



**This transcript was prepared by the
Secretary for Academic Governance and
has not been approved by the Faculty Senate.**

*Per Robert's Rules of Order (Newly Revised) (12th ed.), §§ 48:1 and 48:6,
only approved minutes constitute the official record of the Faculty Senate.*

Comments from the Zoom chat have been lightly edited for clarity, and they appear in italics. Unless otherwise noted, they appear at the approximate times they were sent. Where comments were clearly responses to others, they appear next to each other. Comments that did not substantially add to the discussion have been omitted.

Please direct any questions or corrections to acadgov@msu.edu.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Tyler Silvestri".

Tyler Silvestri
Secretary for Academic Governance



Table of Contents

Approval of Agenda and January 19, 2021 Minutes	2
President Stanley’s Remarks	2
Marlon Lynch Confirmed as New Chief of Police	2
MSU Formalized 30-Year Partnership with Henry Ford Health System	3
U.S. News & World Report Rankings for Online Programs	3
COVID-19 Positivity Rate and Vaccine Distribution Update	3
Black History Month Events	4
Strategic Planning Update	5
Provost Woodruff’s Remarks.....	6
Update on SIRS Supplemental Survey.....	6
MSU Students Named Gates Cambridge and Knight-Hennessey Scholars	7
Chairperson Johnson’s Remarks	8
Correction to Minutes	8
Conclusions from Faculty Get-To-Know-You Meetings.....	9
Thoughts on Proposed Code of Professional Standards	11
Academic Governance Efficiency Metrics	12
University Committee on Curriculum Report.....	13
UCUE Subcommittee Report on Webcam Use in Online Instruction	15
Resolutions from Ad Hoc Committee in Response to the Office for Civil Rights.....	16
Discussion of Policy and Practices Resolution	19
President’s Input	20
The Resolution is Withdrawn	22
Training of Administrators, Faculty, and Staff Resolution.....	23
The Resolution is Adopted	25
Administrator Review Resolution	26
President’s Input	33
The Resolution is Adopted	34
Proposed Code of Professional Standards	35
Faculty Caregiving Resolution.....	40
The Resolution is Adopted	43
Budget Presentation from Vice Presidents Dave Byelich and Mark Haas	45
VP Byelich shares goal to reverse salary cuts in FY22, retirement contributions in FY23.....	52
Faculty assertion that federal funds can potentially be used for caregiving relief	54
Policing Resolutions.....	59
President’s Input	63
Six of Seven Resolutions Are Adopted	71
Closing Comments and Adjournment	71



Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson

Is there any amendment, objections to the agenda for today? Alright, so, without objection, the agenda passes.

Are there any objections or amendments to the minutes from last month? Alright, so, without objection, the minutes pass.

We will have remarks from our president.

President
Samuel Stanley

So, thank you so much, Dr. Johnson, and good afternoon, everybody. And I think I'm going to start my remarks with two personal items and briefly talk about a key partnership in Detroit, some new online rankings, and then I'll finish with the COVID update, some upcoming events, and a brief strategic initiative updates. And, again, I'll try and keep my remarks relatively short.

On Friday, the Board of Trustees confirmed Marlon Lynch as the new police chief for Michigan State University and also Vice President for Public Safety. There's an expansion of duties over time associated with that, and, of course, an expectation of increased focus beyond traditional policing, such as the newly restructured Community Outreach Unit. Some areas related to cyber security, continued engagement in emergency management, and traffic and transportation issues, all of those on campus. Chief Lynch will start on April 1st. Looking forward to him arriving. Over 25 years, he's led some of the largest academic police departments in the country, including the University of Chicago and New York University. And importantly, he's a Spartan. He has a bachelor's degree in criminal justice, and so we're really pleased to welcome him back to MSU.

And the provost may talk further about this, but we also approved Linda Greene as the inaugural dean of the fully integrated College of Law.

Since we last met, MSU has formalized a very important partnership, a 30-year agreement



President Stanley, cont.

with the Henry Ford Health System. This is really going to foster, we hope, innovative research. We want to develop together best from class cancer care. And very, very importantly for us, we want to address the needs of underserved communities, both urban and rural. This is going to give us an opportunity to really align our basic research with translational and clinical research. It will create an integrated network of scientists, scholars, and health care practitioners. And I really consider it—and this is important—to be a university-wide initiative since so many of the problems we and Henry Ford want to deal with are not solvable by purely medical solutions. So many other disciplines are needed for their solution. And, again, we look forward to bringing the university together in support of this effort.

We had some good rankings for some of our online programs, and I just wanted to give a shout out to the programs that have continued to excel and U.S. News & World Report for online programs. Our graduate online education program maintains its number four position; Curriculum Instruction and Educational Administration Supervision Program's ranked number two; the College of education online Master's program for veterans was also number two; Criminal Justice rose five places to number five; number three for veterans' program; and our online graduate program in business ranked in the top 25 for the fifth consecutive year, coming in at number 21. And I congratulate the faculty in those programs for their excellence.

As we moved into Spring Semester, we continue to monitor COVID-19 and support the state's vaccination program. As you know, we had a bump, or surge, in cases as students first came back and we took actions to enhance physical distancing, and other actions were taken under the leadership of Dave Weismantel and [Senior Vice President] Gore. Those have been really



President Stanley, cont.

effective. So in the week of January 25th, in our COVID-19 early detection testing, we were seeing a high of 2.1% of people testing positive in this widespread testing. The week of February 1st, that had fallen to 1.8%. By the week of February 8th to 0.8%. And it continues to go down. We believe it'll go down further this week. And that's marked by the number of positive cases we've had. People in isolation and quarantine have fallen dramatically over these past few weeks.

I think, again, it demonstrates the effectiveness of these kinds of interventions but also points out the importance of maintaining our discipline in this and maintaining physical distancing, maintaining mask wearing, and making sure we're really following the correct protocols in everything we do.

Our vaccination center in the Pavilion that we set up our inoculation center in partnership with the Ingham County Health Department continues to deliver in a high capacity way. It's actually closed today because of the snow, or was, at least, because of road access. I don't know if it's reopened, but otherwise it's been running. Governor Whitman toured it last week, and it's had national news coverage for its effectiveness in delivering vaccines.

On Thursday, we'll have a live webcast town hall and a roundtable discussion for faculty and staff focusing on COVID-19 vaccination. I'll be joined by Dave Weismantel and Debra Furr-Holden in talking about this. We're looking forward to answering as many questions as possible. We've already received dozens covering such topics as the safety, efficacy, and availability of vaccines. And, again, I look forward to talking with everyone about it.

During Black History Month, which, of course, is February, we're pleased to join the celebration of the contributions of Black Spartans and those helping MSU more fully live its [diversity, equity, and inclusion] values.



President Stanley, cont. And I hope you'll be able to view our 31st annual Excellence in Diversity Awards program. It's recorded in virtual this year and will be available online starting February 24th. And, importantly, we had an outstanding lecture from our new chair of our new Department of African American and African Studies, Dr. Ruth Nicole Brown delivered the Board of Trustees research presentation, and it was simply outstanding. And we're really glad to have her leading this outstanding department at MSU.

I want you to be aware of the fact that the Office of Research and Innovation is also celebrating Women in Research Month and are going to have programs, including a panel discussion next month, I think, in the middle of March, featuring women in research and leadership at MSU.

Finally, our university-wide strategic planning, under the direction of Dean Salem and SVP Gore, DEI strategic planning under the direction of Dr. Wanda Lipscomb and Luis Garcia, and the RVSM strategic plan under the direction of Dr. Rebecca Campbell and Lieutenant Andrea Munford are initiatives moving ahead in what we hope is an inclusive and transparent way. We had an update from those groups, in front of the Board of Trustees last Friday, and I think we can all look forward to hearing more from their leaders in the coming weeks and months. I think they're doing great work, but we look forward to more of you getting engaged.

That concludes my remarks. And thank you.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Fantastic. Thank you so much. Provost Woodruff?

**Provost
Teresa Woodruff**

Thank you very much. I, too, recognize the full agenda, so I'll try and keep my remarks relatively brief.



Provost Woodruff, cont.

But first, I wanted to bring good news from the 2020 SIRS supplemental evaluation survey about faculty outcomes for this for the Fall Semester 2020. A number of positive highlights were identified in a survey that was delivered at the end of the semester, and it allowed our students to provide feedback on their experiences with our online courses. This was part of the supplemental SIRS assessment, and it assessed MSU's overall attentiveness to the needs of students with respect to online instruction and questions about the online courses taken during that semester.

And so 72% of our respondents were satisfied to extremely satisfied with the work that MSU did in helping them prepare for online learning. 81% of students were satisfied to extremely satisfied with the communications they received from MSU leadership. 83% were satisfied or extremely satisfied with the communications they received from their instructors. And 73% of the students were satisfied or extremely satisfied with the opportunities for online training and support. 77% of our students who responded to the survey had a quiet and safe place to study, and almost all respondents had a reliable computer (about 96% of them) or access to a reliable smartphone (about 92%), a camera for their computer (89%), and regular access to reliable internet connections (about 87%).

These are exciting outcomes, I think, for the accessibility that we have for our students to our classes and certainly the positive outcomes for our faculty in terms of the way in which our students are evaluating the engagement they had with you. So, thank you to the faculty and academic staff for your diligence across this Fall Semester and continuing into this semester as you work, as faculty, to enable the academic goals of our students. I also want to thank Associate Provost Mark Largent and the staff in the APUE office for delivering the survey and assessing the outcomes.



Sen. John Jiang (BUS)

Is there any difference between domestic and international students regarding the online experience?

Sen. Stephen Gasteyer (SSC)

What was the sample size for SIRS supplemental? Where can we get a copy of those survey responses?

Sen. Joyce Meier (CAL)

Same question as John and Stephen, above.

Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Mark Largent

Sample size for the SIRS Supplemental in the Fall was 3,885. Survey responses have been broken out by college and are being sent to each college's deans office this week.

We also have the results of the fall student experience survey, which had a response rate of just over 20% (n=7500). Responses are individually identifiable, and we are finalizing a Tableau right now that will allow us to disaggregate all the responses by academic and demographic categories of students. We will publish a report of the overall findings soon, and college leaders will have access to the Tableau to explore how students in their classes experienced the fall semester.

Sen. John Jiang (BUS)

Thank you, Mark. I heard from some international students that they had a hard time attending the online classes due to the time difference.

Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Mark Largent

We have been encouraging academic units to offer (and students in distant time zones to consider taking) asynchronous online courses to help manage the time difference issues.

Provost Teresa Woodruff

Two final student honorifics: MSU has one Gates Cambridge scholar and a national finalist for the Knight-Hennessy Scholars Program.

Jasmine Jordan has been named a Gates Cambridge Scholar. She's an Honors College senior majoring in political science in the College of Social Science. She's a member of the Urban Educator Cohort Program and is minoring in educational studies in the College Education. She's also minoring in African and



Provost Woodruff, cont.

African American studies in the College of Arts and Letters. She's a member of the Social Science Scholar Program and the Political Science Scholars Program in the College of Social Science and is an honors research scholar as well.

Erica Benson is a national finalist for the Knight-Hennessey Scholarship Program, which funds graduate studies at Stanford University. She is also an Honors College senior majoring in interdisciplinary studies in the social sciences in the College of Social Science.

So, congratulations to these outstanding young scholars, but also thank you to our outstanding faculty for what you do every day to enable the academic success for our students. Thank you.

