbie: Thank you very much. Are there any questions for provost Sullivan? And I'm still not sure if president Stanley is here.

Philomena Nunez: There are [inaudible 00:05:50] hands.

Debbie: Pardon me?

Philomena Nunez: There are a few raised hands.

Debbie: For questions. Okay. So we have Amelia Marchic. Sorry if I'm mispronouncing your name.

Amelia Marchic: I think that's a mistake. Sorry.

Debbie: Okay. We have... Yeah. I'm not even going to try to... Mr. Cholo Vicky. Cho Lewitski?

Cho Lowitski: This is mistake as well. This was to second the approval emotion.

Debbie: The motion. Okay. All right. All right. So still looking for president Stanley, and if he's not here, we can move on to chairperson's remarks, which is me. So I just wanted to report, quickly report on what... The steering committee did not meet. The last steering committee meeting was... I forgot. Two to three weeks ago. We have not met since then. We have just simply approved the agenda via email. However, the at-large members did meet with president Stanley and provost Sullivan and Dr. Beauchamp. And we basically talked about things that

are already on the agenda. So those will be discussed for me when we get to the agenda. The at-large members are also the faculty liaison group, and we will be meeting with the board of trustees tomorrow. And on that agenda will be introductions and thank yous. And then following that, we will be talking the bylaws that were passed by the university council last year have been forwarded to the board of trustees.

So they will be looking at the bylaws on their Thursday meeting. We will meet with them on a Wednesday for Zoom lunch, and they will be looking at the bylaws on Thursday. One of the things that we wanted to make sure that they understood was that they can pass the bylaws, they don't need to pass the bylaws as a whole. They can pass them by individually or by chunks. One of my main concerns was to get the emergency meeting bylaw passed if possible so that we no longer have the confusion that we seem to be having for the past three years about emergency meetings. The other thing that will be in the bylaw on the board of trustees is the code of professional standards, which has been in UCFA. And they will be talking about that. Mick Fulton, who was the chair of UCLA will be talking about that.

And the other thing I wanted to say is the voting members of the faculty senate should have received an email that allows you to vote. So I just want to make sure that you all received that email and that you have it ready for votes if we have a quorum to vote. And we'll need to have a quorum in order to vote. And that concludes my comments. If you did not receive that email, please, I'm sure you did, but look for it or email Sherry Lott, and she will be able to send it to you. And that concludes my comments. So I'm not sure if Dr. Beauchamp is here either.

Dr. Sullivan: I thought I saw him.

Dr. Beauchamp: Absolutely. I'm absolutely [crosstalk 00:09:22].

Dr. Sullivan: There, I see you. I see your-

Dr. Beauchamp: Yeah. Sorry. I was off video just because I wasn't talking. Yep. Here.

Debbie: Hello time for your comments.

Dr. Beauchamp: Excellent. Thank you so much. I want to acknowledge provost Sullivan. It's really been a privilege to learn so much from her. I mean, it was a blessing to have a president and a provost in a faculty who could really guide and help avoid missteps as I've stepped into my role. So I'm very thankful. As I have had the privilege to meet with the faculty steering committee, as well as with the faculty senate, and I would like to provide an update. All of you would be glad to know that my guidance from the steering committee was to tell us what you've decided. We want to hear about some progress. And so we hear that. So I'll summarize some of the things. Well, actually president Stanley's here so I can

hand the microphone over to him. Deb, [inaudible 00:10:25] come back to my report.

Debbie: Thanks.

Dr. Beauchamp: You're welcome.

Debbie: President Stanley. Now you are muted president Stanley.

President Stanl...: My I apologize to everybody for being muted, and being late. But it's good to be here and see you. I want to begin by thanking everyone for participating today. And again, it's nice to see everybody. And I want to begin by expressing my deepest thanks to Terry Sullivan, for her willingness to serve as Michigan state university's provost over the past months. She's served MSU as she served her other distinguished institutions. With intelligence, decisiveness, expertise, empathy, and a true commitment to the success of each and every member of the MSU community, students, staff, and faculty. It's really been a privilege for me to work with her. And I know you will all join me in wishing her the best as she returns to the university of Virginia to resume her post-presidential sabbatical. Terry, thank you so much. I really appreciate everything you've been doing. And for Thomas [Yashco 00:11:24], thank you for your willingness to serve as acting provost for this next month.

I want to talk about DEI briefly. When I arrived at MSU, I emphasized our shared mission of creating a safer, more diverse and more inclusive and welcoming campus. The events of the last six months have starkly, tragically and powerfully driven home the importance of that goal, not only for our campus, but for the country. The devastatingly disproportionate impact of COVID-19 on the black community in our state, and many others has highlighted the need to address the systemic racism that has led to health disparities and economic inequities that had fueled the much greater death rate among blacks. When one superimposes the far too many Syrian images of brutality against black Americans, including the murder of George Floyd, the need for action and fundamental change becomes indisputable.

I believe the Michigan state university community is galvanized by this opportunity for change, and we will respond. We have a headstart under the leadership of Luis Garcia and Wanda Lipscomb, who has replaced Dean Cynthia Jackson Elmore. The DEI strategic planning committee has already begun some of the critical work of defining the terms we will use to engage in this effort, benchmarking where we stand in a number of key areas of inventory and in evaluating our progress and programs dealing with diversity equity inclusion at both the unit and central level. And the very difficult work of prioritizing which challenges we need to tackle first and how we bring our approaches to scale.

This work is critical and needs to continue. But given this moment, we need to accelerate our efforts. Therefore, I have asked the DEI strategic planning

committee with assistance from Paulette Granberry Russell to create a smaller task force, to identify areas that deserve much more immediate attention. I've asked them to add any additional content experts that they deem helpful to this effort. Again, I see this as an outgrowth of the DEI strategic planning effort, because we don't have the resources to have multiple duplicative efforts in this key area. One topic we know needs to be considered is safety on campus. And one critical component of that is policing. I communicated my belief in the need for police accountability in the letter that went to the Spartan community earlier this month. It also noted that our police department already practices the aid [inaudible 00:13:39] police conduct policies advocated by project Zero.

These include banning choke holds, brutality intervention expectations, and training in citizen conflict deescalation. From conversations I've had with our students and from the national discussions around public safety. I know there are other concerns about what tasks are assigned to police on campus, and how resources are allocated for campus safety. And I look forward to open discussions on this issue in the coming weeks. The effort on DEI will require buy-in from all of our leaders. Last week, I learned from provost designate Dr. Teresa Woodruff and provost Sullivan on the efforts the provost office will be undertaking and working to eradicate policies, practices, and behaviors rooted in systemic racism that create barriers to success for students of color. These include financial aid reforms, general education reform, curricular analysis, and expansion of the first year seminar program.

Dr. Woodruff and Dr. Thomas Yashco and I spoke with me today on this issue and they are fully engaged. I would note a few other things. Co-chairs Paula Granberry Russell and Dean Chris Long are working on the reopening campus VI subcommittee to identify issues and making recommendations to support diverse and vulnerable communities in a return to on premise activity. The office from inclusion is working with campus stakeholders, including faculty senate, staff and students on required mandatory online DEI education development this fall. We're working with the same vendor that developed RSVSN training. And we're also looking at a proposal for a panel to review information, to help assess the campus climate with respect to anti-discrimination policy related incidents in MSU, in cooperation with other campus units. I won't comment on the budget at this time because Dave Beilock will be making a presentation. I did want to thank those of you who are involved in one of the 21, or more of the 21 committees that are working for reopening the campus.

I appreciate everybody's efforts on this and will continue as details are worked out to share more broadly with faculty, staff and students at what's happening there. And finally, as you may know, last week at my request, Steve Shu resigned his position as senior vice president for research and innovation to return to a tenured faculty position at the end of this month. I'll name an interim vice president for research shortly, and of course we'll be consulting

with the steering committee in accordance with our policies. And I'll conclude my report with that.

Debbie: Thank you. Any questions for president Stanley? Seeing no hands. Can we go back to Dr. Beauchamp?

Dr. Beauchamp: Thank you. So there's a website that I'd like to bring everyone's attention to that shows the work that's being done. For those of you that don't know it's msu.edu/coronavirus. The key to the work that we've been doing is it's value based. There's 21 sub committees. And the steering committee in the senate have been very helpful where there was an emphasis on the need for transparency and inclusiveness in the committees. And so what you'll see on the website is a list of who's chairing the committee, the charge of the committee and all of the members of the committee. And one of the things that we've been very thoughtful about is to make sure that there's a product representation on each community. We've stepped up the pace of the meetings in order to start bringing things forward to our community.

We have office hours twice a week. We have a meeting of all sub committee chairs Monday at 8:00 AM. We have two sign off meetings where we just look at what has been put forward as requests and sign them off. We've been meeting frequently with all of you, the steering committee, and twice now with the senate. And we meet with the president's cabinet twice a week. The trends across our nation show that coronavirus is again on an upsurge, and it's not surprising as we look at really the slipping of people embracing some of the things that we know work. Social distancing, personal hygiene, cloth face covers. We've heard of 14 cases diagnosed locally at a local pub, where again, despite a good bit of effort, there still has been an increase in cases. And as we've heard mentioned, this politicization of mask wearing and efforts to decrease COVID has made it even more challenging.

And we must transcend this. I would say certainly as a community and it's going to be critical that we work together to keep our campus safe, our students, our staff, our faculty. Some of the things that we have come to an agreement on that we will do. Students will be asked to sign a code of conduct compact, where they commit to following best practices. Some of the things that we will ask for is for wearing cloth face covers in all closed spaces, the classroom, buildings, and we're strongly leaning towards the idea that they will also be asked to wear cloth face covers and social distance as they're traveling outside as well while on campus. We will be capable of testing all symptomatic individuals at MSU. We're developing that capacity and that will be present by the time students come back. We're also developing the capacity to perform large scale surveillance, using an approach called pooling.

This allows you to sample a large number of individuals, noninvasively. We're not yet sure if we'll enact that, but we want to be prepared. And it's an excellent tool to really look at spread of disease. And we think it's important to have

capacity. We have developed the capacity to quarantine approximately 250 individuals. And we're assessing whether that capacity will be adequate. And that will be for individuals that test positive for COVID-19. We will make masks available in the classroom for instructors in the instances where students show up without masks. Obviously we'll ask that the students remember their masks, but we also don't want to leave the instructors in a difficult position. We want to empower the faculty to say to students, "You need to wear a mask. And if you're not able to do that, we're going to ask you to leave class. And I have a mask available for you."

And we got approval to order 100,000 masks to make sure that we can provide this. We believe that social and behavioral norming is really going to be a key part of this compliance, and we're developing the communication approaches to do that and really benefiting from some of the great scholarship on our campus. We believe that students can also play an important role in reinforcing the importance of mask wearing in addition to social norming, we're going to look at having some student ambassadors. The orientation is really important and we're developing materials to be sent out to students. So they know what to expect when they come back. And that that is actively happening. In general, the orientation for faculty and staff is that we want people to work from home, where they can successfully accomplish their jobs.

We encourage this as a part of decreasing the density of people on campus. We'll implement an approach effective August 1st that will also provide additional guidance to units in making this determination. And there'll be a mechanism for individuals to apply and be granted the opportunity, the ability to work from home. And we believe that reviewing that monthly will be a best practice because this is a dynamic process with understanding the disease and how best to make sure we're serving our students and supporting faculty and staff. We will be coming forward with an increasing pace of announcements. We appreciate everyone's patients. We want to make sure that we're using best available input from across the campus. We met with landlords last Friday, a group of us. Another group met with business owners. We shared with them what we're doing. They had lots of questions about how they can benefit from some of the approaches we're using.

And now we're in discussions about how we can work together again, because working together is going to be critical. The final thing I'll thank all of you is an amazing list of really important questions came to us to be given to the subcommittees, to reflect on. And you also broke them up in a really thoughtful way in terms of what committees these questions should go to. And so they will review the questions and put the prioritization of bringing answers back in the context of the questions that were deemed important to the faculty. I'll stop there to have, and certainly entertain any questions or additions by president Stanley.

Debbie: Any questions for Dr. Beauchamp? [Philomena 00:00:23:41] Nunez? Dr. Nunez.

- Philomena Nunez: Yes. Hi, it's Philomena here. Thank you for your brief presentation. I have a question regarding testing. Has the university considered testing all students that come back?
- Dr. Beauchamp: We have Philomena. And one of the things that we're looking at is the role that that could play. And when I mentioned this approach to pooling. Using pooling, we would be able to test up to 10,000 students in a week. So we're going to develop the capacity. What we're doing, and president Stanley is in communications with university presence across the country, is try to figure out the role that that would play. And it's well accepted that that could be very helpful in terms of surveillance in helping us understand the prevalence and the incidence. What's not as clear is how effective that could be in terms of trying to get to containment.
- And so what president Stanley authorized us to do last week was to be ready so that by August 1st we'll have capacity in place to do this. But what we want to make sure is that we do it in a way that actually helps us support staff, faculty and students. And so we're still trying to determine the role for that. But we'll be ready if it turns out to be the best approach. Does that make sense?
- Philomena Nunez: Yeah. So does this mean with 10,000, of course we've got more than 10,000 students that will return to campus. Does this mean that we would stage their return?
- Dr. Beauchamp: No, it doesn't. If we were to do this, we would do 10,000, and we would focus on campus. We would focus on students that were living in circumstances of maybe at a higher risk for greater crowding. We try to prioritize that, but we would do 10,000. If we did this week, one, 10,000 week two, and try to do it in series. And then another thing that we're developing, Philomena, that we think will be helpful is really a symptoms app where we will develop the capacity for students to report symptoms. Cough, fever, flu symptoms, if you will, and be able to do that because that's also been seen to be a really effective way to... If you do it for more than a few days, right, if you're doing it continually to see the presence of COVID increasing.
- President Stanl...: So simply [inaudible 00:26:25], could I add? Yeah, so Norm, I'm sorry, I missed the beginning of your presentation, but I'm sure it was outstanding, but I'm happy to weigh in a little on testing. As Norm said, I've had a chance to participate and actually lead a number of AAU and APLU discussions on this issue. So first I can tell you, there is no one answer to this in terms of what people are doing. I will say there's general agreement that you have to have the ability to identify people who have symptoms and get them tested. So you have to be able to have people who have symptoms. We have to find ways to make sure they come forward and make sure they're tested. That's very important to add, and then to do the contact tracing associated with that. It's important as well. That's the basic things that I think everybody who wants to open house to be able to do that.

If you go beyond that, there's lots of discussion. There are universities that could have the capacity to test everybody, but don't think it makes sense. They feel as though things change so rapidly potentially with this disease, that it gives you one point in time. If you test 10,000 students that day, it tells you. And it doesn't really tell you much what's happening the next day or the day after that, because people could get infected and change the numbers. So if you're not testing probably in every five day basis, it's very difficult to see a full value for testing.

The thing that we've... What we want to do is again, continue to follow what people are working on in this area, develop capacity. So if we can, we will take a look at some of these things and then we'll decide what's the best way to do it. Is it surveillance? Again is it ways to look at smaller populations, higher risk populations. What about employees versus students? Those are important questions. So I think these are all things we're still working through, but first we have to develop the capacity to do that second phase. But the critical thing, as I said before is to have the first phase.

Dr. Beauchamp: And one of the benefits is, some of you know, I was at the university of Washington before. And so I've got colleagues there. And then my wall mate virtually is running the process at Johns Hopkins, in addition to president Stanley leading the discussions for presidents of the university. So we're getting really good input in terms of doing this right. And one of the things that... The swabs, which is actually the test that you would do to confirm, it's somewhat invasive. And so this idea of testing frequently, and the risk of false positives, when you have a population prevalence that's relatively low. Even with tests that are on the order, and if sensitivity and specificity, 95, 96% is pretty significant. So you'd have the risk as well of false positives, and think about how that could negatively impact students. Again, that's why we're working really hard to think about this.

Debbie: So we have a lot of questions in the chat. I have something from Joyce Meyer. What about testing for non-symptomatic people, since they too can be infected?

Dr. Beauchamp: Yeah. And you know, it's interesting. I may turn the helm to president Stanley. Who's an infectious disease doc here, and I'm glad that to respond after him on this because this is in his strike zone.

President Stanl...: No, I'm happy to do it. So I think the answer is that we probably would not be generally testing people who were asymptomatic unless they had been exposed to someone who had COVID-19. So the difference would be if we decided to do mass screening, but in terms of the basic component I talked about that I think is required for safety. If someone is completely asymptomatic, we probably would not test them, but we'd rather if they had symptoms or they had been exposed with someone with COVID-19, that would qualify them to be tested under the... I would say the basic package. If you go beyond that, then you can

do screening. So screening to me would be you're taking a look at an entire population coming in. So it's the people who are coming to work every day, or it's the people who is students arriving on campus, or it's students within an entire dormitory are being screened or high risk.

Surveillance would mean we might identify representative students, for example, to test students within a dorm, a cadre, one person from a roommate, things like that. That would be more surveillance to keep track over time of what's happening and whether we can detect new infections. Surveillance could be testing for virus, but could also be testing essentially for antibodies as well. So there's different ways you could do it, but I think both those would be possible. And in terms of student privacy, again, if we're doing testing related to medical issues and people coming forward, it's not an issue. For the surveillance, for the surveillance strategies, testing strategies, that I think we still are working through how that would be done and what permissions would be required for that.

Debbie: And the next question is from Catherine Grosso. What are you planning to tell students about any obligation to return to campus and attend in person classes?

President Stanl...: I think we're not putting any obligation on people. I think what we're saying is it's up to them to decide, that they can make a choice. We're trying with the outstanding cooperation of faculty to offer as many courses as we can online and remotely to allow students to continue if they want to their Michigan State University journey without having to come to campus if they don't want to. And that's particularly going to be relevant for our international students who may not be able to come to campus at all. So I think we're putting that option open and I don't think we're working to compel anybody to come who doesn't want to come or doesn't feel comfortable coming.

Debbie: And another question from George Garrity. How frequently would you propose to retest?

President Stanl...: So retest means? So I need a little clarification on what the context is. Is this retest in terms of the screening population, how often you would do it? Or is this retest in terms of someone who tested positive or negative, and you're not convinced of the negative result, you're not convincing of the positive results. That I guess what's that, what's the question [inaudible 00:32:26] exactly?

Speaker 1: Initially it would be, "How often would you retest?" I think you've answered that to some extent already, but it also raises the question. If you set up a surveillance program, how would you propose on doing that in terms of setting up the program so that you could actually find out if there's a new outbreak that's occurring on campus?

President Stanl...: I think again, [crosstalk 00:32:48] we'd have codes essentially that could allow for people to be essentially de-identified in terms of the screening that's done.

So that's how you do it. But then would provide a link so that if it did test positive, then that could be referred to [inaudible 00:33:04]

PART 1 OF 5 ENDS [00:33:04]

President Stanl...: ... provide a link so that if it did test positive, then that could be referred to student health essentially and contact someone, or employee health to contact someone.

Dr. Beauchamp: Yeah, and adding to that, we've worked with about 200 companies. Our institute of health policy is doing symptom monitoring across multiple counties. And we're learning from that then, how do identify outbreaks in the presence of simple symptom monitoring, and developing an app that will help us do that.

The other point to be made is that the key is that because COVID can be spread even before people have symptoms, if we can work as a community to make sure that we adhere to best practices, social distancing, cloth face covers, hygiene, that is going to be one of the key strategies that will work to prevent spread. So it's going to take all of us working together to do that. Really important. That in part, explains to me the low incidents at places like Meijer. Right? That have these close interactions, but they've been able to keep people safe.

President Stanl...: That's such an important point. We're focused on testing and it gets a lot of attention, but really, the key thing is masks, distancing, a layered approach. Each of these layers, when you wear a mask that helps protect others, but also can help protect you to a significant degree.

So, wearing a mask is probably the first and foremost thing in preventing spread, and then the distancing, that adds another layer of protection. So the further you are from people the safer you're going to be.

The hygiene we've talked about, in terms of hands and so on. These are really the tools. If you look at a country like Japan, which at one time was approaching US in terms of pace of cases, their death rates, and their number of cases are extraordinarily lower than the US. It's a country where basically everybody has been wearing masks and people have been doing social distancing. So, these interventions can make a difference, and I think really can provide a way to really optimize risk in a very profound way. And they are the most important things.

Debbie: So can any student self-refer themselves for testing without referral from PCP?

President Stanl...: I think the answer would be, we want to reduce barriers to people coming forward. So if someone thinks they have an issue, then yes, we'll find ways in which, and I think we'll have numbers that you can call or so on, to get yourself

tested. But we would prefer that it go through physicians, so we can track, as students track who it is and the appropriate billing and so on.

Debbie: Could you comment on the value of testing screening in CLIA versus non-CLIA, to get a fast and accurate response?

President Stanl...: For the diagnosis, it's people who have symptoms, whether they be employees or whether they be students, we would be using a CLIA approved. We're working on CLIA approval, essentially, for some of them surveillance testing and other things as well.

Debbie: Okay, and one other. Can students self-report for high risk behavior and request testing?

President Stanl...: Again, I think my preference at this point in time would be that, without a documented exposure to someone who has COVID-19, documented COVID-19, I would not say self-referral for what they think is high risk behavior.

Debbie: What about the news out of Israel, with the new test that they hope will be available in September?

President Stanl...: David you'll have to educate me because I don't know what test that is. Do you know norm?

Dr. Beauchamp: Yeah. It's pretty interesting, where you can do a simple breath test, or a nose swab, and you get the answer back in about a minute, and it's a series. They say meta material sensors that will allow you to do that. And it just goes to part of why we want to pay such close attention as things are emerging at such a rate, right? This idea of pool sampling that allows us to see, 10,000 tests in a week. So, that could be a model. But again, it would still get to, what do you do with the test? How does it bring value? Because even with the test being easy, there are so many other parts of testing, recording the test, tracking the people, coordinating it. If you're bringing people together so that you're not bringing groups together in ways that you don't want to do it. So one, is time of test, but the other is certainly all the parts that go with it. I do believe that we'll have a large scale capacity to test, if that's what's needed.

Debbie: Some faculty are scheduled to teach in person twice a week. Are there any considerations to consolidate teaching to once a week for longer class time to minimize the exposure of both faculty and students?

President Stanl...: That's an interesting question. And I think, I don't know the answer for sure. I don't know what's a bigger risk, of being in a room for a longer time, because in terms of air exchange and things like that, that might actually be a larger risk than going there twice for a shorter period of time. But I don't know, that's something we could look up. An epidemiologists could answer, but I think generally we think exposure increases the longer time you're in presence. So,

my guess would be that it might be better to be in the two classes as opposed to one.

Debbie: How many COVID-19 cases and deaths associated with the MSU community will be the trigger point for moving to online classes again? State news reports today that there are 19 COVID-19 cases linked to Harper's restaurant, MSU students who are here now have not been practicing social distancing.

President Stanl...: So I think there's no question that in those environments, is it bars and so on, that definitely has been taking place. And so, it's a really good question. And of course, nothing we're doing is in isolation from public health. So, Ingham County Public Health is going to be our partner with this. So, we're going to be listening to what Ingham County Public Health says, and what the state says as well. There are some clues in terms of rate of rise of infections that we detect. So, if we're testing people, whether it's widespread, or just people who we're testing brought forward with symptoms or contact. How many positives result from those tests, what percentage that is?