Sen. Tongtong Li (EGR)

Are we taking any actions to prevent armed robbery on campus like what happened inside Holden Hall yesterday?

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Thank you very much. We are using our executive vice president for health sciences today, who is out.

I will comment in a minute. It has been brought to my attention that there was an error in the minutes. It should read on page two, paragraph three, it should read, "Andaluna Borcila and Mary Juzwik presented on the hardships" So, is there any objection to amending the minutes? Great. Let's do that.

And then I will talk. We do have a full agenda today, so while I'm talking, I thought we could have five minutes for questions related to any of our three presentations. If you have a burning question you really want answered, be prepared to jump in because we'll do it in five minutes when I'm done talking, and then we'll move on to our other items.

So, we are live streaming today for the first time, which is exciting. We've had a lot of interest, increasing interest, in what is going on



**Chairperson Johnson,
cont.**

in Faculty Senate, so Faculty Senate today is being live streamed.

You know, several of us—the at-large numbers and our secretary for academic governance—have been meeting with many of you, and we found the following themes, trends, and interesting points. And I first want to say I appreciate the time that you took to meet with us. I was really impressed and inspired, actually, hearing a little bit about all of you and the work you do. We-- As a group, you sing at the Met, you curate the library, you learn about the soil and the water. It was just really interesting to hear about each of you as academics. So I wanted to share that I was really impressed and inspired by the work you're doing.

So, you know, when we ask people why they joined Faculty Senate, one very common answer was that, actually, they did not know what they were getting into, that someone in their college nominated them or asked them to serve. Other very common answers included wanting to do something to help in the wake of our sexual abuse scandals, wanting to know more about how the university works, and feeling an obligation to get involved rather than just complaining. So we have, I think, a healthy mix of people who want to help change and make the institution better and people who ended up here a little bit by surprise, but, once here, really want to help make the institution better.

When we asked what issues people were interested in addressing in Faculty Senate, safety was one of them in the university. Diversity, equity, and inclusion was another very common answer. A focus on gender. Other common answers included transparency, administrator review, Code of Professional Standards, and hearing perspectives from other colleges in the sense that the institution is very large, and we might not talk to each other otherwise.



**Chairperson Johnson,
cont.**

We asked for thoughts on how Faculty Senate functions, and we asked people for their thoughts and got frank feedback, which I appreciate. Overwhelmingly, they say that they think we're going in the right direction, that we're becoming more organized and efficient. One common criticism was that discussions can be circular and sometimes don't seem to be about actually trying to convince people. This quote was pulled out: "The collapse of resolution after resolution in Faculty Senate makes it difficult for those trying to make change. We need to be thinking more strategically about how to move things through Senate." And we'll continue to talk about that. I think some of this is there's some structural things that make that challenging, but we'll all continue to work together to make it better.

We realized when talking to people that not everyone knew that we have actually implemented several of the recommendations of what I shorthand call "the Filomena report." It was from, I think, a year and a half ago. Several of us made recommendations in a group led by Dr. Filomena Nunez about how to help make Faculty Senate more effective, and one of the suggestions was to, in a standing way, bring in various leaders from the institution to get feedback from Faculty Senate in advance of university decision-making. And actually, we have been doing that this year. Most, or almost all, of the administrative discussion leads we've had have been from that list. So that-- We have enacted that.

There were some thoughts about how to have a better mix of people speaking during discussion. A few members noted that faculty in general don't know the purpose or the actions of Faculty Senate and that it can make getting feedback from constituents a little bit challenging. I hope that we're addressing that through being able to email the faculty and that that will get better over time. And a surprising number of faculty



**Chairperson Johnson,
cont.**

senators thought we should stay on Zoom post-pandemic.

And one person suggested making our tracking system public. This is the tracking system of the issues that come in through Steering committee and where they go in academic governance and what happens to them. And that has actually happened now. And Tyler can put [the link](#) in the chat for us.

So one of the questions we got asked is, "Why don't we move X issue or Y issue forward?" And you know, what happens with academic governance is that we actually bring forward the issues that people bring to us, whether they're faculty senators or faculty in general or other people. And so one of the things that we will do: [Secretary for Academic Governance] Tyler [Silvestri] is making a handout this week—I will talk about it a little bit in my comments at University Council next week—which is how to make a good proposal or a good motion for Faculty Senate so that, you know, if you have issues, they get brought forward, because the truth is, we bring forward what people bring to us. I'm excited that the tracking system is public.

Our own survey about our own diversity and academic governance will be coming out soon, so when you see it, please answer it.

There will be a discussion today about the Code of Professional Standards. As I think you saw, it will be just a discussion today and not a vote. We had hoped to vote today, but there were some legal issues raised by the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education, FIRE. And in light of those concerns, we talked with the University Committee on Faculty Affairs and decided to pull together Academic HR, our legal team, UCFA, and some of the other concerns brought to date and bring a final version.

And I want to just note, you know, this is one of the challenges I think we have. And I think it's a little bit structural and, honestly, a little bit



**Chairperson Johnson,
cont.**

in being in an institution with some historical trauma, or at least historical challenges. Because, you know, with this new code, the big concern about the code was that it would be used by administration as a tool of reprisal against faculty who spoke up about lack of safety, sexual assault, or other issues in the institution. And historically, here, sometimes things like that have happened. In trying to be responsive to the concern, UCFA essentially asked the administrators to not participate in the development of the code. Hence, the ultimate code had some language in it that probably wouldn't have been in there if Academic HR or attorneys had been involved. So we're rectifying that now. But all of that is to say, you know, on the one hand, where we've been is really hard, and there's reasons why people are reacting to all this like they are, because it has been hard here. And I think, you know, at this point, we have to try to work together to come up with some things that we can move forward. So we'll have a discussion today. Hopefully that team will be able to come up with something, and then we'll vote next month. And the discussion today, you know, I think it's, in essence, "Does the code or whatever the code turns in to make the university safer or less safe, and, if less safe, what would make it safer?"

And then despite that-- I'm being, I guess, pretty frank about what our challenges are. But despite that, we have some data that academic governance is working better. Our secretary for academic governance pulled together some data that says that even though the average Steering Committee meeting has 1.6 more times more agenda—no, just 1.6—more agenda items than last year, the average meeting is 14 minutes shorter because it takes 2.3 fewer minutes to handle the average agenda item. Similarly, Faculty Senate has an average of 1.5 more agenda items each meeting, but the time it takes to address the average item is shorter, leading to an average meeting length of 13



**Chairperson Johnson,
cont.**

fewer minutes this year. In other words, academic governance is doing more and doing it more efficiently. So I think where we have been has had some bumps and challenges. We are moving forward and I appreciate the collaboration and efforts of all of you to try to make that happen.

We do have a full agenda. The policing item near the end is seven different motions. So why don't I stop there? And, like I said, let's just take five minutes today. If you have a burning question for the president, provost, or for me about anything we said, and then we can move on through our agenda. So, Tyler, I haven't paid attention to the burning questions. Do we have burning questions that have popped up?

**Secretary for
Academic Governance
Tyler Silvestri**

I think Associate Provost Largent's been getting most of them. Yeah, I'll leave it to--

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Raise your hands, I guess, electronically, if you have something you'd like to ask before we move on. Alright. Okay, well, thank you very much. You know, if you have additional questions, you can always try to put them in the chat, and I think people will answer them as they can.

So why don't we move on today to our new business? The University Committee on Curriculum report from Dr. Marci Mechtel.

**UCC Chairperson
Marci Mechtel**

Good afternoon. I had to move because apparently the light was really bad.

So, the report from UCC. We actually just met a couple of weeks ago and approved the following.

For new programs, there's eleven new programs. Clearly, in COVID pandemic and Zoom, we're all being really super creative in how to make up some of the differences. And so the new programs are Art and Cultural Management, Graduate Certificate—all of these are effective Fall 2021, just to save my readings; Communicative Science and Disorders, Bachelor of Science; Digital



Dr. Mechtel, cont.

Storytelling, Bachelor of Arts; Financial Planning and Wealth Management—I can't speak—Master of Science; Financial Planning and Wealth Management, Graduate Certificate Program; Finance, Financial Planning and Wealth Management, linked BA/MS, again, for those to shorten that time to an MS; Migration Studies minor; Non-Profit Leadership, Global Cultures and Social Enterprise, Master of Arts; Real Estate Development and Construction, Graduate Certificate; Rhetoric and Writing, Master of Arts; and Urban Resilient Development, Graduate Certificate.

With that, we did, furthermore, sixteen program changes, again, aligning some of the graduate programs with the [Student Information System], and as we're always improving curriculum, and then two deletions, which I will talk about in a moment. For courses we did a further additional 78 course new courses, 66 course changes, and eight course deletions.

For moratoriums, they are all effective-- The first three are effective from Spring 2021 through Summer 2021. And they are in Psychology, Master of Arts—University [Committee on Graduate Studies] was consulted, and provost approved. Moratorium in Psychology Ph.D. Again, UCGS was consulted and provost approved. And a moratorium in History Ph.D. UCGS consulted, and provost approve. And then for Spring 2021 through Fall 2022, moratorium on Agricultural Food and Natural Resources Education, disciplinary teaching minor. In this, University Committee on Undergraduate [Education] was consulted, and provost approved. And then, finally, just for one semester, just Spring 2021 only is a moratorium in Sociology, disciplinary teaching minor.

The two discontinued programs are a Master of Jurisprudence in American Legal System. University Committee on Graduate Studies was consulted, and the provost has approved it. And



Dr. Mechtel, cont.

this is effective for Fall 2021. And, finally, Clinical Laboratory Sciences, Bachelor of Science; University Committee on Undergraduate Education was consulted, and provost approved, and this is effective Spring 2021. And for that program, in specific, because they've really changed the program significantly. So there is a program that has a new title that covers that.

And that's my report.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Thank you very much. We will now have the report from Professor Andrew Corner on the University Committee on Undergraduate Education, webcam use in online instruction.

**UCUE Chairperson
Andrew Corner**

And thank you. UCUE appreciates the opportunity to consider this issue. There is a new document, this report that's available to all faculty senators was distributed earlier. There were some mistakes in that report. I think Nicole Smeltekop for bringing them to my attention. They've been corrected. The corrected version of the report is available on the website acadgov.msu.edu, and Tyler's put up [a link to it](#).

Faculty Senate instructed UCUE to examine the university's policy on webcam use in remote learning from the perspective of persons with disabilities. The charge, specifically, was to identify the issues and/or drawbacks for people with disabilities under the current webcam policy, which states students cannot be required to have webcams on without sufficient notice.

UCUE formed a subcommittee to explore the question. We're thankful to Professor Rich Bellon, Professor Corey Drake, and ASMSU rep Aubrey Hanes for leading this investigation. They delivered their findings to UCUE via the report that supplied with today's meeting materials. UCUE accepted this report unanimously.

In brief summary, the bottom line on their investigation is this statement from [MSU Ability Access Specialist] Virginia Martz: "It's a



Prof. Corner, cont.

fine line between what benefits some students and what benefits others." Virginia has a long list of responsibilities and expertise in this area, and her statement captured the central challenge of webcam use in classrooms. The subcommittee met with several campus units that have responsibility for helping students with disabilities navigate their academic journey. Based on those meetings, the subcommittee found the existing university webcam policy effectively balances student needs and interests.