That gives us a clue of where an outbreak could be on campus and how fast it's spreading. Then, I think a lot of it, honestly, Gwen, would depend on what's happening in the community. So, if there's widespread outbreak in the community, then would it make sense to continue to keep people on campus with sheltering essentially, while going to remote, as opposed to sending people home? The going to remote would make sense, I think, if the outbreak in the community is at a point where we feel people were involved in instruction, student contact, and so on we're vulnerable at higher risk than we can tolerate. But I think again, we'd have to cross that bridge when we come to it.

Debbie: What can we do if, someone walks into a meeting, not wearing a mask and refusing to wear a mask, can we call security? Are we worried about lawsuits from those in our States convinced masks are a violation of rights?

President Stanl...: So, there are good questions. I think that I'm not worried about lawsuits. Brian Quinn, or general counsel would not like to hear me say that, but I'm not worried about lawsuits in these areas. I think we have a right for public health reasons to say, we're taking precautions related to this. What we're doing right now is completely consistent with an executive order that the governor herself has put out. So, we're not doing anything that's beyond that in terms about people wearing masks indoors, in public areas. And so, that's completely consistent.

In terms of how you deal with this issue, I think, again, we will be giving some guidance on this. We've had a lot of discussion. I think I would look upon it as what would happen if someone's disrupting a class. Many of the same things you would be doing if someone's disrupting the class and not cooperating in some ways that disruptive. And, what your options are in dealing with that. That'd be the first approach I'd take to it.

I think we're trying to stay away from police as enforcing this for a number of reasons. But, I think again, safety is always important as you think about this. So, we'll try to have more guidance on this, but I think hopefully this will be a rare thing that's happening. Clearly, if someone's disruptive in your class, as I said before, you probably have ways of dealing with it. That could include them not being able to return to your class in the future.

Debbie: So, I'm going to go off the chat and go to [Undaluna Borchila 00:41:41] . I'm sorry that I'm going from chat and not seeing the hand raising. So, let's go to Undaluna, she had her hand raised.

Undaluna: Okay, thank you Deborah. As we're along, some of my questions have been answered others, not. But, a couple of things. So it seems like there's evidence that the behavior of students is not such, at least of students, is not the one we count on it to be. And so, we already have that evidence out there and what I'm hearing though, is that we're counting on that behavior to change, and we're counting on faculty and others in the community to somehow rapidly socialize students into these new norms.

So, that makes me kind of nervous as a researcher, right? Because when I see evidence in front of me that says this behavior is this, here are numbers right now. Here's a fact, here's what's going on, students at Harper's are, look at the pictures. I also hear other information from people who are currently teaching Zoom classes, students telling them that they're in fact sick with COVID, and that there are a number of them in the dormitories. So, there's this evidence that we have, and then there's here's what we hope students will do. There's this discrepancy, and then there was a lot of weight put on, and here's what you can do as faculty in terms of how to enforce in the classroom that is behavior of social distancing happens. So, it seems like the evidence and what we're asked to do, don't kind of line up, and then also question what constitutes enough numbers for an outbreak. In fact, how do we make that decision? This is an outbreak.

President Stanl...: So again, I think I answered that question already in speaking to Gwen, that we'd be working with public health as well. There's some parameters you can look at in terms of how fast things are doubling, what percentage of the tests you do end up being positive and not positive. And so we'll develop that as we go forward. So, I think that's answered.

To the second question, I think that the first thing to say is that we haven't told those students on campus that they need to be wearing masks in those environments, right? There's been no normative effort for those students. So, in other words, they are not returning to campus with the peer group at this moment in time, right? The only people staying on campus are the few students who are in dormitories who are more stable. So you're talking about the students outside of campus, and it's going to be very difficult for us to control the behavior of students outside of the campus.

But, the vulnerability to all of you comes from transmission that's taking place on campus, assuming. That's what you're concerned about right now, right? That's what we're talking about. We're not talking about your risk in the community. We're talking about your risk in campus. So I think if we're very clear to students that this is the norm, this is what you have to do. You have to wear a mask, and we make that clear to people that this is a condition. Part of a compact to coming. I think we will get buy-in from students. From the conversations I've had with students, and I've had a chance to talk to a number now, and the conversations Dean Maybank has been having with students as well. They really are concerned about their own health as well, and they think it's important that students be wearing masks. So, at least that's the impact, that's the conversations we've had with them.

So I think, again, this is something where I liken it a little bit to what took place was smoking on campus, I'm sure. A number of years ago where you made the decision to go tobacco free on your campus, and by peer pressure, you stop people smoking on campus. If it was done the same way it was done at Stony Brook university, it was done by peer pressure. It wasn't police telling people to stop it. It wasn't necessary, students really talk to other students. We had something the equivalent of the student ambassadors, nursing students who called out students who weren't complying and we got people to get where they needed to go. And so, I think the same type of strategies are what we need to employ here. I think we will be able to see, this is not something you can't see or not see, whether someone's wearing a mask or not wearing a mask.

I think again, if somebodies inside, my expectation is other people will say, you need to have your mask if you're coming inside. We plan to have student ambassadors stationed outside of entry areas to make sure as people are coming inside, they're wearing masks. We will continue to try and encourage people to wear masks outside as well, because we think that will also help to reduce the risk. That's harder to enforce, but I think it's potentially doable particularly in areas around campus. So, yes, I mean, it's a challenge, but it's a challenge that every other institution is facing. So, it's not a unique challenge to Michigan State University.

And again, I think, I guess I have more confidence in people's ability to adapt to a health issue. Particularly again, if it's considered a condition of being on campus. What we'll talk about in the compact is, to be on campus you're basically signing something that says you're going to adhere to these rules going forward. So, that's an important component of it.

Dr. Beauchamp:

Just adding on to Luna, because I agree, it's really hard. Is, we also know that many students are really struggling in their communities right now, right? Our LGBT students are really struggling in homes where they may not be accepted. The disparities in health that we see particularly affecting underserved communities have been devastating. We do believe that we'll be able to better support those students when they come back to campus. That's a goal that we

have and so, it's part of the challenge. But, we'll work hard at it, all of us to get there. I think the key is keeping the classroom safe, which again, we're committed to do.

Debbie: We have one other question that I need to find.

President Stanl...: It's about opening up human subjects research. Norm has that, come up onto your task force on research. So, can you talk about that?

Dr. Beauchamp: That should be coming up pretty quickly. I can't give you the specifics right now, but let me jump out and look at that question and come back. But, that's one of the things that's near the front of the work that we're doing, is bringing research back.

Debbie: Okay. Thank you. And I just wanted to remind everyone that I do not have a list here of who is on faculty Senate and who's not. But, people asking questions at this point, if you are not a faculty Senator, you need to be given voice to ask a question. So, I may be reading things from the chat that are not from faculty Senate. So, if you can just be aware of that, that would be very helpful. I think that is it for the questions. So thank you Dr. Beauchamp, and president Stanley, and I believe we can now move to new business.

So, the first item of new business is reopening taskforce update on questions submitted by faculty Senate. I can make this very quick since that's what we've been talking about. So basically the attachment A has all of the questions that were submitted through the faculty Senate, that was submitted by the faculty to faculty senators, and then will be submitted to the various sub committees. I want to thank [Anapeg Lagordon 00:49:22] for her work, first of all, for putting the questions in categories, and then for coming up with the answers that came up two weeks ago at the steering committee, that was very, very helpful. Then, I put the questions into the various subcommittees and I have submitted those to Dr. Beauchamp and Dr. Weismantel and those will be submitted to the sub committees.

There's quite a bit of overlap in the questions, and the subcommittees also. So some questions have been submitted to more than one subcommittee because some questions are relevant to more than one subcommittee. The subcommittee that I'm on is the HR subcommittee. I've already forwarded those questions to that committee and a sub subcommittee is meeting tomorrow morning at 11 and we'll be discussing those.

I think that things are moving and I think one of the things that is important to realize is that there are lots of questions, there's lots of concerns and people are actually working very hard on it. There's a lot of people working on it and things are moving very quickly. They may not seem that way, but it really is. People have done a lot of work on it and I think that I just want to congratulate Dr.

Beauchamp and President Stanley, Provost Sullivan for all of the work that they've done in terms of moving this forward.

The committees are hard at work and the answers will be coming out from all of the questions that we have. It was just very, very gratifying to get the huge response that we got from the faculty in terms of questions. That was absolutely wonderful because it lets everyone know how concerned the faculty is, and how involved the faculty is, and how caring the faculty is. How much it matters to them. That, probably more than anything else, shows how much we care. So thank you very much.

Dr. Beauchamp: Thank you.

Debbie: Next is DEI concerns from faculty Senate members and the first one is an action item and it is advancing DEI at MSU and this is Dr. Stephanie, Anthony.

Dr. Anthony: Thank you very much. Thank you. Good afternoon, everyone and thank you for your earlier comments regarding DEI, Dr. Stanley. In the spring of 1904 Michigan Agricultural College, which later became, what we know today, as Michigan State University, had his first black graduate. That man's name was Mr. William Thompson and his accomplishment was extraordinary, especially for the times in which he lived. As a black man he surely would be amazed at the many changes the world has seen in the 116 years since he received his degree. The more things change, however, the more they remain the same. 116 years later, a variety of events and circumstances have occurred. The country has seen the Spanish flu pandemic, the great depression, the Harlem Renaissance, numerous wars. World Wars one and two, the Korean war, the invention of the polio vaccine, the civil rights act of 1964, and the civil rights era. The Vietnam war, Afghanistan, the 2020 pandemic, and the current world protests related to racial inequality, systemic racism and police brutality.

Today, we are still faced with racism, disagreements, [desyncion 00:20:04], the rise of white nationalism, confusion, the senseless loss of life and dignity, and willful disregard by some for the lies of others in our society. I would share with Mr. Thompson that yes, gains have indeed been made, but each time gains are made for many people of color. There are inherent feelings of fear and panic that those gains will be lost. I will tell him that there is in the large majority of people of color, a natural hypersensitivity, that one small move, and we will be set back. What is considered progress will to a grinding halt. There's a sense that we must hold tightly to promises that are made, less they be unfulfilled. We must continuously fight because if we don't, the very things that we have fought for over time will be eroded. And yes, there is sometimes a sense of uncertainty about who is genuine and who was not. Who really cares? We still must decipher who really truly cares.

Lastly, I would share with Mr. Thompson that we struggle still to make small gains. That often are not, we, as people of color are still the only people of color

in the room, much as when it had to be in 1904, when he was in classes. I would share that those small gains do matter. Sincerity matters. The support of great colleagues matters. The implementation of steps for improvements in race relations that promote accountability matter. Kindness matters and yes, black lives do matter. Black people contribute to this society every day and we matter.

There are many different viewpoints and perspectives within our own intellectual community. Each of them contributes to what is a positive and flourishing community, despite our differences. Sometimes we fail to get on the same page, but other times we agree unanimously and we experience that euphoric feeling of being on one accord. Today, I would like to make a forward looking motion related to DEI that would potentially allow us to be on one accord. I would like to make a motion that we, the faculty Senate, make a formal resolution to our incoming provost, Dr. Kathleen Woodruff, to take the following four specific steps in support of Michigan State University faculty, and particularly faculty of color upon her arrival to MSU.

Number one, we would like to ask that doctor Woodruff commit to refrain from reducing budgets of any programs which are focused on diverse populations, programs, or initiatives for a period of no less than two years. Number two, we would like to request a review and possibly increase of budgets whenever possible for programs which impact minorities for the same period. Too often, programs affecting marginalized populations are hit hardest when cuts are made. It is the programs which serve the underserved that are often asked to work on shoestring budgets, or are phased out when financial difficulties arise, sacrifices are sometimes made at the expense of careers and career progress. Invariably, we are moved around, but not up just as sometimes less value is often placed on the lives of black men and women, so to go out programs. So, for indigenous peoples, for black, for brown, and yellow people, we ask that you not cut and be consciously aware of the dynamics in play when you do make those necessary reviews.

For the third step, we ask the provost Woodruff commit to the development, review, and expansion of an even more intensive plan than that which currently exists for the recruitment of faculty of color, and faculty members from other marginalized groups, as well as a review of our retention efforts. Lastly, we respectfully request that provost Woodruff will commit to the Michigan State University community, that the efforts of our new, much desired and looked forward to provost, will commit. We'll work on behalf of diverse, or marginalized populations, and her work will not be limited as some have feared to just women and STEM, but rather will be more broad based during her tenure at Michigan State University. Included will be members of the LGBT community, ethnic minorities, underrepresented identities, and persons with disabilities. We look forward to her arrival and we respectfully request this resolution. Thank you.

Debbie: Thank you. Is there a second to the motion?

Speaker 2: Second.

Dr. Beauchamp: Second has been made, Deb.

Debbie: Okay. Thank you. Is there discussion? And, for discussion if you could raise your hand, rather than the chat function, if you could raise your hand in the... Oh, I see a Sandra Login. Yes.

Speaker 3: Hi, thank you. Thank you very much, Stephanie. I'm wondering if you could just restate point three. I didn't quite catch it and I'm just a little bit confused about what that point was. I just really want to hear it again. Thanks.

Dr. Anthony: Absolutely. And thank you. We asked that provost Woodruff commit to the development, review, and potential expansion of an even more intensive plan than that which currently exists for the recruitment of faculty of color, and faculty members from other marginalized groups, as well as a complete review of our retention efforts.

Debbie: Thank you. Other questions, or comments? Seeing none. Are we ready to vote? So for voting, you all have the email that the people who are faculty Senators have the email, and we will have 90 seconds in which to vote.

Speaker 4: Can I make a point of order, this is [inaudible 00:28:17].

Debbie: Yes.

Speaker 4: [inaudible 01:01:23]

Debbie: Sorry, I can't hear whoever's making a point of order.

I didn't hear the point of order.

I'm still not hearing it. Is anyone else hearing it?

Speaker 5: Perhaps they can use the chat box.

Debbie: Yeah. Can you put it in chat?

Speaker 4: Yes.

Debbie: The chatbox, "Since this an action item, may members of the Senate have a written copy of the proposal that we are voting on?"

Dr. Anthony: Yes.

How would you like for me to do that? Would you like for me to send that to you? Share?

Debbie: I'm not sure if they want a written, Richard needs to check.

I'm not sure if he wants it now.

Speaker 5: Perhaps a copy paste into chat would solve the problem.

Dr. Anthony: Okay. I'll do that right now.

Debbie: And Laura Cloud says she has the email, but it will not let her vote.

Dr. Beauchamp: I'll take that one. For those who may be having a difficulty with the link, I would suggest refreshing your browser. I've noticed on a couple of times that that may be a way to get your web browser essentially to activate and be able to catch the vote again.

Dr. Anthony: I see that part of it got left off, so I will also resend the second part of that.

Debbie: Okay.

Dr. Anthony: Thank you.

PART 2 OF 5 ENDS [01:06:04]

Debbie: I think we were going to have 90 seconds. Greg, can you give me an idea of where we are on that?

Greg: Yeah, we've gone significantly over the 90-second mark.

Debbie: Okay. So can you give us the results?

Greg: I sure can. Just stand by one moment.

Debbie: We have 50 yeses, four noes, and seven abstains, so the motion passes. Thank you very much.

Dr. Anthony: Thank you. Thank you.

Debbie: Next on the agenda, we have a letter from faculty senators, and this is being presented by Dr. Anna Pegler-Gordon.

Tyler: I'm sorry to interrupt. I would make a motion to reconsider the last one on the grounds that we didn't have the text in front of us. And now that we do, because I voted on the prevailing side, I have standing to make a motion to reconsider. The use of the term yellow people, I genuinely don't know. My understanding was that that was not a term preferred by the Asian-American community, and I just wanted to raise the issue.

Dr. Anthony: Is there a term that you would prefer that I utilize? because it's never my intent to offend. I am aiming for inclusivity and to demonstrate care.

Tyler: And I assumed as much. No, I don't have a better term. I wanted to raise the issue, because ... It may well be fine.

Dr. Anna Pegler...: It is not fine. Yeah. Yellow people is absolutely considered a racist, offensive term. The term APIDA, Asian Pacific Islander Desi American is one preferred term, although Asian American or Asian Pacific Islander American, I think is commonly used.

Dr. Anthony: More appropriate?

Tyler: Yeah. [inaudible 01:08:33].

Dr. Anthony: I'll make the adjustment. Can you repeat that again, please, Anna?

Dr. Anna Pegler...: Asian ...

Debbie: Can you put it in the chat?

Dr. Anna Pegler...: Sure.

Debbie: That might be the easiest.

Dr. Anna Pegler...: Let me just... Hang on one sec.

Greg: I did have one question also come through on the chat about being an Enter button to vote. There isn't one. As soon as you select your choice, it is recorded, though you do have the option to clear your choice and then essentially re-vote in the time period. So if anybody is concerned about making sure their vote counted, simply selecting it ensures that your vote goes through.

Debbie: Thank you, Greg. Is it safe to assume that we do not need to re-vote, that we can just simply accept replacing this? If anyone would prefer to re-vote, please raise your hand. I'm not seeing any hands, so I think we're accepting this as a friendly amendment and the motion passes. All right. Thank you very much, Tyler. Appreciated, and thank you Dr. Anthony.

Dr. Anthony: Thank you.

Debbie: So now we move to 7.2.2, Letter from faculty senators, and this is Dr. Anna Pegler-Gordon.

Dr. Anna Pegler...: Yes. So the next agenda item is this Faculty Senate statement that has been provided in appendix two that came with your Faculty Senate agendas. This outlines a series of DEI concerns and was brought forward by members of the

Faculty Senate. This is an action item. The Faculty Senate statement, references letters from BFSAA, COREM and ChiLA. Those are also provided in appendices three, four, and five.

So I would like to introduce the resolution in support of the Faculty Senate statement, and then I would like to give voice to Eunice Foster, who's the current president of BFSAA, Black Faculty Staff and Administrators Association, followed by Naoko Wake, executive board member of COREM, the Council Of Racial And Ethnic Minorities, and also the co-convenor of APIDA APSA, the Asian Pacific Islander Desi American and Asian Faculty, Staff, And Administrators, and the reason for doing that ...

If we could maybe first take a vote on the resolution and then just sort of introducing it. If I could get a second.

Debbie: So you put forward two things. First, you want to make a motion to approve this letter from some faculty senators. Is there a second to that motion? Okay. So that has been seconded. And now you would like to make a motion to give voice to ...

Dr. Anna Pegler...: Thank you, sorry. Yes, to Eunice Foster, current president of BFSAA, and also Naoko Wake, because they can provide context for the Faculty Senate statement and then Galia Benitez and Rufus Isaacs, who were members of the group who developed the statement would like to speak in support of it.

Debbie: Is there a second to that motion? And then there's also a chat from Jennifer Johnson. I was going to actually say this. If somebody could put the text of the proposal of the letter in the chat, it would be helpful, and also to read it. I think it's important that we know what it is. So there was a second to the motion, so all in favor of giving voice, please say, "Aye."

Male: Aye.

Debbie: Oh, wait, please.

Male: Aye.

Aye.

Female: Aye.

Dr. Anthony: Aye.

Female: Aye.

Male: Aye.

Debbie: All right.

Female: Aye.

Male: Aye.

Female: Aye.

Aye.

Male: Aye.

Aye.

Debbie: Any nays?

Female: Aye.

Debbie: Okay. So the motion passes. Do we want to read the letter first and put it in the chat, or do we want to have the context?

Female: Voice [crosstalk 00:07:39].

Dr. Anna Pegler...: I'm sorry. I can't put it in the chat, because the version I have that we were shared with is PDF, and so I'm not able to put that in the chat. Is it not ... Oh, thank you. Yeah. Oh, no, sorry. It's not this. It's appendix two, which is [crosstalk 01:14:02] Attachment B. Sorry, Attachment B. Sorry. [Natchie 01:14:09], Juliet says she can put it in the chat because she has it. Oh, and there's also a link. Thank you, Catherine.

Debbie: I think you can do the screen sharing. There we go. Here's the letter in the screen sharing. Can you make it a little bit bigger, Greg?

Greg: Okay. Ew.

Debbie: All right. Has everyone had a chance to read the letter? and we can move on to the people who have been given voice, and then we will have discussion. I believe the first person was Dr. Foster.

Dr. Eunice Fost...: Yes. First I'd like to say, "Thank you," for having this open meeting. I'd like to say, "Thank you," for giving me voice. And I'd also like to thank the Faculty Senate people who have members who have developed this letter of support or the letters that were written by COREM, BFSAA and ChiLA. I wanted to be clear, first of all, that none of the letters were an attack on anyone. It has seemed to be misunderstood by some, and I pray and hope that the recent events of the last few months, how people understand why these letters had to be written.

Institutional racism is deadly. We've seen it with George Floyd, with Breonna Taylor, Rayshard Brooks, and so many others, but we see it every day when we see that people's lives are being curtailed, their ability to reach their potential, the fact that they are consigned to poverty by institutional racism, and we see it on campus. We see it in every institution in the US, so those of us who wrote those letters were not attacking. What we were saying is that we have a lived experience, and history documents that lived experience.

What we were saying, and what we said clearly, was that yes, the incoming provost has the research credentials that are impeccable. However, she has limited DEI experience as we just even heard from the letter today with regard to experience in working with women in STEM, and yes, she's been at the White House for her work with high school students, but she has limited experience in diversity equity inclusion. And I want to thank Dr. Anthony for her resolution, and I want to thank Faculty Senate for passing her resolution and the statements that were just made.

I wanted to really clear ... When we had the last open meeting, I heard statements and I respect everyone on the Faculty Senate, Dr. Anthony and everyone else. But it was expressed that the letters were not needed, because it had been decided that Dr. Woodruff was coming. To me, that was quite painful to hear in the sense that it was decided by this government that black folks should be enslaved. It was decided that Jim Crow was okay. It was decided to relocate Native Americans across the country in what became the Trail Of Tears, to inter Japanese Americans, and to separate most recently, Hispanic children from their families, some of whom will never be reunited. So whenever decisions are made, that does not mean they're always right decisions, and we have a responsibility as human beings and as citizens of this country, which can become much greater than it ever has been in living up to its principles, to make sure that we stand up and say, "No, wait a minute. There's some problems," and their concerns.

When it was put forth in the papers as though the individual who's coming has the excellent research credentials, which are undeniable, but also this vast commitment to DEI, which had not been demonstrated, nor by the fact that the individual had over 350 students from her own college asking for her removal, that needed to be spoken to. Given the individual, the decision was made to bring the individual in, but it has to be clear that the individual is coming in with some handicaps and some areas in which there needs to be growth. That needs to be laid on the table. And I think what you just passed is some acknowledgement of that.

All of the organizations that were just mentioned, and also EAGLE didn't write a letter, but they also stood with us, is to say we recognize and will continue to say much has to be done. We cannot accept what we've had. Institutional racism is deadly and police brutality is only the tip of the iceberg. It also exists here at Michigan State University. It has hampered people's careers, messed

with people's health, whether those are faculty, staff, students, whatever. It is real, and we feel it every day and we live it every day.