Implementation and communication of the existing policy can and should be improved. Instructors need resources to implement the policy and flexible ways to address the requirements of their particular courses and the needs of the students in them. And this policy is not a substitute for RCPD visas, and the previous process for student visas should continue to be upheld. The committee also acknowledged that it could be beneficial to include a hyperlinked, separate document with the policy mentioning the benefits and drawbacks of the policy.

And that's my report. Thanks for the opportunity to provide the info.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Thank you very much, and thanks for your work and bringing your decision back to us.

So now we have item 4.3, which is resolutions from the Ad Hoc Committee in Response to the Office for Civil Rights. I believe these are three separate motions. If somebody-- It might be good to start with somebody from this committee who would like to just briefly explain the motions and then we can have a-- Actually, why don't we do this: let's have a motion to pass the motions, a second, and then discussion, and when we have discussion, you can explain them. So is there a motion to pass, let's say, at least the first motion?



**Sen. Sandra Logan
(CAL)**

So moved.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Alright. Is there a second?

**Sen. Andaluna Borcila
(JMC)**

Second.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Okay. Can somebody give us a quick overview?
And then we can discuss.

**Sen. Sandra Logan
(CAL)**

So, I'll do that. Sandra Logan, College of Arts and Letters. So I'm representing this ad hoc committee that was charged with developing resolutions to the university's response to the Office of Civil Rights report on the Nassar and Strampel tragedies. The committee included me, Dr. Joyce Meier, also from the College of Arts and Letters, Dr. David Ewoldsen from Com Arts, and academic adviser Nicolas Gisholt from the Center for Integrative Studies in the Social Sciences. We were also advised by other faculty senators on these: Andaluna Borcila from James Madison College, Anna Pegler-Gordon, and Juliet Guzzetta, also from the College of Arts and Letters. So thanks to everybody for the really fast work that happened here on this set of resolutions.

So, as you'll recall, we have had two meetings to discuss the OCR report, the campus culture that enabled the abuses detailed there, and the issues we saw with the responses of the university, both to the initial report and in their first annual report on the progress in the areas that have been identified by the initial OCR report.

So those meetings generated about ten pages of ideas for actions, which we have attempted to distill into viable resolutions. We've endeavored to capture the most frequently mentioned items in these resolutions, and we want to acknowledge that these are drafts. We don't think they are necessarily completely ready to go yet, but time will tell. This conversation will tell us.



Sen. Logan, cont.

We certainly welcome suggestions about these proposals and also suggestions if you think there are additional proposals that need to be created. So with that, I think we can go to the first proposal. They are indeed three separate proposals.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Dr. Logan, would you like discussion today and not a vote, or do you want discussion and a vote?

**Sen. Sandra Logan
(CAL)**

Well, I think we need to see how the discussion goes, because it's very possible. I mean, in my-- I am hopeful that people will actually think these are in pretty good shape. But I've also been here for three years.

**Sen. Chris Wrede
(FRIB)**

There are some grammatical issues with the 3rd bullet under "Policy and Practices" that makes it difficult to understand.

Sen. Rob LaDuca (LBC)

There are some glaring errors in this document (item D). "That such reporting not be limited to grievable transgressions, but include microaggressions, behaviors that create a welcoming environment." NON-welcoming... "and that such environments be defined by their impact on individuals, not just the intention of the perpetrator-micro-aggressor. "Perpetrator" has criminal connotations.

**Sen. Sandra Logan
(CAL)**

"Glaring errors in this document." See, there's-- thank you, Rob.

Sen. Joyce Meier (CAL)

Yes – that is an error, Rob – it should be "unwelcoming" (not welcoming). We can change it.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Alright, so do you want to talk about the motion and what it is or start discussion?

**Sen. Sandra Logan
(CAL)**

We're getting a lot of responses in the chat right now.



Sen. Logan, cont.

This first one, is it all of the-- All of the motions begin with the same set of values, and then each one addresses a separate area. This one is on policies and practices related to creating a safe, inclusive campus environment. So the main concerns that we have, I think, have circulated widely in our conversations. They have to do with transparency, reluctance to speak up in the context of various kinds of transgressions, and that it's difficult to report incidents that don't reach the level of the grievable. And that the-- We want to make sure that people who do call attention to transgressions are protected, that they're not subject to retaliation of various kinds. And we did have particular concern about the OIE staff in this context.

We also think that OIE needs a broader audience that they report, we understand it only to the president of the university at this point. And so we think that there should be a broader audience for their reports.

Sen. Brian Roth (CANR)

Do we need to define what OIE is supposed to report to the Senate?

**Sen. Sandra Logan
(CAL)**

We think we need some kind of regular policy to be established regarding crisis communication and the importance of rapid and transparent responses. So we understand that university is often in a situation of having to respond quickly, but it seems difficult to keep everybody informed of what's going on and really important to do that. So we think there needs to be some work in that area. And then, as I said, we also think that OIE staff needs to report out yearly to the Faculty Senate as well and has an opportunity to make their concerns known. Okay, so. We want to have any verbal discussion on this?

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

So I definitely see the comments in the comments section, we can pull the chat and send it to this group afterward.



**Sen. Sandra Logan
(CAL)**

That would be great.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Is there anyone who would like to raise their hand and give any comment for or against this first motion? I actually don't see anyone. Oh, there is one. President Stanley?

**President
Samuel Stanley**

So-- So first of all, I appreciate the effort that's gone into this and all the work. My one bit of advice, suggestion, would be to at least reach out, if possible, to Tanya Jachimiak, who is our Title IX coordinator. There's suggestions in here that I think she wants to talk to you about that really would actually violate the OCR agreement. Some of them would violate federal rules around Title IX. And some are repetitive. I mean, if you just want to emphasize something, that's fine. But if you're implying that some things are not done—for example, that we currently don't have retaliation policies, we do—and those are actually baked into the regulations that we have. And so I just think there's an opportunity here to make this maybe something that would be more consonant with what the law suggests has to be done. But that's kind of up to you, as, again, it's a resolution, not an actual change in any legal things we're doing at this point. But I think it's important that maybe some of these suggestions be reviewed for how much they conform with what current federal law suggests.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

And [Associate] Vice President Jachimiak did reach out to meet with us. We are trying to get that meeting schedule. The plan was actually to invite the group who wrote these motions and anyone else who was interested. If there are people who are interested, email Tyler. But that was partly us; we just didn't get it scheduled before this meeting. So thank you to her for reaching out.

**President Samuel
Stanley**

Yeah. Thank you. I think it would be helpful. And just to the reporting issue, the OCR report actually says, you know, definitively that the Title IX office needs to report to the president



President Stanley, cont.

so it's free from influence from other parts of the university, interestingly enough. So that's one example where it's very specific. That's very different from reporting out in terms of giving data. That, I think, OIE would be more than happy to do, to the Senate to provide data, de-identified data to the Senate. Of course, that I think makes total sense. But in terms of actually people taking their instruction on what they're supposed to be working on and what the initiatives are and so on, that's pretty clearly in the OCR agreement that has to go through the president. So anyway, that's just one example of the kind of thing that's challenging.

**Sen. David Ewoldsen
(ComArtSci)**

I think the intent was for data to be reported.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Thank you so much. We now have Dr. Andaluna Borcila. You're muted.

**Sen. Andaluna Borcila
(JMC)**

Okay, so I don't know if everybody has just Tyler's screen. Yes, there in front of us.

Okay, so first of all, I want to acknowledge all the work that went into this and just to also underline or emphasize something that happened Sandra—Dr. Logan—said, and that is that a number of senators, a number of faculty have worked for about a year now to put forward to Senate basically to enable us to face our recent history and to create productive discussions around MSU's response to Nassar and Strampel and the culture that enabled them. And, you know, there was lots of organization that went into that and faculty who put a lot of time into it, some of them, you know, who are untenured. And I think that one important issue to keep in mind is that, you know, we do have a new upper administration, or at least some very key players here are new. And I so very appreciate that. I want to just say that.



Sen. Borcila, cont.

But a second point—there's no "but"—a second point is that the recent history of our institution, which still very much impacts our present, is something that while our new administration is, I'm sure, very well informed of, they have not necessarily lived through that. And so I think it is really important for those of us as faculty who have—and frankly, for our whole institution—to acknowledge this history that we still carry with us today that has enabled the kind of crime and, frankly, institutional betrayal that we have faced. And so the OCR discussions of this report and MSU's response and these three resolutions are a way of or some steps in the direction of coming to terms with this institutional betrayal and with our role as faculty in it and being complicit in it through our silence. And it continues in the path of making our voices and our concerns heard and indicates that we want to move from a position that we might have held in the past to an active position where we own or are important voices that own the culture of this institution. Thank you.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Thank you very much, Dr. Borcila. Are there other comments or on this proposal? And Dr. Logan, while I'm waiting for that, do you have a thought about if you would like to have the discussion today and vote later or if you would like to vote on this particular? I mean, it sounds like it might be good to circle around with OIE, but, you know, it's up to you.

**Sen. Sandra Logan
(CAL)**

Anna is suggesting-- Anna Pegler-Gordon is suggesting to me that we could possibly remove bullet points three and four for discussion with the vice president and we could vote on the rest of this proposal. That's the part that's focused on reporting. I'm not so sure that's a good strategy. I wonder if it makes sense to just take all of the suggestions into account and do some revision on this and bring it back as a whole piece. I think that might be the best approach.



**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Alright. I'll defer to you. I want to say thank you for all your work on this. I know it's a lot of work to pull together. A hundred different suggestions across, you know, emotionally charged issues, and I know the group has been very diligent and thoughtful about this and persistent, and I really appreciate that. So let's take the thoughts on this one. Why don't you put up the next one, Tyler, if you could, and we can have a discussion on the next one? Let's get everything sort of out and discuss now. Would somebody like to explain this and the, sort of, rationale for it?

**Sen. Sandra Logan
(CAL)**

Yeah, so, that's me again. So the preliminary material is basically the same, but for this, we were grappling with the question of how we actually create a viable means for bringing people up to speed on the kinds of practices that are needed here around sexual harassment training and training and other kinds of transgressions. This one particularly focuses on sexual harassment. And what we wanted to emphasize here was that, again, the mechanisms we have in place for dealing with this kind of work are not all that functional. They don't get at the level of behavioral issues that we see happening, the lower—the relatively lower level ones, especially—seem to just keep slipping by.

So one of the things we wanted to suggest is that we need to have transformative approaches to training, transformative justice approaches, that we need to make sure that there's some group norming going on, and that we really need to have awareness of what microaggressions are and how they can be avoided. So a lot of this has to do with just creating a more sensitive, more self-aware culture here rather than thinking about the punitive approach. Okay.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Fantastic. So discussion on this motion? I don't see hands. Would you like to put this one to a vote or keep that with the next month?



**Sen. Sandra Logan
(CAL)**

I think we should-- I guess we should put it to a vote if there's no discussion of this. It sounds like we don't have the same level of reaction going on here, so let's put it to a vote.

**Sen. Danielle DeVoss
(CAL)**

Has the group done an audit on MSU's current sexual harassment training? What is working and what needs to be extended, done differently, etc.?

Sen. Joyce Meier (CAL)

No, we have not done an official audit, Danielle. But there is a felt need for more in-person, rather than just virtual, training.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

I see one comment that says, "Has the group done an audit on MSU's current sexual harassment training, what needs what's working, and what needs to be done differently?" Oh, and you just answered that. Fantastic.

Alright. Well, so -- Let's put it to a vote then. So "yes" would be in favor of passing this motion. "No" would be against.