So I want to be clear. There was never an attack. We stated at the facts, and we stated our commitment to continue to say, "Change has got to come." We will work with the incoming provost as we've worked with everybody else, no matter where they've stood, but we will push because we have no choice. This is our lived experience. We don't have an option. I can't come home and take off my black skin. And I must say, "I'm black and I'm beautiful, and I'm proud to be black." Okay? I can't go somewhere and take it off. It goes with me everywhere. And the same with all the other ethnic and racial groups and anybody else that's been marginalized in many instances. It goes with us. We have no choice.

So I wanted to be clear and to thank you all for bringing this to the senate, those that wrote the letters, those that agreed to bring this and put this on the agenda, because it is important, and it takes courage. It takes courage, and often you're vilified for standing up for what is right and what must be said, and we will continue to do that. So again, I thank you, and I thank those who wrote the letters. I thank you for bringing it to the senate, because it is important to know that others do care. We're all people and we all care. You don't know how it made us feel to know that there are people who are standing up and saying, "Yes, we understand, and we care, and what can we do? We want to work to make things better." So on that note, I will stop. Thank you very much.

Debbie: Thank you very much. Who is next in the line of voice people?

Naoko Wake: I guess I can go ahead. Hi everybody. Thank you, Anna, for introducing us. And thank you, Eunice, for your statement. I'm Naoko Wake, and I'm here to describe some of the context that generated COREM letter about MSU selection of new provost. So I like to say a few things, but let me start with how COREM works, because I believe that some of you may not be very familiar with COREM. So I like to emphasize how COREM is a coalition of four major racial and ethnic faculty and staff here at Michigan State. It's consists of EAGLE, which is Native American and indigenous population, APIDOXA, Asian Pacific Island and Desi American and Asian population, Black Faculty And Staff Association, BFSAA, and ChiLA, which is Latinex population.

It's a very broad coalition, and I wouldn't claim that we would always agree on everything. I wouldn't even say that I can speak in representing every single member's voice in speaking today or any other occasions when I speak as a COREM representative. But I do like to emphasize that this is a broadest coalition that we have at MSU to speak for the people of color communities, the members at MSU. So that's how COREM letter about the selection of new provost was written.

So just to give you a sense, we have all full-time jobs, so we will just ask for volunteers to do the first draft. In this case, it was EAGLE, the Native American community members who studied the draft, and everybody participate to compose letter. And the for other occasions there will be another group who will initiate a letter, and everybody else from all four respective groups would participate in finishing the letter, so it's a genuinely collaborative effort that's based on broad coalition.

So secondly, I like to also say COREM is really based on this lived experience that Eunice just mentioned. Many of you, or probably everybody I should say, is by now familiar with what happened to Professor Stephen Hsu and how he was led to resign from his position. And also everybody is aware of how there was a racially and otherwise offensive [inaudible 01:25:26] online survey that was being sent out by one of the faculty members at the College of Communications and Arts recently. But probably less known is that there are also Asian and APIDA students, Asian American students on campus who are being called as coronavirus or more simply virus. They, in response, is a town-hall meeting to demand MSU leadership to respond, right before the campus closed down back in March.

Probably it's also less known that there was toilet paper noose that hung on the doors of African American students in one of [inaudible 01:26:11] halls, and also there was another instance where a pickup truck that was decorated with a Confederate flag was parked in front of another residential hall on campus. It's those things that really shapes what I sometimes think as alternative universe at MSU that people of color live in. It's the same space. It's still MSU campus, but for POC, it's a kind of alternative universe where we always struggle and feel intimidated, so that actually we cannot really engage with what we should be engaged with, which is research and teaching and other activities that we all want to engage as faculty, staff, and students. So that deep knowledge or really the lived experience of living in this alternative universe and desire to be integrated into the campus in all possible ways so that we could be more productive as our entire community is, is where this letter is coming from.

Thirdly, I'd like to say that, so I'm currently serving on the search committee for a chief diversity officer, and it's a very important search for so many reasons. I think we all agree that we want to have somebody who doesn't tokenize, but also refuse to be tokenized, who can say, "No," to compartmentalizing DEI issues as if it's some kind of add-on or extra curriculum activities that MSU does. I think it has to be fully integrated into everything at MSU to, again, accomplish this kind of integration that I mentioned earlier. So it's an important search for various reasons.

So how do we get this person? As a search committee member, this is a question I really think a lot about recently. One thing I can say is that, so faculty-listening session that was conducted about two months ago by now, as many as more than a hundred people showed up, and they raised many concrete points,

including credentials, qualities that they hope to see. So those voices are very important. We can bring it back to the search committee saying that as many as a hundred people showed up on a day. They voiced those concrete things that they hope to see, and we can really bring that up in our search-committee discussion in thinking about what qualities that we want to see among candidates and selection process of candidates as well.

And another thing I can say is that this is how I see the value of letters such as BFSAA or ChiLA or COREM wrote can do to express disagreement, critiques, and concerns when they are needed, so that leaders at campus can take those initiatives, including this CDO once they come to the campus. I would hope that they would have a foundation to step on so that they can stand firm by initiatives that they believed that MSU needs to change the culture and climate.

So those are some of the contexts that I see and the purposes of those letters that are under discussion. I hope that this gives you some sense of the context and the purposes of those letters. It is not meant to be reactive. It is a preventative measures and also measures that we can take for the future so that we can build on it. Thank you very much again for your time and letting me speak.

Debbie: Thank you very much. We have one more.

Dr. Anna Pegler...: I think Galia Benitez was going to speak and also Rufus Isaacs, just in support of this specific statement.

Debbie: Okay.

Galia Benitez: Thank you. Rufus is not able to connect to internet right now, but David is going to begin to speak for us, and Dana will continue. David, could you please begin?

David: Yeah. Yeah. I just wanted to add two things to the last statement. First of all, it was mentioned about the study that was done in my college, the racist study. I thought people should know that the investigator in that study was found to have done nothing wrong, and there were no repercussions for having done that study, which disgusts me. I also would add that I have two sons who are Korean. One of them was talking about coming to MSU, and after talking with my graduate students who I work with who are Asian, I had to advise my son, no, not to come to this university, and that hurts a lot, because I didn't want him to have to put up with the way that Asians have been treated on this campus. That's just to give more context to that statement.

Several weeks ago, a group of faculty senators from across the university drafted a statement responding to the announcement of our new provost. Faculty senators have hopefully now had the opportunity since Friday to read the statement. The statement was developed to support, amplify, and broadly circulate the three statements from the Black Faculty Staff and Administrators

Association, the Coalition of Racial and Ethnic Minorities, and the Chicano Latino Faculty, Staff, Specialists, and Graduate Students Association in response to the outcome of the provost search. And I hope you've all had a chance to read through those letters and absorb their important points.

With this motion, we are asking the Faculty Senate to vote on this statement today to show support for our colleagues and to highlight the aspirations of this institution as a place where diversity, equity, and inclusion should be central to our work. We want to emphasize that this is not a statement against our new provost, Dr. Woodruff, and we look forward to everything that she will bring to MSU, but we are concerned that the process followed in making this decision did not take faculty voice sufficiently into account and missed opportunity to bring expertise and greater diversity into our administrative ranks.

This statement highlights to our MSU leadership that faculty have concerns about DEI here at MSU, and we will contribute to making DEI issues a central part of our institution. The Faculty Senate will have a keen interest in ensuring that the chief diversity officer, excuse me, is well funded and an integrated position, and we ask our leaders to see other administrative openings as opportunities to further integrate DEI into our administrative ranks. Thank you.

Debbie: Thank you.

Dana: As explained in the letter, we need to make the voice and concerns of the staff, students, faculty from historically underrepresented groups central to the priorities and actions for Faculty Senate, as we, as a faculty, need to take responsibility and share the burden of advocacy for diversity, equity, and inclusion so this doesn't fall only on these members of our community. I want to encourage all of us to take a stand and support the underrepresented voices of this university and their organizations and show that this university values our voices.

This is an invitation to show our support for a cause that will benefit our university and our society for the future. Since our Michigan State community is only as strong as the most vulnerable of our members, we make the following motion. Faculty Senate supports the critical importance of diversity, equity, and inclusion experience in administrative positions at MSU, and we support the statement of MSU three organizations of underrepresented groups in response to the selection of the new provost. Thank you.

Debbie: Thank you very much. So could we use the Raise Hand function for people who would like to speak for discussion. Mick Fulton, Dr. Fulton.

Dr. Mick Fulton: So, excuse me, I support all that's been said, but I wanted to give people an insight of what I experienced. I am the chair of the University Committee on Faculty Affairs, which puts me on the steering committee as well. And by being a member of the steering committee, I was involved in the interview of all the

candidates for the provost position. Maybe it was my mistake, but I did not take skin color in consideration. I wanted what was best for the position. Dr. Woodruff was the only person in those interviews that had a vision for the future. She understood about the tough economic times that we were facing with. She had ideas about how to succeed in that time, and based upon that, I thought she was the best candidate for the position.

- Debbie: Thank you. Other comments? Going to give it a couple more ... I see Sandra Logan.
- Sandra Logan: Sorry. I'm just a little bit confused. I thought we made a motion and that we needed to have a second on the motion, before we could have discussion. Is that not correct?
- Debbie: We did have a second on the motion.
- Sandra Logan: Okay. Thanks.
- Debbie: We had two motions. We had the motion to vote on the letter, and then we had people who were given voice, and now we're having a discussion on the motion.
- Sandra Logan: Okay. Thanks.
- Debbie: Anyone else for discussion on the motion for the letter from Faculty Senate, for Faculty Senate. Jeff Ray. And ...
- Jeff Ray: Okay. Hello folks. I would just add this and it has to do with, I've been at MSU for 20 years. I'm a full professor here. I'm so frustrated and angry about what we say we're about and then what we do. And so again, I feel like we constantly have to say that this has nothing to do with Dr. Woodruff herself, but the process by which this came about, and we claim that DEI is a high priority. In this case, it would seem that it is perhaps important, but it is not a priority. And I think that happens quite a bit at MSU. You know, it's a place that I've enjoyed working at, but there is, right now, a palpable anger amongst black faculty and people of color on this campus about what is-

PART 3 OF 5 ENDS [01:39:04]

- Jeff Ray: ... on this campus about what is not happening. And I wrote a letter myself to Dr. Stanley, which I didn't get a response to. I understand that he's probably got a lot of letters on this.
- But it seems as though on this campus, and I'm sure at other campuses, black people are always told to take it easy, to give someone a chance, to let them come in and see what happens.

And so that always happens with black people and people of color. And it's also put off to, "Let's study it. Let's have a committee, let's do some considerations." So, you know, I love the previous resolution, but it's got to be about results.

It has got to be about results because if it's not about results, you will just have anger that is building and building and building. I do not want to be angry at the university that I've devoted 20 years to. I don't want to be angry with that.

And I would also note that in the letter that I wrote to Dr. Stanley is that we have three very high profile African American folks who are leaving the university this year. And so I'm always questioning what does the presidential suite up there look like? What do our colleges look like as well as what our student body looks like?

So, one thing that I would love to do is just have this equity audit of what our places look like. Because to me we are obviously falling short. And to say that we're going to do better is not enough. To ask of our incoming provost who was a talented person to ask of her to do kind of the minimal things is not enough.

Black people are always told to wait. Black people were never apologized to. Black people are always in some ways kind of shuffled off to the side and said, "We'll get to you later."

In my most cynical moment, and I'm not typically a cynical person, I hope that this is not the case, that the search for the chief diversity officer is not a consolation prize for the lack of a strong, progressive hire that we could have made.

So and I'm serious to our leadership. There is a palpable anger here, and I want you to understand that. And that more than anything right now, as soon as we can be it Zoom or in person, I think that our leadership from president to vice presidents need to have that conversation right now.

All kinds of corporations and everything are having those conversations and they're leading to direct results. And we are waiting. We got to have results. We got to have action. Otherwise, all this talk is for not.

And that's important for folks that we are trying to hire, that's important for students coming in. And it's important for those of us who have been here, whether it's a year or 20 years, and we want to give our all to Michigan State.

So when we say smarten the family, we got to mean it. We got to mean it. We can't have some folks at the big table and other folks at the small table. So I am so, so angry right now. And I just really had to express it.

So all that we're doing and saying that we're going to do was good, but I want results. I want action, please, please, please. Dr. Stanley and others, please. Thank you.

Prof. Moriarity: Thank you, Dr. Ray. Just a reminder to everyone that if you are not a faculty senator, you have to be given voice in order to speak. So thank you. Alyssa Dunn.

Alyssa Dunn: Thank you. Thank you to everyone who has spoken so far, especially our colleagues of color for coming here and sharing your experiences with us. As a white faculty member I can say that it is not your job to educate us and we appreciate you sharing your experiences.

To hear that members of the provost search committee did not look at skin color is deeply disturbing. This is a committee that is supposed to represent the university and saying that we don't look at skin color is ignoring the lived experiences of our colleagues and our students of color.

We have to recognize that not taking race into account leads to further oppression and marginalization as we have heard here. And we've also heard, of course, that the decision has been made multiple times. And so now we have an opportunity to take a stand and refuse to continue to ignore race, refuse to be colorblind or the less ablest term to be color evasive or color neutral.

And the very least that we can do, the very least, is to make this motion, approve this statement. We have to vote like people's lives are depending on it because they literally are. So please join us in voting for this.

Prof. Moriarity: Thank you. Other comments, other discussion? None. Are we ready to vote? Oh, Stephanie, sorry. Your [inaudible 01:45:33] hand function. I'm not looking at the pictures.

Dr. Anthony: Let me just say this. This is a hot topic clearly and it's an emotional issue for everyone. I'm very black. I'm not kind of black or sort of black. I'm very black. My experiences are as a deeply, deep dark black woman.

Colorism is also an issue in our culture as well. So I'm a very dark skinned black woman. I'm proud of it. I don't hide it. I'm not trying to make it softer for anyone. It is who I am. I can't change that.

And true when I get up in the morning, this is how I look maybe with a little eyeliner and all of that, but for the most part this is how I look. When we talk about the palpable anger I too feel the same way.

I want to tell you I have been very angry. I explained last time we met, when I think I had just reached a point with everything that was going on. [inaudible 01:46:38] And I couldn't say it in the way that I wanted to say it.

So I'd like to say it today in a calmer way. As the mother of seven children, four of them are young black men. I worry constantly. It's hard to explain to anyone that feeling. I have two sons that will be at Michigan State in the fall.

A second one will be coming there. He wanted to go to school in the South. I was petrified, petrified to have him that far away in a community that he could be pulled over and they would not know him. Now that's horrible to think that I impacted my son in that way, but I did.

I'm being very honest today. My response to the letter initially and part of my frustration is we worked very hard on that provost search committee. We worked very hard and I told you then, and I will tell you once again, I was the affirmative action advocate.

I went home and I researched. I researched. I wanted to make sure that at the end of the day, that I had done something positive to bring a candidate pool to this university that really reflected DEI. I took what I did very serious.

I recall at one point there were no black men on that committee that had been selected. I will say this. I advocated for Dr. Tillis to bring him in. I felt that he was a great candidate because of many factors, some of which were the fact that he was he had studied Hispanic culture, Latino culture, Afro-Caribbean.

I mean, he had a very diverse background. I advocated as well for Dr. Blanchard. When I said, and I said it, that the choice had been made I don't back away from that. The choice that had been made. I'm the type of person I look for solutions. I'm a solution-oriented person.

I realize and I respect the fact that others think differently from me, which is why I really enjoy being a part of this community. We are different people and I'm not going to condemn someone else for feeling the way that they feel when I feel very differently.

I think that's what makes us a rich community. If we all thought the same exact way this would not be any fun. And I realize that this is not fun now, but this would not be any fun. I think it's important to sometimes just step back and reassess and find and figure out from each one of us, what am I willing to give?

And people of color will say, "I have given a lot. I can't take anymore." Trust me. I understand that. But I'm asking anyone who's listening to just step back and ask yourself, "What am I willing to give? Where is my point that I can meet you halfway?"

Now I want to speak one more time on the committee of the three candidates there. I think people were under the misconception that if they send in a letter that everybody must've loved those two candidates.

Everybody did not. We took feedback from the entire university. And I don't know if this is the popular thing to say, but I can't live and try to tell you the popular thing to say. I have to speak my truth as I know it. And I think I shared this with David or Dr. Ewilson. I said there was some crazy comments that came back on all of the candidates.

Some things were almost rude and had no relevance. So just because you or I thought that one person was the absolute best, there were many people who did not. No matter whom the candidate was, everybody did not agree.

I reviewed the comments along with other members of the provost search committee and everybody did not agree. So I want you to know that. And I want you to know that that provost search committee worked very hard. My colleagues and I on that committee put a lot of time and effort into it and it was a very intense process.

Now, nobody got to fighting or anything, but it was pretty tough. It was pretty intense. What I'd like to do now is I realize where we're at. I know the palpable anger. I live it. I have family connected to Rosewood. If you are familiar with Rosewood you know that it's a town that was basically obliterated off of the face of the earth.

My father is from Oklahoma. I know the story of Tulsa, Oklahoma very well. There's a lot of pain in my own family as it relates to these circumstances. But I have to stop somewhere and say, "What can I do? What are the solutions?"

I have to also respect the fact that you may feel differently than I do. I am willing to meet you there. And we will have to feel our way along. We're going to have to because we're all different people. Initially, I did not support the letter because I thought that... I mean I understood the nature of it, but I was like, well what's the point?

Because they're so angry I'm not sure that it will solve a purpose. But now I look back in retrospect and I always will appreciate and admire Dr. Eunice Foster. So let me be very clear. I love Dr. Foster. And I believe that even in my current role, she was someone who advocated for my own department.

So I tried to understand that. I tried to understand it, and I knew the anger, I felt the anger and I could relate to the anger. But we are going to have to find a point where we can all meet in the middle, whether we'd like to or not.

We're also going to have to ask extensively what are the solutions? What specific things do we want people to do? That is what I try to do today in that resolution to come up with something specific so she would know, this is what we want you to do.

I believe that we will be successful. And even though I spoke of a circumstance 116 years ago, I do not believe for one minute that Michigan State will have to wait another 116 to make progress. It begins with us right now and I think that we can do it.

But it is going to require a great deal of work. For any of my colleagues who differ from me in terms of your opinion, I still respect you. I totally respect you and I respect your opinion and I embrace you. And I'm glad to be working with you because we learn from each other every day and I'm certainly learning from you.

So I just wanted to speak to Dr. Ray's anger. I felt it. I understand it. I'm very angry. But my anger, unless I channel it to something else, I don't know what will become of it other than it being anger. So I'm asking that everyone just try to work together at this point, because there has never been a body at this moment at this time like us. We are here together.

I'm an alum of this university. I see its success as much of my own. Now I don't know about anybody else, but I think that people here aren't invested in the success of this institution and this body can make a difference. So if we come up with specificity and we're willing to work together, I think it can be done. So thank you. I just wanted to share that. I appreciate your listening.

Prof. Moriarity: Thank you very much. All right. Are we ready to vote? Same process as before. You go to the website on your email and we will have 90 seconds in which to vote.

(silence).

Greg, can you let us know when the 90 seconds is up?

Greg: Certainly will. We've got about 15 seconds remaining.

Prof. Moriarity: Okay. Thank you.

Greg: The voting has concluded.

Prof. Moriarity: Thank you. Can you give us the results?

Greg: Standby.

Prof. Moriarity: We have 40, yes. 14, no. And six abstain. The motion passes. Next on the agenda is policing, which we have as an... Oh, I'm sorry. I'm reading wrong I think. Policing. And that was simply put on the agenda something that could perhaps elicit discussion from and questions from faculty members who might have questions to ask president Stanley about policing. So if there are people who have questions, please raise your hand.

If not, we can move to the next agenda item. Seeing no questions, I will move to financial impacts of COVID-19. And this is Dave Bilek, Vice President for Planning and Budgets.

Dave Bilek: Professor Moriarty, if I might, can I share my screen here? Will that work I hope? I think that Greg is the person who knows how to do that. Greg, can you...

Greg: Yes, he should be able to share a screen now.

Prof. Moriarity: Okay.

Dave Bilek: Okay. Professor Moriarity, we had discussed a bit ago the financial impacts of COVID-19 dovetailed directly to the 20-21 university budget. As a result of that, we've combined these two and we'll try to respond to those pretty quickly and provide a briefing that we hope is informative here.

In terms of approach, the protection of the academic mission and the ability for that mission to progress in a safe manner is one of our most important objectives of the budget this year.

It is fairly unique in the sense that we have used number of sources to try to distribute the impact of this issue over time, and also to distributed in a way that understands that there are continuing uncertainties in terms of the progression of the disease and in terms of the reactions from our economy.

So it is always true that a budget is put forth as a projection. This year that is certainly the case, that it is a projection based upon our best understanding and best use of different scenarios. But we need to be up front with you in indicating that it is a projection.

It is our best estimates based upon what we know today, but stipulating up front that the disease continues to change and our economy continues to react in this way. So if you might, I don't want to come forward with a level of false precision as we move forward.

These are very difficult times financially, and we ask your time and insights as we go forward. Okay?

Impacts in this current year range from about \$50 to \$60 million. At this point as the year is progressing to closure it's closer to the \$60 million figure. We have a estimate from the last day or two that it might be slightly above that.

But you can see the actions that have been taken here, the hiring issue. As you may be aware we have implemented compensation cuts. We also have implemented a furlough program. And this furlough program from my perspective is unique at least in my time here in the sense that of it allows us to

furlough people where we have to and where we must, but at the same time to provide those individuals with continuing healthcare.

At this time, the furloughs of six to 800 people is an estimate within residence hall programs alone. We're now approaching that 800 level in residence hall programs. Again, the savings are approximating about \$3 million per month. So this is a very significant issue.

We've also gone through and have undertaken a review of capital projects. Vice President Wu has headed a group that has reviewed our projects and where we possibly could we have deferred or set those projects aside in order to allow greater flexibility for solving the problems that we're working with in terms of the budget.

I think those are pretty straightforward. If it is okay, let me share with you some of the explicit finances in terms of our assumptions at this time, the large assumption being our in-state appropriation, a reduction of 15%, that is unprecedented in our time.

It would result in about \$46 million dollars of loss. There would be additional losses and appropriation support for both ag bio and MSU extension. These are important judgments, but it is also important to share that these totals could go higher.

We believe this is reasonable, and this certainly pushes our planning parameters and so forth. But in terms we look at this, these as I say are projections, and there are scenarios that are even more concerning than this.

Let me come back to the tuition and fees for just a moment. Investment income, as we use some of our reserves to cushion the impact in this particular year and to allow for a smooth implementation of reductions over time. But most importantly, that we allow the time to protect our students, to assure that students can graduate on time and to assure that they can take and move their own journeys or their own curriculums forward in a way that we're not providing impediments.

So we do need to understand that we have committed one time resources to try to smooth this path, to protect our students and protect your faculty and researchers. We have as a result of that in the lower note here, we have committed about \$90 million. About \$74 million of this comes from our facilities and facility projects that we have either deferred or discontinued or take it off the drawing board.

And about \$16 million from a facility reserve funding that we had set up for future projects. So this is an important component here of trying to provide a very balanced approach that gives us time to react and to address this crisis in a manner that protects both our students and our faculty and our employees.

Let me just show you one other piece. As we looked at that enrollment item a minute ago, what it showed was a \$63 million contraction. That contraction really is a product of four different actions. The first with respect to international students, our forecasting is that about 75% of the international students who would be new, entering students, in a typical year would probably not come to Michigan State as a result of this crisis.