And Tyler, can you help us with our voting procedures?

**Secretary for Academic
Governance Tyler
Silvestri**

So, the polls should be up.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Alright. And, Tyler, I see a hand right as the poll went up. What do we do?

**Secretary for Academic
Governance Tyler
Silvestri**

It's up to you. You're the chair.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Dr. Gasteyer, why don't you--? If you have a quick comment, and then let's vote.

**Sen. Stephen Gasteyer
(SSC)**

Yeah just a quick question. A little unclear what things are-- If we vote yes, what does that - Does that mean we're committing to do-- It seems to me like there'd be a bunch of other steps that we then have to take having passed this resolution. And so, yeah.



**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

That's a good question. So I think, you know, this is advisory. This would basically say Faculty Senate as a whole thinks this is a good idea. And then we would then take this to the decision-makers and say, "Faculty Senate would like to respectfully request that you consider the following." Did I answer your question?

**Sen. Stephen Gasteyer
(SSC)**

Yeah, that's good.

**Secretary for
Academic Governance
Tyler Silvestri**

Still got a few coming up. One person's asking how they get to the poll; it should just be appearing on your screen. If not, you might have an old version of Zoom, in which case, I guess you can message me your vote if you want.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Maybe while we're waiting for the vote to come in, you could screen share the third OCR motion?

**Secretary for
Academic Governance
Tyler Silvestri**

Well, it's looking like votes are done on this one.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Alright, so, what happened?

**Secretary for
Academic Governance
Tyler Silvestri**

Are folks seeing the results?

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

No.

**Secretary for
Academic Governance
Tyler Silvestri**

Shoot. Oh, there.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Okay, so overwhelmingly passed. Alright, fantastic. So that will be a discussion item when we meet with [Associate] Vice President Jachimiak. We can, you know, say that we passed this. Alright. So, the next OCR resolution, if you could screen share. And Dr. Logan, if you can explain it to us.



**Sen. Sandra Logan
(CAL)**

So, this is our this is our attempt to address something that's been coming up in the bylaws resolutions for quite a while and to try to get a finer toothed approach to the issue that we're thinking about here. So this is on the review of deans and higher-level administrators related to creating a safe, inclusive campus environment. And there's been some-- It's been difficult to move that particular bylaw forward.

And so one of the things that we thought would help here is that rather than thinking about this as a full scale review of deans and higher level administrators, we would focus specifically on their accountability in creating a more inclusive, safe and supportive environment and in sharing their plans for coming up with for continuing that sort of work in the future. So we are proposing at least every other year, review of all administrators specifically on these points. We wanted to make sure that there's some kind of committee who oversees this review. A committee of all, we thought, the faculty excellence advocates—could be a very helpful group here—and then some representatives from Faculty Senate. But that committee would be empowered to do this kind of review and provide oversight on higher-level administrators, especially from a framework that ensures the safe, inclusive environment.

We're not establishing exactly what those reviews would look like, but simply the need to have this kind of review undertaken on a regular basis. We would suggest that committee have a chair who is elected and who attends all of the deans' meeting and advises on issues related to the FEA position and reports back to FEA the committee as a whole; and that it report its findings yearly, or perhaps more frequently to the Faculty Senate; and that this committee would have input into the structure of the review process for administrators, including how input from stakeholders will be solicited and taken into account in the review process and how expressions of concern and



Sen. Logan, cont.

actual complaints will be dealt with; that the review of all administrators includes substantial anonymous feedback from faculty, staff and students around these issues. In their review materials, administrators include a statement of their values, commitments and actions in support of a safe and inclusive environment for the community members and how they're responding to complaints and expressions of concern; and at the end of the process there would be a report to the entire community—that is department, college, program, university as a whole—on the way the feedback from faculty, staff, and students has been taken into account in the review.

Okay, so comments on this one?

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

I do have an initial question because we have created a subcommittee of faculty senators and Academic HR and others to sort of work through this larger administrative review issue. How do you see this motion dovetailing with that? Or not?

**Sen. David Ewoldsen
(ComArtSci)**

I don't believe that committee has ever met.

**Sen. Jane Bunnell
(Music)**

Not yet.

**Secretary for
Academic Governance
Tyler Silvestri**

That is correct, as we are waiting on a few constituencies to appoint representatives. I think this (if passed) could serve as a nudge as well.

**Sen. Sandra Logan
(CAL)**

I think we were hoping to keep this separate from that work because that work would in some ways well, I don't know if it would supersede this or not, if in fact, that kind of that sort of a resolution was finally ever achieved or that bylaw change was ever achieved. So I think what would make sense would be to go ahead and vote on this resolution or hear feedback on it and revise it if that's necessary, and to implement it so that we are actually moving forward on this issue.



Sen. Logan, cont.

If at some point that seems to be in tension with the other committee and its work, we could discuss how to handle that tension. Does that make sense?

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

It does. And I see in the comments that the other committee hasn't met. So we will nudge them also. Alright. So given that, comments, discussion on this particular motion? Alright--

**Sen. Andaluna Borcila
(JMC)**

I think this should be separate. However we move forward with the bylaws, this is critical.

**Secretary for
Academic Governance
Tyler Silvestri**

So I guess, Jennifer, I did have a question for Senator Logan. It mentions "a committee," and what wasn't clear to me from the proposal was whether it's an administrative committee or whether it's an academic governance committee, if that distinction's clear.

**Sen. Sandra Logan
(CAL)**

I'm not sure I understand the exact distinction that you're trying to make here. But the committee as described-- How-- Perhaps you can answer that. The committee, as described, which category would that fall into? So it's comprised of faculty excellence advocates and representatives from the Faculty Senate.

**Secretary for
Academic Governance
Tyler Silvestri**

Yeah, well, the question is how you go about forming the committee. If you're looking to amend the Bylaws to create a committee versus something that you're hoping the president or the provost or somebody would put together. So it's essentially where it comes from. And that's sort of why I ask, is reading it as described, it sort of sounds like both or something in the middle.

**Sen. Sandra Logan
(CAL)**

So the responsibility would be to the committees-- The committee's responsibilities would be to define the parameters of such reviews and to conduct them.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Alright, so, we have we have three hands, we have President Stanley, Dr. Pegler-Gordon, Dr. Kelly-Blake, in that order.



**President
Samuel Stanley**

So I think my question—or comment, I guess, more appropriately—is really an extension of what's been said before. I think this is really running very parallel to what's been proposed to collaboration between the administration and shared governance to work through an issue around the evaluation of senior administrators, and I just see this as really kind of the same type of thing, obviously having the focus on issues related to DEI, but I don't think it changes substantially.

And I have concerns, as I've expressed before, about some of the elements of that, particularly anonymous reviews that are posted and things like that I find problematic for administrators and the requirement that they-- I don't think, you know-- I have concerns about that in terms of what they expect from their job, from their current assignments, and what would be they would be held to these. And so I just I think that's the reason, again, we wanted to try and reach an agreement on how this might be conducted in a way that doesn't really put administrators under a kind of review that, you know, it could be potentially damaging to their career, where you have comments posted about you that are anonymous that people don't say that are posted in what's viewed as an official report of the university and your conduct.

So I think these kind of things really need to be looked at. And it would be the same for faculty or other individuals who are undergoing review to have a public review available and things put out about anonymous things that people had said about you, again, I find troublesome. So I think I'm concerned about this and how it's structured currently.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Alright. We have-- Thank you for that. We have Dr. Pegler-Gordon and Dr. Karen Kelly-Blake. Let's go there.

**Vice Chairperson
Anna Pegler-Gordon**

I was just going to speak to the question of whether this would be academic governance or administrative, and I can see why Tyler sort of

Faculty Senate

Transcript

February 16, 2021



MICHIGAN STATE
UNIVERSITY

**Vice Chairperson
Pegler-Gordon, cont.**

sees it as potentially mingled, because the faculty excellence advocates are appointed by deans, and, therefore, that to me suggests that it would be administrative. And I think the key question would be how the Faculty Senators are selected. You know, if they were elected by, you know, an academic governance body, then that would sort of shade into academic governance. But if they were selected, then it seems to me that it would be a purely administrative process.

Sen. Rob LaDuca (LBC)

I think FEA is nominated by the deans approved by the provost.

**Vice Chairperson
Anna Pegler-Gordon**

Yes, I understand the FEA is nominated by the dean, but approved by the provost, which is what makes it administrative, in response to Rob LaDuca's comment.

Sen. Rob LaDuca (LBC)

It was to bolster your stance :-)

**Vice Chairperson
Anna Pegler-Gordon**

Got it! Thanks, Rob.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Thank you. Karen Kelly-Blake?

**Sen. Karen Kelly-Blake
(CHM)**

Yes. Thank you, Dr. Johnson. I just have a quick question. Dr. Logan, can you explain how you came up with the review period? It reads, "reviewed at least every other year," as opposed to annually, which everyone else receives an annual review. What was the reasoning behind this particular time frame?

**Sen. Sandra Logan
(CAL)**

Thank you for that question. Well, currently they're reviewed every five years, and we think it needs to be more frequent than that. And we thought perhaps every year would be-- There wouldn't be sufficient time to show progress if there are issues. So we wanted to make sure that there is actually time for development in the administrator's functionality in these areas. So that was the reason we did talk about the possibility of annual but thought it might be more feasible to do it every other year and may be more effective. Thank you.



Sen. Logan, cont.

And I had a couple of other points I wanted to make in response to President Stanley. I think that the intention here is not and we certainly are aware of the concerns you expressed earlier, previously about the public posting of anonymous reviews. And I don't believe there's any language in here that indicates we would do that. We certainly think it's important that people have the opportunity to make their concerns known anonymously, but that does not equate with posting anonymous comments publicly. And that would be-- And I don't think that this is suggested here. If it is, we can, if someone would point it out to me, we can eliminate that language, because that certainly, I don't think, was the intention of this committee.

And in response to Anna Pegler-Gordon, the intention here was to have faculty senators was appointed by the Faculty Senate or elected by the Faculty Senate or volunteers from the Faculty Senate and not appointed from an external body. So we thought the faculty excellence advocates might be a good group to work with because much of this is within their purview. But we also recognize that they are not elected. And so we wanted to make sure there was some elected representative participation in that committee, on that committee and in that process.

And I think that's all my responses.

**Sen. Mary Juzwik
(EDUC)**

The language of the resolution seems to suggest that the reporting to the entire community focuses on how feedback has been taken into account in the review.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Alright, we have Dr. Andaluna Borcila.

**Sen. Andaluna Borcila
(JMC)**

Okay. Hi. Thank you for letting me speak. I think that what Dr. Logan suggested makes sense and that we can certainly talk about the composition of that committee moving forward or after this point.



Sen. Borcila, cont.

What I do want to say—and I really appreciate President Stanley's comments—but one of the points that has appeared recurrently, and this is why, you know, in our discussions on Senate when we have talked about the Strampel and Nassar crisis, institutional betrayal over the last three years, and including at the last meetings that were moderated by Dr. [Stephanie] Nawyn was, you know, the importance of a review of administrators. And in looking closely at these reviews, as they were done, as they were presented in the OCR report, we saw how that process failed. And we saw that there were people who voiced the issues that they had anonymously, and they were dismissed, and people who stood up and voiced their issues in person, and they were dismissed. And that happened over and over again. So clearly faculty think that administrative review is really important. People have worked on that on—UCAG, over the summer, Senate has approved those twice, so forth, and so has [University] Council.