Our borders have simply been closed. Of those students who are already here, our concern is that those numbers could diminish by about 20%. So as a result of that we look toward about a \$63 million issue. If you go down the page just a little bit more in terms of our domestic out-of-state students, we're forecasting about a 10% change there, a 10% contraction.

Again, the \$15 million item. Summer, not this coming summer, but a summer ago, our enrollments contracted and as a result that impacts this year's budget and so you see a number there.

With respect to all of this, we have looked at and examined our Michigan enrollment and believe that it is reasonable to attempt to bring forward about 700 students. These are students that had already met Michigan State University requirements. They were on our waiting lists.

And so as we moved to that waiting list, we try to admit these students and we believe that that might offset some of our issues here by about \$9 million. As a result of that our entering class I still believe will be close to the prior year or slightly above at about the 8,600 level for the number of entering students, which is what we're now forecasting as we go forward.

If we look at the expenditure components of our budget this year, a couple of things are extraordinarily important to us. One is that we have continued our financial aid increases in order to assure that we provide students with the best possibility of attending Michigan State.

We had 4% in early on in our planning, and we have made sure that that stayed in place. Let's come back to the salaries in just a moment. The graduate assistants go forward. We've had some savings on utilities, both in terms of intelligent consumption as well as some changes in our plant that has made it more efficient.

Our supplies and operations are stable. We're proposing unit reductions of about 3%, okay? That will yield about \$20 million in terms of some of our solutions. We also see, I have requirements for additional contraction, that contraction comes in a \$30 million reduction in our retirement program where we will fund at this point the direct match.

The employee puts aside 5%. Michigan State will put aside 5%. That is a change from a two for one match that exists today. That saves about \$30 million.

There's also a employee salary contraction of about 2.3% that has been graduated based upon income and based upon employee category or employee type.

That's a quick review. I wanted to just mention here with respect to faculty salaries that they are flat this year, but we have continued to place here a faculty market fund that we hope will be available to address the competitive pressures that we know are out there.

The framework items that we have here, this is \$3 million that has been part of our longterm plan for investing in technology, another million dollars for our global issues activity. And then finally, a \$2 million component that is a pass through that relates to things like our revenue-based initiatives and that type of support.

That's a quick rundown of the general fund activities within the auxiliary programs. Intercollegiate athletics is you'll see on the board here provides about a \$11 million reduction in their material and their budgeting.

This is based upon not a worst case scenario, but one in which it envisions the football program being staged across the big tent. Residence hall programs reductions here also very significant. The 810 employee furloughs and so forth we mentioned here, and as I say, that's about a 300, excuse me, about a \$3 million savings per month.

As I mentioned, I want to make it very clear that these are projections. They can increase or they can decrease depending upon the path of the disease and the way the economy reacts.

You can see on the left hand side some of the options if we need to identify further reductions. On the right hand side you can see some levers that we would pull if indeed our revenues prove to be higher what we had anticipated. So that's sort of a straight up, quick review of our budget activities-

PART 4 OF 5 ENDS [02:12:04]

Dave Bilek:

A straight up, a quick review of our budget activities. These budgets will be proposed to the trustees on Friday. We've tried to follow the principles that we have noted here. And as we go forward, any kinds of questions that you may have, we would be pleased to address. Professor Gordon had sent a letter with four or five questions. I'd be happy to follow up, Anna with you, either this evening or tomorrow Wednesday, and to work through those questions to your satisfaction. Professor Moriarty, that concludes my presentation at this point. I don't know if perhaps Dr. Stanley has other comments or considerations to add, but this concludes my notes.

- Debbie: Thank you very much. Are there questions or comments? Again, please use the Raise Hand function, over in your participant list. Yes, Juliet Guzzetta? I'm not sure, Juliet, are you on? You may be, I can't hear you. Let's move on to Megan Donahue.
- Megan Donahue: Hello. I just had a quick request and I'm just going to amplify what I'm seeing on the chat. Could we get a copy of these slides?
- Dave Bilek: There would, Professor Moriarty would be happy to post them at wherever and however you wish. I can put them on my website, yours, which or whatever you might like.
- Megan Donahue: Thank you.
- Debbie: Thank you. We will definitely post them. Thank you very much. Juliet, I'm still not able to connect with you. Is anybody else hearing her? No, I am not. Actually, could you put your question in the chat? That would be great. In the meantime, can we go to Jennifer Johnson?
- Jennifer Johnso...: I was going to say, if you can quickly, I think it might be worth answering the questions in the Appendix that Dr. Gordon sent, but I'll mention one of them and ask another question. The first, people have been asking, since we financed the \$500 million for the NASA payout, can we finance some of our way out of this? And then, my question I had is, if you could speak quickly to the decision, if they are about, if we do better than we expect, why we're restoring the unit budgets first, instead of salaries and retirement first?
- Dave Bilek: Let's go back, if we could do that just for a minute, to make sure that we're on the same page. The reference here, is to decrease or eliminate the one-time resource draws, which in my mind would include the cause of the salary contractions and so forth. The unit reductions are further down the list.
- Jennifer Johnso...: Okay, Thank you. That's very helpful.
- Dave Bilek: Okay. The issue of borrowing is an important one. I know that the University of Michigan has received a fair amount of press, with some of their planning. We do need to make sure that we understand that that planning is based significantly upon their hospital activities. Most institutions that we're familiar with, including our own, balance our debt portfolio and our ability to pay and we try to come up with a manner that is most advantageous. At this point, the resources that we have, are such that borrowing does cause some concern. At some point we may see more stability, and there may be an opportunity to borrow for this or for other items. But at this time, we really don't know how the disease will progress and a would prefer to proceed as we've outlined, at least at this point.
- Debbie: Thank you. The only hand that I still have is Juliet Guzzetta.

- Dave Bilek: She's asked her question in the Chat.
- Debbie: Yeah. I really have a medic question which is, "How can faculty better engage with the process of decision-making when it comes to their work and their pay?" Many colleagues across the colleges want to have a conversation with the administrators, who are making the decisions about their salaries and retirement packages, but they don't know the forum through which to do so. Is it Senate?
- Dave Bilek: Professor Moriarty, I think perhaps you would answer or address the question as well. But from my perspective, I work, spending at least a couple hours a week with the University Committee on Faculty Affairs and Professor Fulton, as chair of that committee and his members are free to ask, and to probe and to request information that is pretty much across the board. So, the conversation with the college member of the University Committee on Faculty Affairs, is perhaps one way to start. I'm sure there are many others.
- Debbie: And the University Committee on Faculty Affairs has representation from every college on that committee. And that has been the process through which... The University Committee on Faculty Affairs has two subcommittees. It has the Personnel subcommittee and the Budget subcommittee. And so that has been the process through which budget then comes to... Things come to the steering committee from UCFA. However, recently there has been concern, expressed from faculty Senators that they would like to have an annual budget talk. And we started that before COVID-19 crashed and stopped everything. And I think we had come up with a list of questions that Dave Byelich was going to answer. And we never got around to that and now we're obviously onto a very different budget scene. But I think it was decided in faculty Senate to have Dave Byelich come, at least once a year and make it a regular thing, that he would come and discuss the budget. So that will, I believe that that is in the future. And that's what we're going to be doing.
- Dave Bilek: Professor Moriarty just one note between us, my colleagues point out that I attended the faculty Senate and then school closed, as of March. But we did take your question seriously. We answered them. We put them together. They're out on my website at budget.msu.edu information. I think Items and Information is the name of it. If at any point you were a member or a subgroup of the faculty Senate would like to meet, either over the Summer or in the Fall to review those questions and to continue that conversation, I would be very pleased to do so.
- Debbie: Thank you very much. Could you repeat the website again?
- Dave Bilek: Just simply budget@msu.edu.
- Debbie: Okay. And it's under what category again?

- Dave Bilek: I believe it's called Items and Information.
- Debbie: Okay. Thank you very much.
- Dave Bilek: It's about halfway down in it.
- Debbie: Okay. That's very helpful. Thank you very much. So the questions that we had, have been answered and they're available on the website.
- Dave Bilek: Yeah.
- Debbie: And any other questions for Dave Byelich? I'm just going to read Juliet Guzzetta again, because we can't get her verbally. So she says, "But decisions are made frequently before we have had a chance to discuss, like yesterday's email." Anything, anything else? Jennifer, sorry?
- Jennifer Johnso...: I think, we can all do better at communicating. I think these are good issues and good concerns. I think that faculty Senate itself bears some responsibility for this, in the sense that its each of the Senator's responsibility to be in touch with their constituencies. That's made difficult by the fact that we often don't have college email lists and other things. But, I think that starting actually with Philomena's group, at the end of last year and over the summer, a lot of us have been working on ways to try to make the communication more efficient and effective. I just wanted to thank the Senators, I know many of you really do work hard to reach out to the folks that you represent, and to bring their concerns back and not see this as sort of an opportunity to fill the service check-box on your tenure.
- But, you really do work hard. And so I think, as a faculty Senate, we bear some responsibility amongst ourselves in trying to figure out how to make this process work. Where there's 77 of us, who represent 5,700 of us, and how do we do that in a way that's really representative? So I guess that is to say we're working on it. And if you have thoughts about how to do that better, please bring them forward because it is really important. Thank you.
- Debbie: And it has been one of the continuing items of discussion that we have had for a long time. And I think we're actually making progress on it, but it is something that becomes very important. And thank you, to Anna Pegler-Gordon, she just put the website in the Chat function for anyone who wants to, the OPB office of planning and budgets@msu.edu is now on the Chat Anna Pegler-Gordon? Sorry.
- Anna Pegler-Gor...: I just wanted to expand on maybe what Juliet is addressing here. I absolutely agree with Jennifer that there is the issue of communication, from the Budget Office to faculty Senate and the ability of faculty Senate is to be able to take the information. And so I just learned that these answers to our questions from before, are actually posted on the website. And so there was that issue of communication, but I think that what Juliet is addressing is the fact that there

has been a lot of communication from faculty. A lot of concern around the budget cuts, specifically around the retirement cuts, around the ways to finance this, around all of the impacts that this will have on faculty. And essentially what was decided and sent out in an email yesterday, was exactly what was said two months ago in the steering committee.

And, so in fact that the communication can go from the Budget Office to faculty Senate, and then through the faculty better. But faculty are really communicating and we're sharing this information. And I would say with the one exception of the issue, of differential impacts that faculty raised in faculty Senate at our last in-person meeting. Our voices had zero impact. The university administration decides what it needs to do, and it does it. I think that's what Juliet is pointing to, is that really, we were trying to have an impact, but it's not really happening.

President Stanl...: So I think, first of all, thank you for correcting and saying that exactly there was changes made. And it was definitely in response to the thing we heard the most at that meeting, as I recall. So when we had that meeting, the biggest concern expressed by faculty at that meeting, was the issue around gradations essentially. So the people at the lowest income faculty would not be bearing the same percentage count, as people at higher income. So, that was very important. We heard that issue and did deal with it. The other things were decisions made, based on what we thought would work best essentially at this point in time. And we do know that people have had concerns about this.

I'll point out as I have before, that in other institutions around the country, that did adopt not matching retirement matches. They completely removed the retirement match for the University of Michigan State, because we had this additional 5% component to it. While, I realize it still represents money. Did we feel we wouldn't be hindering so much people's retirement contributions, because we still were able to provide a match and that was important to us.

So we felt this was the right step to do, that would have the least impact on people's take-home pay. And yet at the same time, enable us to have significant savings that we really need. This is an extraordinary budget situation, we're in right now. You cannot overemphasize how bad it is, it is an absolute perfect storm in every way, shape and form. It's a perfect storm, in terms of interfering with international students, which already was in decline. It's a perfect storm, in terms of it's interfering with our State Allocation because the State's finances are at an all time low, in terms of revenue potentially, so that's a tremendous impact. And it takes us at a time when, because of things in the past, we're leveraged in terms of our borrowing capacity, at a place we haven't been before.