This seems to me to be a very reasonable attempt to get at something that was really critical here at our institution. Our upper administration failed us, and they failed to listen to the voices of faculty. And if Strampel would have not stayed in the position he was in, he wouldn't have been able to enable Nassar. And so that is so critical. That is just, you know, and it's such a recent history of this institution. If you read the report like we all did, and I'm sure you have, President Stanley, it's just unbelievable, you know, how voices were dismissed in favor of this.

This suggests-- This says, "Let's review administrators. At least let's have an agreement that we formed a mixed committee and that we review them—or that they are reviewed—with a specific focus on issues of inclusion." That's what this says, you know, and it seems to me to be critical in light of our history.



Sen. Borcila, cont.

And whatever else happens, you know, debating issues on a committee, that this needs to move forward. Thank you.

**Vice Chairperson
Anna Pegler-Gordon**

Thank you, Andaluna. That gets to the heart of the matter.

Sen. Joyce Meier (CAL)

Thank you, Andaluna.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Alright. Any other comments? Dr. Logan, would you like to try to put this up to a vote today or would you like to wait?

**President
Samuel Stanley**

Can I just quickly respond to that there? Just that I don't disagree that there is a need, absolutely, for better evaluation and, actually, implementation of the findings of evaluation, which I think was one of the problems—where evaluations actually pointed to problems, some things were brought forward, but, in fact, then the sanctions or things that were supposed to be brought in were not done. So I think it's a combination both of the evaluation and acting on the evaluation is where there were problems with both of those things I think are an issue, and I wouldn't argue at all with Dr. Borcila on that.

I think for me, my concern is just how this is done in a way that doesn't end up subjecting people to, again, things that are anonymous, complaints that are anonymous, that things that, you know, haven't been proven. Accusations are made, and then these end up as part of a review of someone saying they have a problem with this and that, and so that things that maybe as simple as workplace disagreements get blown into things related to performance. So I think that's an important thing to me, again, to make sure that the right thing is being looked at and this is done in the correct way.

No argument with the need for better evaluations and better review of activity. No, no argument about that. But I think the question for me is, "What's the best way to do it?" Which is why, again, I was supportive and continue to



President Stanley, cont.

support putting together the committee that was looking at this to address some of the concerns I have and come up with something that works within that framework. But I wouldn't argue with you about the need for better review processes, better implementation. And that's something I continue to talk to the senior administrators about, about our accountability and need to do a better job with this. And I know the provost is doing it, and I know the deans, you know, from my conversations, are committed to really changing that culture.

**Sen. Sharlissa Moore
(JMC)**

I think it's important for anonymous comments to be allowed in some format in reviews, so people in vulnerable positions can voice concerns with less fear of retaliation. Votes on tenure cases at the department and college level and associated comments are anonymous too.

**Barbara Roberts,
Executive Director of
the WorkLife Office**

One question to start down the road of accountability for inclusion is to ask what barriers to various groups were removed in the previous year, what facilitators of inclusion were initiated, and what of those two are planned for the coming year? Then there is an expectation and goal set for action, year over year.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Fantastic. So, Dr. Logan, would you like a vote or would you like to--? What would you like to do?

**Sen. Sandra Logan
(CAL)**

Again, I don't think there were any substantive emendations here. So I think I'd like it to go up for a vote.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Okay, so let's put it up for a vote. So to clarify, yes, again, this isn't something we have direct authority over, nor is it a formal bylaws amendment, as is. So a "yes" vote is, again, essentially to respectfully request that this happen or at least be considered and that, yes, if the Faculty Senate votes yes as a whole, that means that we as a whole really thinks this is important. So, Tyler, if you could put the vote up.



**Secretary for
Academic Governance
Tyler Silvestri**

We have about 78 percent of attendees voted.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Is it very clearly one way or the other, or do we need to wait?

**Secretary for
Academic Governance
Tyler Silvestri**

I'll share it now. [The resolution was adopted.]

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Okay, thank you. Alright, so, moving on to 4.4, a discussion on the Code of Professional Standards. We have discussed this a lot. It is going, again, to this more combined committee of UCFA, university legal, Academic HR, et cetera. I guess I would say if you have any other comments that you would like them to consider in crafting the final proposal at this point, now is your chance. You can either do it now or perhaps email Mick Fulton or acadgov@msu.edu, and we can get it to him.

So, any comments on the proposed Code of Professional Standards? Okay. Oh! There is one. Dr. Logan and Dr. Poitra?

**Sen. Christie Poitra
(CANR)**

Dr. Logan can go first. I'm looking something up.

**Sen. Sandra Logan
(CAL)**

Okay. So, I mean, I'm still experiencing some concerns with this particular code. Policy, I think it is. So I was-- I really appreciate the work that went into this revision, for starters, because it was substantially reworked. And I think a lot of comments—most of the comments we made—were taken into account. So I think that's extremely positive. And I think it's in really good shape.

I think there are a couple of questions, though. I'm still concerned about the references to the Faculty Handbook and the implications. Although the specific explicit language of "punitive responses" has been removed, there is still pretty much no alternative other than going through the standard grievance procedures or the processes leading up to those



Sen. Logan, cont.

to resolve any of these kinds of issues. In the second resolution we had up a minute ago, we mentioned transformative justice as necessary approach to changing the culture on this campus, and I think that applies here. So as long as these are purely aspirational and that there's an effort to develop other means of responding to problems that arise, then I think we're really stuck in a punitive system that will unnecessarily burden those who are already being harmed at this time by these kinds of behaviors. So that's a concern I have with this code. That's one concern I have with this code. And I think I'll just stop there. Thanks.

Sen. Sing Lee (COM)

I have a quick question, are we voting on coming March meeting? If yes, is it possible to get it at least a week earlier like this time the document was sent a week before the meeting?

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Alright. Thank you very much. Dr. Poitra and Dr. Gasteyer?

**Sen. Christie Poitra
(CANR)**

Hi, everyone. I want to say, first off, thank you so much for all the work that you have done on this draft. It really shows from when I first saw it to now. I guess my concern is-- I sort of come to this with a perspective of someone who was sexually harassed at MSU, who went through the entire OIE process and received RVSM findings. In fact, this month marks the one-year anniversary of those findings.

I want to say I'm concerned with the juxtaposition of academic freedom and issues of problematic employees and harassment. And I think when you start, sort of, putting those two issues together, it doesn't make a lot of sense to me. And I'm hoping someone that has worked closely on this document can sort of explain how academic freedom relates to sexual harassment and problematic employee behavior. I think both issues are incredibly important. Academic freedom is critical to our higher education system within this country. It's also very important that people come to work and are able to be safe.



Sen. Poitra, cont.

So I'm hoping someone that served on the committee to draft this can sort of better explain the relationship between academic freedom and problematic behavior.

**UCFA Chairperson
Mick Fulton**

Madame Chairperson, may I respond?

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Yes, please.

**UCFA Chairperson
Mick Fulton**

We certainly considered this. At least within the code, it references sexual harassment and other protected classes and actions to do that.

What we tried to do was to provide a modeling of appropriate behavior for academic freedom, of how we respect each other, how we treat each other when we argue different points.

We want to encourage robust discussion about lots of different topics. We did not try to write this to try to inhibit people from presenting their thought processes. But we did want them to do it in a respectful way. And so that's how we did that.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Alright. So there's a member of UCFA here, Dr. Claudia Finkelstein. Is there any objection to me giving her voice?

**UCFA Chairperson
Mick Fulton**

None at all.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Okay. Dr. Finkelstein and then Dr. Borcila and then Dr. Poitra.

Claudia Finkelstein

Hi. Thank you for giving me voice. And I just want to say I was one of the people who worked closely on the revision of the document. And I think we were absolutely not trying to equate academic freedom and sexual harassment, but rather to prevent the argument that this code impinges upon people's academic freedom. People are absolutely free to have the opinions that they wish. The code is an aspirational document for the behaviors that we wish to see and embody. So not trying to restrict the freedoms that are allowed to everyone.



Dr. Finkelstein, cont.

And I think we're doing a delicate dance because both sides—the people that are nervous about the code and those of us writing it—I think wish for an inclusive, safe environment. And I think it's a bit of a testimony to how we're still a little mutually suspicious and not trusting that the institutional structures will do their part to move us forward. So it is not intended to be punitive, does not equate harassment with academic freedom at all. It's trying to make clear the distinction. Thank you.

**Sen. Mary Juzwik
(EDUC)**

One constituent raised a concern about the extent to which the code would advance white fragility and privilege at the expense of faculty of color. The concern is that this code could be used to maintain the power/privilege of dominant identity groups because they would be empowered to claim being “disrespected” when called out for micro-aggressions, racist behaviors, etc.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Alright, fantastic. I believe-- I'm-- Apologies if this is out of order, Dr. Poitra and then Dr. Borcila.

**Sen. Christie Poitra
(CANR)**

I just wanted to make it clear that I think there needs to be, sort of, some added language, because when I read that and then also read the [Foundation for Individual Rights in Education] letter, it sounds like we are putting academic freedom against sexual harassment. That's how I understand the letter from the FIRE group and also the way the policy currently reads. And I think, sort of, that philosophical stance is very problematic. They are two distinct things and not necessarily mutually exclusive. I sometimes, in my own experience, as someone who was a claimant in an RVSM investigation, that these things are sort of put together, and it ends up stifling progress to support people in having a safe work environment.

Claudia Finkelstein

We are aiming to do the opposite! We ran it by multiple affinity groups, who gave it support.

Sen. Rob LaDuca (LBC)

Bullying is a big deal too.



**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

And Dr. Poitra, if you have the bandwidth—you don't have to—but if you do have the bandwidth to send either acadgov@msu.edu or Mick Fulton a couple of lines you think would help fix it, that would be really helpful. Let's have one more comment and then move on. I have to say, today we have a presentation and two sets of resolutions that are time sensitive. So we will go past 5:00 today. There's no other way to do everything. And I just wanted to put that on people's radar and apologize in advance. So go ahead, Dr. Borcila. And then let's move on to 4.5.

**Sen. George Garrity
(NatSci)**

According to the FIRE letter, the Code went beyond restriction of academic freedom but also ran afoul of First Amendment rights.

**Sen. Andaluna Borcila
(JMC)**

Okay, thank you for all your work on this.

People probably know—some of you do—that I wrote in response to this code multiple times. I'm happy to see that circulated among various constituents and that there have been changes made to it.

I still remain concerned about a number of issues. One of them is the difference between aspirational and policy. And I think this is very important. Aspirational behavior is one and policy set in place that has punitive and disciplinary action is another one. But there are a number of other things here, too, that I am concerned with. I can specify them, but more to the point, I don't really know if we need this code rather than having the bullying code that's being worked on, the values that [Faculty] Senate has talked about in the OCR resolutions, and a code for administrative behavior.

And my concern is—and there is a national conversation going on about this—that when we adjudicate what respectful and disrespectful behavior is, this can be adjudicated in very narrow ways. And oftentimes, constituents who are women and women of color and people of color who might have dissenting perspectives



Sen. Borcila, cont.

from the dominant ones, their interventions, their positionality can be misinterpreted. And this is one of my main concerns: that those of us who raise concerns of dissent in an institution that's very rigid can be identified as being disrespectful. For instance, some of us have raised very pointed concerns about particular people who were in the upper administration of our institution: the former president, the former provost. Were those "personal" attacks and acts of disrespect? So there are other particular points, too. But I can get to those that are, you know, at a later time if we actually get to vote. Thank you.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

I guess I would just add that there is evidence that shows that women and minorities, for exactly the same behavior, are perceived as more aggressive. So. Alright, thank you for that. I would say, you know, if you have comments against them to send them to acadgov@msu.edu, send them to Mick Fulton-- Especially suggestions for what to put in, I think they will do their best and come back to us.

**Barbara Roberts,
Executive Director
of the WorkLife Office**

It is important to note that there is a collective initiative underway across campus to coordinate efforts to articulate how we want to be together as a community, which will likely evolve into a series of procedures and practices for resolution which may be different - in tone, objective and emphasis - from existing disciplinary or grievance-type procedures. The need for addressing behavior that is not safe but does not rise to the level of protected class/discrimination/RVSM violations needs to be, and is being tackled.

Positive Workplace Alliance: [link](#)

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

We have "Resolution on Faculty Caregivers." Anna, sort of, regardless, at 4:45, I feel like I need to give voice to our vice presidents, who fit us into their schedule, so we may have to do it and come back. Or maybe it's easy, and we'll be done in fifteen minutes.



**Vice Chairperson
Anna Pegler-Gordon**

So I just wanted to introduce the Faculty Senate Caregiving Resolution, which follows up on a discussion we had at last Faculty Senate meeting around caregiving. And thank you, Tyler, for putting that link into the chat. And so I just want to make a motion for this resolution.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Is there a second?

**UCFA Chairperson
Mick Fulton**

Second.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Alright. Is there discussion?

**Vice Chairperson
Anna Pegler-Gordon**

I think Andaluna was going to just kind of briefly, sort of--

**Sen. Andaluna Borcila
(JMC)**

Yeah. Do you want to read the resolution, Anna? Or how do we do this?

**Vice Chairperson
Anna Pegler-Gordon**

I don't think we need to read it.

**Sen. Andaluna
Borcila (JMC)**

Okay. So should I make a couple of points, a few points here?

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

A quick summary would be super helpful.

**Sen. Andaluna Borcila
(JMC)**

Well, okay. So, the resolution is here. So a few points that we wanted to make.

So first of all, we appreciate the adjustments to the tenure and promotion process and the uncoupling of student feedback from faculty evaluations. These are definite actions taken by the Provost's office that we really appreciate. We think that more needs to be done to address these, and I think that the conversation is going to go in that direction.

But that alone will not be sufficient for faculty to recover and advance. As our university data clearly shows, and as our colleagues who spoke last time so eloquently articulated—much more eloquently than I can today—we are dealing with a crisis, and we need to do much, much more. The resolution that you have in front of



Sen. Borcila, cont.

you is calling for the Faculty Senate, the main representative faculty body at our institution, to acknowledge this collective crisis that all faculty, but faculty caregivers in particular, have been and are facing. As the main faculty body at our institution, we have the responsibility to raise the voices of faculty and in particular of those faculty who have been most dramatically affected by this pandemic.

This crisis and these needs are not simply individual faculty needs that can be addressed on an individual level in a local department or college. Why? A number of reasons why. Many who are caregivers are also in such a position that they do not—or we do not—feel safe in our jobs, are confident that we will be heard or respected. We fear that we will be considered less than and that our needs will be overlooked yet again. We also do not want to be pitted against each other. And also we know that there are serious discrepancies in terms of what departments and colleges can do financially and have shown themselves willing to do across the university.

This is why we need this resolution, a resolution that insists on acknowledging the collective dimension of this crisis and that insists that this crisis be addressed accordingly and effectively through a university-wide financial commitment to meet this collective need of caregivers and to consider this a priority. You have the resolution in front of you. Thank you.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Alright, any comments on this? Any other discussion before we vote? Alright, Tyler, if you put it up, let's vote. Alright, and then as you're voting, Tyler will collate the votes.

I am going to turn the schedule over, if it's okay, to our vice presidents for budgets. And then when they are done, we will come back to the policing motions. They are time-sensitive, so my guess about when we're going to get out today is about 5:20/5:30.



**Chairperson Johnson,
cont.**

So I guess, you know, apologies in advance.
Thank you for your patience.

Alright, that was easy. So, the resolution has
passed.

Alright, we have our standard-- These are some
of our standing discussants, our Vice President
for Planning and Budgets Dave Byelich and
Vice President for Finance Mark Haas, who've
come to discuss with us. My hope is that
discussion can go until around 5:00, 5:05, and
then we can vote on the policing motions fairly
quickly after that.

**Sen. Danielle DeVoss
(CAL)**

*Thank you, all! Being somewhat new to Senate,
I'm curious about the next steps, action, and
accountability with the resolution. Where will it
go? Will we be invited or is it appropriate for us
to suggest specific actions? Can we invite a
follow-up conversation or response from those it
implicates?*

*Are there any specifics documented or available
about what "financial support" means? Or any
suggestions for "additional guidance" that will
enable colleges to better support caregivers? Are
we working in coordination with EAP,
the WorkLife office, etc.?*

**Vice Chairperson
Anna Pegler-Gordon**

*These are important questions, Danielle. This is
a strong endorsement by the faculty that the
university administration should provide
financial support and guidance to the colleges to
help meet the caregiving crisis (beyond the
important measures that have already been
implemented). I believe that there are specific
proposals circulating in different colleges and
particular needs that cannot be met without
additional financial support. Each college is
different, so this resolution is intentionally open-
ended. But I would not anticipate Faculty
Senate working further on this, except in so far
as the provost and colleges ask for additional
guidance.*



**Sen. Andaluna Borcila
(JMC)**

Thank you for such good questions. The specifics of how to address this centrally is something that seems to me to involve central admin conversations with colleges and also faculty. I am fairly sure that there are specific suggestions as I have seen them.

**Sen. Danielle DeVoss
(CAL)**

Yes, I have seen some productive work in our college. I could be rough on details (Sandra, please correct me if I'm wrong!), but in the Department of English, the chair is meeting with each tenure-system faculty member to discuss their needs and concerns, and if it's possible to do so, when they might ideally take a semester research leave in the coming years. This is a longer-tail strategy than immediate support, but I think it's a really, really important strategy.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Alright, we have our standard-- These are some of our standing discussants, our Vice President for Planning and Budgets Dave Byelich and Vice President for Finance Mark Haas, who've come to discuss with us. My hope is that discussion can go until around 5:00, 5:05, and then we can vote on the policing motions fairly quickly after that.

**Vice President for
Finance & Treasurer
Mark Haas**

Probably help if I unmuted, right? So, Dave, you're there, right?

**Vice President for
Planning and Budgets
Dave Byelich**

I'm-- Okay. I think we're back. I think we're set.

**Vice President &
Treasurer Mark Haas**

Okay.

**Vice President
Dave Byelich**

Alright.

**Vice President &
Treasurer Mark Haas**

You want to move us to the first slide?

**Vice President
Dave Byelich**

Yeah. Thank you. Here we go. Mark, go ahead.



**Vice President &
Treasurer Mark Haas**

Yeah, so, today we're going to talk a little bit about our cash balances update and our projections for the rest of the year, talk a little bit about Fiscal Year '21 year-to-date compared to last year, and then some of the considerations for what happens to the budget next year.

Do you want to go to the next slide? Go ahead, Dave.

**Vice President
Dave Byelich**

You want one more slide? I'm on slide three at the moment.

**Vice President &
Treasurer Mark Haas**

Yeah, that's you. Go ahead.

**Vice President
Dave Byelich**

Oh! Okay. Fair enough. Sorry. Sort of the big picture review that we have been in part of—and this may be a little bit different for the members of Faculty Senate from the past—but because of the COVID circumstances, we've had very significant fluctuations in our revenues, particularly as it relates to tuition and so forth. So as a result of that we have been trying to do is to track very carefully the changes that we've seen in our various revenue sources and our various expenses.

And what we're here to show you—and I think Mark will share as we go forward—that while we have very significant changes, about \$1.6 billion in revenues, about \$1 billion in aid and expenditures, and about \$200 million dollars in reserves that are necessary to move the institution forward during this period, that we are on course for making it through the year and to move through the year essentially within the general fund as planned or a little bit better.

For our two large auxiliaries of residence halls and for intercollegiate athletics, their circumstances are a bit more difficult as we look at it, but all within the overall envelope of the institution's resources as we look at this.



**Vice President Byelich,
cont.**

So with that, a review, again, of the first six months, we believe that we're on track and that we are operating within our overall envelope that was set up for this current year.

**Vice President &
Treasurer Mark Haas**

So on the next slide, we'll talk a little bit about our cash flows and budgets. As you know-- [Phone rings.] Just let turn this off. We look at our cash flows—I think of it as our checking account for the university—trying to make sure we have enough money, cash on hand, to pay all our bills. So we have a historical model that looks back at the last 10 years using daily data. We do it daily because, like your personal checking account, you need to have money in it every time you write a check, not just at the end of the month.

So with the COVID-19 outbreak, we've had a lot of uncertainty about what's going on so far. We've run several hundred different budget and economic scenarios that we've analyzed since March of last year.

The key assumptions that Dave mentioned, a couple of them, enrollment and tuition revenue being a big one, and housing and athletic activities being another couple. Those changed dramatically, depending on what the government regulations are about what size of crowds we can have, etc. And so, though we're looking at the impacts only for last fiscal year and this fiscal year, those are likely to carry.

So, when we adopted the budget back in June, we were very uncertain about whether we'd be open in the fall and what circumstances it might be. We had thought we could lose a lot of, particularly, international students, and so we had expected tuition to be way down. That's the area in white above. You can see that athletics and housing were basically balanced budgets and that the clinical center and Wharton would be down just a little bit because of some activities, but that we felt that the general fund would be the biggest problem.



**Vice President Haas,
cont.**

On about a monthly basis, sometimes more often than that, we have updated our budget assumptions by talking to all the different units.

And you can see things have changed quite dramatically. Athletics had a huge drop in their revenues, and they've cut their expenditures not by quite as much as the revenues fell. The clinical center is just about in the same position as they were back in June. Residential housing is wildly different. Instead of having some 17,000 students in our dorms and apartments, we're down to about 3,500. So, huge drop in revenues there and they made adjustments accordingly.

The general fund is the one sort of bright spot here. Actually, it turned out to be not as bad as we thought it would be. It's still down from a typical year, but not quite as bad as we anticipated in June. Wharton Center is a little bit worse off than it was. You can see the numbers circled in red there. \$163 million. That's how much our budget is on balance for the current year.

And you can see we can draw from reserves. Athletics will draw down most of their reserves. Clinical center will draw down some of their reserves. The housing is projected to draw down all of the reserves and still be \$9 short. The general fund would have to draw down part of its reserves, as would Wharton.

Just to give you an idea of how bad it really is, let's not compare this to a budget year, but to a typical year. In the gray area at the top—some of you may have seen the slide before we presented it to the Board now a couple of times—you can see typically everybody's budget would be balanced. And for this part of the university, which excludes the research activity and a few other things, it's about \$2 billion. When you compare that to our most recent budget assumptions from a couple of weeks ago, you can see that revenues are down about



**Vice President Haas,
cont.**

\$418 million. And you can see that our spending is down about \$250 million. So it's quite a bit worse than we would be in a typical year and still a bit worse than we had hoped for in June of last year.