So for all these reasons, the measures we have to take are significant and they hurt. And I appreciate the sacrifice people are making. And I appreciate people's concern about their fellow employees as well. And I think that's very important.

So I think we have tried to hear that. We are going to have times, when suggestions come from the faculty that we end up doing something different. But where there's going to be other times, where we listen and are able to do something. So, I think the characterization that there was no listening is not fair. And I think we're going to continue to listen and hopefully as we move forward. And when we're doing unit reductions, hopefully there'll be discussions with unit directors on things like that as well. So we do want to listen.

It is important to listen, but at some point in time, we have to make decisions, because we had essentially \$169 million short-fall that we have to fill. And these are the decisions we made to do it. And finally, one of the goals, and one of the reasons it gets to this 5% again, and as well as the percentage reduction salary, was preserving jobs. Because in this situation, you may have seen other institutions in Michigan, had been laying-off faculty and reducing their numbers of Adjunct-Professors. That's been in the news.

We've made a great effort to avoid doing that. We wanted to keep our academic strength high. We want to keep our research capacity going. And this is very important to us, to maintain those things and all the people, of course, who contribute those things. We thought that was very important. So that's been a part of this as well, is to find ways to not have lay-offs or eliminate positions. Eliminate programs at this point, but still keep things going at the university.

Debbie: Thank you. I also just wanted to read something that I received from Bill Beekman, who is the Athletic Director. Which, I know that there was a lot of chatter today about an article that appeared, that said that the athletic coaches would not be taking salary reductions. So, this is from Mr. Beekman, "While MSU Athletics is self-funded, and does not receive funding from the university general fund, athletics employees including coaches, will be taking salary reductions. Details are still being finalized and an announcement should be forthcoming by the end of the month."

So, I received that in clarification for some emails that I had sent inquiring about this. He was concerned that the media reports were inaccurate. On other questions for Dave Byelich? Thank you, Dave.

President Stanl...: Thank you very much. I appreciate your time. Look forward to chatting. Bye-bye.

Debbie: Bye-bye. And next we have undergraduate course delivery. Professor Mark Largent, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education and Dean of Undergraduate Studies.

Professor Mark ...: Well, good evening, everybody. Thank you for the invitation to come here. I'll try to be as concise as possible, and I'm happy to unpack anything that I say more, in the interest of saving some time this late in the day. So, we made a decision about how we would deliver courses in the Fall, given some of the

parameters that had been imposed on us. We work within three values, that we've been very clear about from the start. They were values that were provided to us by the president, but they're also values that we've operated under, in the student success community for a while now.

First and foremost, is the health and wellness of faculty, staff, students, and their families. Second, are student success issues, related to progress to the degree and related to supporting those students and recognizing that very different students have a very wide range of different kinds of needs, both in-person and online. And third is a recognition of our need to be good stewards, the fiscal health of the university. And when you, thinking back to the violet slides, recognize that the largest liability that we have, going into the coming academic year, isn't the declining state funding. It's the decline in tuition revenue.

That's because undergraduate tuition makes up about 72% of our General Fund. So small changes in undergraduate tuition revenue, equates to large changes in our General Fund budgets. We have had imposed upon us, physical distancing requirements, that will mean that students will need to stay six feet from each other when they are inside of classrooms. When we do that, in the 320 classrooms that we have on campus, we go from just over 24,000 seats available at any one moment, to about 6,500 seats available at any one moment. That means that we have to figure out how we teach the same number of classes to the same number of students, but we do so with one quarter the capacity that we had last semester.

To do this, we, doing the math, figured we'd have to do two things. The first, we'd have to move online to some significant degree. Secondly, we would have to, as Leo Kempel, the Dean of engineering has said, "Stretch space and time." We're going to have to use new spaces that we haven't used before to teach. And we are going to have to teach at times that we have not generally taught in the past. About 70% of our classes typically have start times between 10:00 AM and 3:00 PM. That five hour start time window, is when we have our densest use of campus facilities. Prior to 10:00 AM and after 3:00 PM, it falls off. We're going to have to teach more 8:00 AM classes, and we're going to have to teach more afternoon, late afternoon and evening classes, in order to make better use of the seats that are available to us.

We will likely have to run labs on Saturdays, which is going to necessitate a significant investment in resources for lab personnel, safety oversight, things like that. We will probably have to teach more evening classes in the labs, especially the chemistry labs, which have some of the greatest structural deficits, for what we've got. The 50-25-25 split, came about as a recognition of this decreased seat availability. We assumed by knocking it down to 25% of our available seats, we could claw back, about an additional 12.5%, and getting us up to about 37.5% of our seat capacity.

If we used some new spaces, places like the Huntington Club in the stadium or rooms in the Union. There aren't a lot of those rooms around though, so the rest of the 12.5% that we get, will have to come from teaching earlier in the day later in the day and on weekends. So, we have about 37.5% of the capacity to teach on campus, that we had before. Now, going back to our first value, of health and wellness. There is a competing demand for how we use those seats. On one side of the equation are faculty, who we believe we would have a very difficult time encouraging to teach online, to the degree that we needed them to. When we first started saying, half of the in-person classes will need to migrate to online modes of instruction, that seemed like a very heavy lift.

The faculty have responded in this overwhelmingly positive way. I think we have been really happily surprised, by how quickly faculty have seized on the opportunity to become more adept at teaching in an online environment. We have over 700 faculty, who have gone through the week-long soirees that The Hub has been offering, including the Provost has gone through the soiree, because she will be teaching back at UVA in the Fall, online.

It has gotten extraordinarily positive responses. The result has been that we have a very large number of faculty, who wants to teach online in the Fall. I am also aware of the fact that there are other reasons why faculty members may want to teach online. They may feel safer, teaching online for themselves or their family. They may have uncertainties about childcare, or care that they have to provide to other people in their household. There may be transportation issues. We understand and recognize all of that.

The 25% in-person, right now we are still at about 50% online, 40% in-person and 10% hybrid. We need to cultivate more hybrid classes. The hybrid classes would use classroom space at about 50% of the rate that in-person classes use them, but it gives students that in-class experience. The other tension that we have, is that the students want in-person class experiences. This is extraordinarily important to them. I will tell you I field every day, between a half dozen and a dozen responses to parents or students, who are very unhappy about the number of classes that they will have to take online in the Fall.

I tell them about the resource constraints, but I also recognize that if a student's taking four or five classes and all five of them are online, that we're probably a little bit out of balance, at least for that students. But also there's a real relevant recognition that going to college, is not synonymous with going to class. That the college experience extends beyond the classroom. And so part of our important thing that we need to do, is to assert very strongly the value proposition for college, not just classes, but college. We're working to do that. It's a value proposition, frankly, we've never had to do before.

So trying to figure out how and where, and when we make that value proposition, is an important part of the work that we're doing right now. Many of you have been leaders in this space, moving both to remote teaching. And

now in the Fall to this, 50-25-25 division of online, in-person and hybrid, I want to thank all of you. The faculty have been really amazing, through an extraordinarily difficult time. And you know, this is not anything that's going to be resolved at Thanksgiving.

We're going to have to figure out Spring. That's our next step right now. And to try and figure out how we do that in ways that continue with the values of health and wellness, student success and fiscal health are important to us, but also as a recognition that we have a massive amount of uncertainty about this Fall. The Spring is even more uncertain and we're going to have to figure out when and how we make those decisions. I'm happy to answer any questions that you might have or take any suggestions. The more suggestions, the better at this point.

Debbie: Questions for Dr. Largent?

Dave Bilek: If I could speak for a second, Debra. I just wanted to echo what was said by Mark on the incredible effort that faculty have been putting in. And the effort that has been done, was done to switch remotely. I think I've been talking about it when people ask me, "What was one of the most amazing things I've seen since I've come to Michigan State?" I talk about the ability people had to just drop, and switch on a dime and begin teaching remotely at very short notice. And I hope that same ingenuity and commitment, I think we're seeing it again as we do this planning for Fall, which I think again, in academic history, it's probably unprecedented, the kind of planning that has to go into this. So I appreciate everybody's cooperation and everybody's help in getting this done.

Debbie: Thank you. Joyce Mayer?

Joyce Mayer: I have a question about the hybrid classes, and we discussed this in our college meeting just a little bit ago. I think in our department, we're a little confused about what exactly constitutes hybrid. We read Provost Sullivan's guidelines very carefully, and there's all these distinct and very interesting and creative forms of hybrid teaching, that don't fit the usual definition or ways we think about hybrid, which is you meet with your students one day. And then the other day of the week you teach online or you do something asynchronously. So my question is, from what Mark Largent just said, it sounds like hybrid is that traditional model, but Provost Sullivan's guidelines give us a lot of different kinds of leeway there. So, I'm asking for clarification about what exactly is hybrid?

Professor Mark ...: Yeah, there's a lot of space for creativity in that hybrid space. And the fact that only about 10% of our in-person classes have transformed into hybrid, tells me that we need to do a little bit more work in helping to prime the pump, to kickstart our faculty's creativity in using more hybrid approaches.

At its simplest, hybrid simply means you're using both the classroom in-person environment and the online environment, they compliment each other. In some cases, they compliment each other simply by switching out the students. On Tuesday, you teach half the class in-person and online, and on Thursday, they switch places. The people who were online, become in-class and the people who were in-class could go online. That's its simplest construction.

There's actually dozens of different models for using hybrid in really sophisticated ways. RAC uses it in really interesting ways, especially in the summer. And has interesting and I think very innovative ways in which they do it. What happened last night, actually, after a group of us had a conversation that started just like Joyce's question. Jeff Graybeal reached out to four people, who he knows think a lot about these kind of issues. And he asked them to build, what he called a pattern book. Which I think is design thinking language, for some examples that you might find could be useful for thinking about this.

From my point of view, it's only about resources, it's about desks and online space. And the question is, "How do you use those desks and that online space to give students a sense of interpersonal relationships with each other?" Because that is the college experience, rather than the absorbing knowledge experience. Jeff, I think will turn that out pretty quickly and his group. They tend to work very fast on these sorts of things.

So what I'm hoping is that by next week, we will start providing examples that might be used. But from our point of view, it's a classroom resource issue. We only have so many seats and if you can use the seat half as often and still give students some in-person, it's good. Everything though begins with your learning outcomes, "What are your courses learning outcomes, and what tools are at your disposal can be used to meet those learning outcomes?"

Students want to feel a sense of connection with you, right? Our job isn't to fill a bucket, it's the light of fire. So, how can we use the tools available to us, to light that fire? And I think The Hub's doing a very good job in a very stressful time. But we also need to know, what they can provide for resources, that might help, generate the creativity we know is inherent among our faculty?

Debbie: Thank you. Other questions for Dr. Largent? Seeing none. Thank you very much, much appreciated. And we now move on to comments from the floor. Joyce Mayer, or is your hand just still up from before? Or do you have a comment? Thank you. I'm seeing numbers. Is there a motion to adjourn?

Professor Mark ...: So moved.

Debbie: Any second, anywhere?

Dave Bilek: Second.

This transcript was exported on Jun 25, 2020 - view latest version [here](#).

Debbie: Thank you. All in favor, signify by raising your hand. And just a reminder to the steering committee, that we are staying on for a little bit after this meeting. Thank you all very much. Stay safe, stay well, please take care. And we will be scheduling another faculty Senate meeting in July, date to be announced. It'll be on a Tuesday at 3:15PM at the usual time.

Dave Bilek: I'm going to stop the recording now.

Debbie: Okay. Thank you.

PART 5 OF 5 ENDS [02:44:33]