So we use this information, then, to determine whether we needed to put more transfer money from our long-term investments and from our intermediate term savings into our checkbook to make sure we covered all of our expenses. If you go to the next page, we've done some scenario planning, and for reasons I'm not quite sure, the worst case and the best case didn't show up on this graphic. But let me assure you that they're both within that yellow band, up between 60 and 90 days of operating cash. And so under all the scenarios, given that we've moved some money out of our longer-term investments into our checkbook, we, even in a worst-case scenario, we should be all right from the cash flow point of view.

The other thing that we did a little bit differently this year, as we began briefing the Board on our budgets, is we took a look at what happened the first six months of this year compared to the first six months of last fiscal year.

On the next slide, I've summarized it here. Our total revenues are down by about \$228 million dollars compared to a year ago. That's July through December of this year compared to July through December of last year. Our total spending that we've cut during that time has been about \$140 million. And you will note in the following pages that most of the revenue losses are in athletics and housing, as are most of the reductions. A number of units may, in any given year, exceed or underspend their budgets because they have some monies that they might have carried forward from last year that they're using, or there might be some expenses that they anticipated would be in this year, but instead they are holding the money because the expenses won't be until next year.



**Vice President Haas,
cont.**

A good example might be faculty start-up funds. You might get a million dollars to set up labs for a couple of new faculty members, and because of the hiring process, they don't get actually on board until next budget year. So those kinds of things. Or vice versa—you could have planned to hire somebody last year. They didn't get here last year, but they come in this year.

If you go to the next table here, the first column shows you are actual revenues and actual expenditures for the entire university for the first six months of last fiscal year that ended December a year ago. And then column shows us what happened the first six months of this fiscal year through December 31st of 2020. And you can see revenues-- And then the column C shows you the change, and then D is the percentage change. And you can see there that our total revenues are down about \$228 million dollars. And then if you go down a little bit further on expenses, you can see the total expenses are down about \$139 million dollars.

Now, one of the things you'll notice on column A, if you go down to the green area, you can see that for the first half of the year, revenues exceeded expenses by about \$400 million. Now, how is that possible? Well, by December of each year, we have collected tuition for both semesters, but we've only spent money on wages and salaries and supplies for one semester. So we have more revenues than expenses, typically by December of each year. What's important to note is that that net difference, instead of being closer to \$400 million, is closer to \$300 million this year. You can see we're down about \$89 million from where we were a year ago.

If you go to the next slide, we've done the same kind of thing. We've compared the first six months of the year, actual revenues and spending to the budget amount. And Dave will walk through this slide.



**Vice President
Dave Byelich**

What you can see here, is that we are actually within our parameters here. We had revenues of about \$1.027 billion. It turned out that our year to date actual, \$1.059 billion. So about \$31 million there. If you look down in terms of the expenses, we would typically count on expenses of about \$847 million. We actually expended \$768 million. So in that instance, for our general fund, as we look at our budget compared to what we actually expended for the first six months, we were actually improving by about \$110 million because of everyone's activity as they began to try to slow expenses in order to accommodate to the lesser revenues and the uncertainty of the current environment. So this is a chart that shows the good work of the full campus.

**Vice President &
Treasurer Mark Haas**

We did the same thing for a couple of the units that had issues, and we looked at athletics, and we looked at housing, and we looked at the clinical center, and I didn't present all that detail here because of the time involved. But you've gotten a sense already from the earlier slides, the difficult situation that they are in.

The second thing that we did then is we looked at the unrestricted fund balances for each of the units. Again, comparing this year to last year. If you look at the next slide, what you'll see is that there's a very seasonal pattern. This is the last half a dozen years. Typically the unrestricted fund balances are the lowest in June of each year, and they are the highest in December. And so you really have to compare December to December. And it's for the same reason I mentioned earlier, is that we've collected—in primarily tuition and room and board, [which] has been collected in full by December—but we haven't spent the money which will end up getting spent through June of the year.

What you have here is, if you look at all of our fund balances, you can see in the first three columns it shows you, where the yellow is, that typically we've been about \$1.3-\$1.4 billion at June of each year in the last three years. In



**Vice President Haas,
cont.**

December, you can see we're closer to \$2 billion in December of each year. And if you compare this year to last year, you can see we're down about \$75 million from where we were a year ago. And that makes sense.

We're projecting to be about \$163 million short for the year, and we've been spending part of our savings here through the first half of the year.

I've taken out some of the other things below. It's a little bit of accounting activity going on. We have OPEB, which is the other post-employment benefits, which is primarily your healthcare, and those numbers jump around a bit from year to year. And so those adjustments I've taken out because they would sort of muddy up the picture.

The other thing that I've taken out that would muddy up the picture is the Nassar lawsuit payments issue. Remember, we paid \$500 million three years ago. You can see that number has gone from negative \$500 million, and it's gotten a little bit smaller each of the next three years because we've been making payments on both the principal and interest on that. This last year we had a \$100 million settlement with the insurance companies that helped pay down that. And so again, that \$95 million that you see there, improvement in the new settlement, is unrelated to COVID activities, but rather part of the insurance settlement. So I pulled that out.

**Vice President
Dave Byelich**

So, these impacts, we've only, at this point, projected them out through the end of Fiscal Year '21. Vaccines are beginning to roll out. Different parts of the country are having different degrees of success, and how quickly and how efficiently they're able to get those vaccinations into the arms of the public, depending on how that goes throughout the summer, will make a difference in what we expect to have happen next fall. If the vaccinations go well, we may be able to have



**Vice President Byelich,
cont.**

everything back to normal in the fall. At this point, the projections seem to be suggesting that you won't get enough people in the population vaccinated until sometime in the fall, maybe October or November. So I think we're still on a wait-and-see-what-happens as we go through the summer. If those things-- If the vaccinations don't get rolled out on the schedule that everybody's hoping for, we could see some significant problems again next year.

As markets work through our current cash position, we wanted to take a just a minute or two to look forward and to look more at our Fiscal [Year] '22 budget and to note, in terms of the overall value proposition of the institution, it is certainly our student success, it is certainly to advance our reputation and instructional as well as research domains, and to maintain opportunities for students in Michigan. So there is a very qualitative dimension to our task here. And we wanted to note that up front.

**Secretary for
Academic Governance
Tyler Silvestri**

FYI for all involved: It's very difficult to see the chat when you're screensharing, so don't be shocked if VP Byelich isn't seeing questions posted there right now.

**Vice President
Dave Byelich**

A couple of items that we would note here is that, as you know, it has been a difficult several years, probably the most difficult several years that this institution has faced going back probably to the, as we read our history, to the World War II period, where I would suggest that the only thing that was different or that was worse is that we were all drafted during that period, or our colleagues at that time were drafted. So, a very difficult time for the institution.

If we look forward, there are a number of items that have been very important to us to try to set up as objectives. A lot of our success will depend upon our ability to stabilize enrollment. If that can be done, we have an opportunity to discontinue our wage concessions, perhaps as early as [FY22], that is next year, and to



**Vice President Byelich,
cont.**

discontinue our benefit concessions in the year thereafter. But those activities are certainly dependent upon the ability to stabilize the enrollment, which is, as you know, is a situation that is related as much to the virus as it is to the economic circumstances here. So these are the objectives that we have.

We want to just spend just an additional second with you as we as we look forward here. We wanted to just animate the reputation of the institution is so important, and it's so important in the enrollment equation as well. And we use some illustrative rankings here, but there are many, and this is just a small subset.

Another item that we wanted to make sure that we were talking about. We have a very different circumstance this year with respect to our state appropriation for the first time, at least in my tenure, the state appropriation, the governor's recommendation is flat, that is to say, no additional recurring support. But the interesting nuance is that they're proposing to provide us with up to five percent in one-time support, which suggests a different kind of an equation for our budget and something that we really haven't confronted in the past. But we wanted to lay that out here, mention it to you, and we will continue to monitor this, as we will these other objectives as we move forward.

Two other very quick items that we wanted to talk about. Again, I referenced the enrollment circumstances last year. Our entering class was about 8,228 students. It's that second column. This year, as we're trying to focus and to bracket where we're attempting to end up, it's the number three that is identified with the square there, to move up to about 8,600 students. This does suggest a change in number, but also, as you look across, a change in mix, with a rebound in both the entering international as well as the non-resident components of the class. So that's where we're aiming as we go forward.



**Vice President Byelich,
cont.**

We have had some reductions over time, and we can talk about this at another point, about a \$50 million reduction in tuition and fees that are part of this year's budget. And these are some of the important things that we've tried to work with.

Let me just share with you one other thing, and then we'll terminate here. I do have a fair number of comparisons in terms of tuition and fee history, comparisons in terms of faculty salaries, comparisons in terms of faculty benefits, and so forth. We will, by noon tomorrow, have these up on the website, and you can take a look at the full presentation, both that provided by Mark Haas, as well as myself.

As we look at it, as we said, four important objectives as we try to move forward in our planning for this year. Those objectives, of course, are to stabilize enrollment, to discontinue the two concessions, and to begin to be able to fund our most important programmatic investments.

So that's where we are. If I can respond to any questions, or if you would wish to just email, that would be fine, too. So we'll have this up on the website by tomorrow.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Thank you so much.

**Vice President &
Treasurer Mark Haas**

Jennifer, one more point that I would make, just to maybe answer some questions in people's minds, we will, by the time this is over, we will have received about \$100 million in federal stimulus money.

And two things to think about: one is that that money can only be spent on COVID-related activities, so it doesn't really help us in the sense of helping us with our normal budget. Second is that it doesn't make up for the \$400+ million of revenue that we lost. So those are two additional considerations.

Faculty Senate

Transcript

February 16, 2021



MICHIGAN STATE
UNIVERSITY

**Vice Chairperson
Anna Pegler-Gordon**

COVID-related activities like supporting faculty in a caregiving crisis?!

**Sen. Andaluna Borcila
(JMC)**

Yes. I agree. That is COVID-related.

**University Committee
on Faculty Tenure
Chairperson Susan
Barman**

I thought that same thing too, Anna.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Thank you very much.

**Vice President &
Treasurer Mark Haas**

You're welcome.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

There were some questions in the chat.

[Chairperson Johnson proceeded to read questions from the chat. The questions themselves are reproduced here.]

Sen. John Jiang (BUS)

Do the predictions assume that we have the same salary cut, retirement contribution cut, hiring freeze, and travel freeze?

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

And I think that your answer was you estimated it all those different ways, right?

**Vice President
Dave Byelich**

What we always acknowledge is that this current year has been unusual because, as Mark will tell you, our travel activities have been down, and many of these operational activities have been less than they were in the prior years. But we anticipate that units will begin to spring back. Perhaps not in travel. Maybe the world will have changed a bit there. But in terms of our expenses, with respect to being in the classroom and operating on a more typical basis, it's undoubted that we will see some increase in our expenses from the very depressed levels that we've had in the past year. And that's part of our thinking.

Sen. Joyce Meier (CAL)

Will housing be able to recoup any of these losses, if indeed we are able to bring back all of those sophomores to campus in Fall 2021 (in addition to the freshmen)?



**Vice President &
Treasurer Mark Haas**

So, typically, in a normal year, our dorms are about 95% full, which is a very high level of capacity utilization, and they're normally able to run a small surplus. So, yes, if they can bring all the students back, they should be able to not only break even, but make a little money and build the reserves back up. It will probably take a good ten years for that to happen.

**President
Samuel Stanley**

So, this is Sam. Just to clarify, the two-year living requirement doesn't take effect for this class of freshmen this year. It takes effect for the entering class coming in. So, while we do hope we will have people staying their second year, it's not mandatory coming up this next year.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Fantastic. Thank you.

Sen. John Jiang (BUS)

It is admissions season. Can faculty help in the admissions process? I am happy to talk to potential students who are interested in the business school.

**President
Samuel Stanley**

I know Provost Woodruff who would speak up on that, perhaps.

**Provost
Teresa Woodruff**

Yes, we're happy. So, John Ambrose is doing a fantastic job on recruitment. We have the highest number of applicants to MSU in our history, and we are working very rapidly to get those students' financial aid packages out, and we hope to welcome them next year. So we'll definitely take back to Admissions faculty senators' interest in being helpful.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

And, so, is there someone in particular they should reach out to, or you'll let us know?

**Provost
Teresa Woodruff**

I can let you know, Jennifer.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

OK, fantastic. Are we able to email out these slides?

**Sen. Stanley Griffis
(BUS)**

Which website will these be posted on?



**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Are we able to email out these slides?

**Vice President
Dave Byelich**

I'm very comfortable with these slides. This is public record information. Mark, if there is anything that is of concern, I mean, in your material, I-- Mine is fine. We'll put it on whatever website you might wish. We could put it up on Faculty Affairs if you want, or on Planning and Budgets, or both. Whatever makes sense to you.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

And then what we could do, maybe, is email the link.

**Vice President
Dave Byelich**

Sure.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Alright. Four different comments, essentially arguing that that supporting faculty caregivers should be COVID-related, and maybe the emergency funds can be used for that. You know, I think we'll just have that as a suggestion.

**Vice President
Dave Byelich**

Thank you.

**Sen. Danielle DeVoss
(CAL)**

As far as I understand it, MSU funds can be used for business-related purposes. Is there a way to strategically present caregiving as a business-related purpose? There are likely more restrictions on the federal funds, but maybe more opportunities?

**Sen. Jane Bunnell
(Music)**

Federal funds for COVID-related issues – such as no performances due to aspirants and the budgetary hit from things?

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Okay, so, a lot of this has to do with is there any way to turn this COVID-related money into support for faculty caregivers because it is COVID-related in a sense. So does that count? And is there a way to make it count?



Sen. John Jiang (BUS)

Since international students contribute more to tuition, are any measures being taken to help to recruit international students?

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

And I know the answer to this is "Yes." I don't know if you want to answer very quickly about that.

**Provost
Teresa Woodruff**

Yes, we have a number of a number of strategies to recruit from around the entire globe.

**Sen. Stanley Griffis
(BUS)**

If we've been at 95 percent without a second-year housing requirement, can we support two full classes in the dorms?

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

So, is there enough space in the dorm?

**President
Samuel Stanley**

Short answer, yes, in part because there's exemptions that are made for students with different needs and so on.

And there's a possibility of, the opportunities, with appropriate supervision and so on, to be living in fraternities and sororities, potentially, as an exception as well, so that should accommodate that.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Fantastic. Alright, any other questions? Alright, we will try to-- We will get you either the slides or the link to the slides out to you. Tyler, If you can just make sure that we follow up and send that out.

And I'd like to thank you, Vice Presidents Haas and Byelich. Thank you for your transparency. Thank you for visiting the faculty. Thank you for your responsiveness. And thank you for being patient. I know we've scheduled with you and rescheduled a couple of times. So, you know, thank you for accommodating us and for being willing to talk with faculty. I really appreciate it.

**President
Samuel Stanley**

And, Chair Johnson, if I could just make a very quick comment. Just again, you know, my thank you to everybody. You've seen what an extraordinary financial stress the institution has been under, and I really appreciate the fact



President Stanley, cont. that the faculty and academic staff have really stepped forward and been willing to take these reductions, which you can see, in terms of the kind of diminutions we had, were, I think, hopefully you understand, were necessary to get us through this time.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson** And I also see, or at least heard, potential hope on the horizon in terms of them being reversed.

**President
Samuel Stanley** I have made it clear to the entire leadership team, which I think they will agree with it, that the number one priority is to get that restored for everybody in this upcoming fiscal year.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson** Yeah, and again, I mean, like I said, thank you. Thank you for coming and taking the time to talk with us.

**Vice President
Dave Byelich** Thank you. We appreciate it.

**Vice President &
Treasurer Mark Haas** Happy to do it.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson** Alright, so, our last item.

Dr. Stephanie Anthony has led a group on policing resolutions. It was the sense that this was time-sensitive since the new chief of police is coming in. So I would like to turn the time over to her to explain them. There are seven motions. Depending on the discussion, we can vote on them as a group or individually. Probably we'll discuss as a group, you know, just for the sake of time, and then we could potentially have, like, seven individual votes or one big vote, depending on how it goes. So, go ahead, Dr. Anthony.

**At-Large Member
Stephanie Anthony** With all support to Jane Bunnell and Dave Ewoldsen, who were part of the committee on this, I'd just like to say that the Michigan State University community comprises some of the best and brightest individuals, I think, in the world. I don't think I'm totally biased, and I'm really excited that we've been able to try to pull together some policing options that we think have value, especially in view of what is



Dr. Anthony, cont.

happening in the world today. We've addressed some very key topics throughout this entire Senate meeting, as we always do, and each one of them is very important. One of the reasons I wanted to present this information is that, Stanford University did a study, not too long ago, and they reviewed probably a hundred million stops, police stops. And they found it in their study, with maybe about 50,000 stops per day and about 20 million motorists per year, that, after having analyzed nearly a hundred million stops, that there was significant racial disparities that existed in those stops. There was just no getting around it. So I saw this as an opportunity with our brand-new police chief coming in to make sure that we remained above and beyond in terms of the quality of our university and our police force. I shouldn't say police, I should say, as recommended by the Task Force on Racial Equality, our peace officers.

So, if you can, can you put those up? And we look at them all at once. Would that be possible, Jennifer or Tyler?

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Yeah, absolutely. Tyler, if you could screenshare.

**At-Large Member
Stephanie Anthony**

Thank you. This may speed things along. I don't know if you want me to read them, but I'm thinking folks could probably take a look at them.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Maybe if you could just, like, summarize each really quickly?

**At-Large Member
Stephanie Anthony**

Okay. We really want the opportunity to do the—I won't say coffee with a cop opportunity—but we'd like to have the Michigan State University Police Department implement on a monthly basis community-oriented occasions. These will offer MSU community members an opportunity to interact with our peace officers on a totally different level. And we think that this will help to foster and develop those



Dr. Anthony, cont.

positive relationships between our officers and the community. That's motion number one.

Motion number two is we would like to encourage MSU Police Department officers to immediately discontinue any policies that target, in a discriminatory manner, at-risk or marginalized communities within the campus. And this may include policies related to ICE or those that may promote our support the same factor that I just mentioned, as it related to stops. The data for that particular study indicated that every jurisdiction—every jurisdiction—that stops were frequently made more for people of color than white individuals. So we want to make sure that anything, by going through and taking a look at the books, that our policies do not promote or support racial profiling or ICE policies.

Additionally, we'd like to encourage our MSU Police Department to implement strong, interactive training programs, and we'd like to request that they be mandated. We know that there is a big wave in terms of crisis intervention trainings that are going across the country. But we'd also like to address those trainings that support better quality interactions with victims of relationship or sexual violence.

Motion number four: In terms of transparency, we wanted to make sure that the data that is being collected—or, if it's not being collected, that it begins to be collected—but the data that's there is published, related to traffic stops, hiring data. It doesn't matter how it's done. It could be done on a website or information as to how someone can get it from one particular individual. But we'd like to know that data is available.

Additionally, we'd like to require intensive investigation into prospective officers. Don't know how this will go, but I think recent events on the national stage made us really kind of stop to think about it. We're asking that those



Dr. Anthony, cont.

hiring, pre-hiring practices be deep enough to reveal any memberships in organizations or groups that directly contrast with the safety of individuals on our college campus. And this is motion number five and number six. Anyone that it might be LGBTQ persons, Black or brown persons-- If we know that someone is following the Boogaloo Boys, as an example, are affiliated with Proud Boys, then that is an issue, and we'd like to have someone be aware of that and take that into account with our hiring practices.

Additionally, as our last motion on number seven, "We summarily reject the use of any military force equipment and/or tear gas on the grounds of the university." We realize that those items have been being used, but we'd like that they be used in a training setting, and so that's why we have put this together as a motion rather than with MSU community members.

And those are the seven motions. Quickly.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Thank you very much. Thank you for the summary. Much appreciated it. Alright. So, discussion on any of these motions?

**Sen. Stanley Griffis
(BUS)**

Why would the materials in #7 be trained for if they were not to be used on campus?

**Sen. Danielle DeVoss
(CAL)**

MSU Police are often alerted by State of Michigan Police. That's why they had the Bearcat out during the summer—because of warnings from State Police about riots downtown. As far as I know, and I could be wrong, the MSU Bearcat has only/primarily been used to safely transport people.

**Sen. Jane Bunnell
(Music)**

We received rifles that are only used for target practice, for example.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

President Stanley. Then Anna Pegler-Gordon.



**President
Samuel Stanley**

Again, my thanks to Dr. Anthony and everyone involved in this, and I think it does parallel a number of the suggestions that came out of the racial equity task forces that we set up. So there's certainly a parallel there.

I would say that and again, I encourage you-- I'll share documents that we have from Interim Chief Monette that does illustrate that a number of these things, I think, are in place. They may not be in place exactly as listed here, but a number are in place. A number of the training components, a number of the issues around targeting and bias training, I think are in place.

But we certainly, again, continue. We could do better. There's some things here that, you know, might be problematic to implement for a number of reasons, and we could explain that why in the future. But I think I understand what drives this. I understand its importance.

And again, I think, you know, there are some issues around privacy, around people's, you know, that are issues, but certainly people who are parts of groups that have been associated with domestic terrorism, that certainly, to me, would be certainly a reason not to hire people. You know, beyond that, I think, you know, what groups or communities people frequent, you know, it becomes more problematic in terms of a hiring decision. Anyway. But all of this is to say that I understand what's driving this, that I think we're trying to put the number of these things into effect. And I agree with you, this timing will be good for incoming Vice President for Public Safety and Chief Lynch to take a look at.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Thank you very much.

**At-Large Member
Stephanie Anthony**

Thank you. In terms of the one response, a good example would be everything that has transpired with the Capitol building.



Dr. Anthony, cont.

And someone said—I'm sorry, I didn't have the chat right up; I just saw it pop up—you know, when would those trainings, what is the purpose of them occurring if not to be used? That would be an example. We have no idea, if something were to occur like that again, that it might be necessary to utilize those items. So-- Okay. Motion number seven. I don't know, Jennifer, if you--

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Yeah, no, I'm just going to take the comments. I have some hands raised, and then the comment. So we have Dr. Pegler-Gordon and then Dr. Crimp. So, go ahead, Anna.

**Vice Chairperson
Anna Pegler-Gordon**

I just had a very small comment. Each time the police has presented to us, they always emphasize they don't use tear gas, they use pepper spray. And so I would simply say that we-- I would make a motion to amend seven to say, "Any military force, equipment, tear gas, and/or pepper spray."

**Sen. Danielle DeVoss
(CAL)**

"Chemical agents"?

**At-Large Member
Stephanie Anthony**

Chemical agents. Oh! That's also a good way. Okay, thank you.

**Sen. Stanley Griffis
(BUS)**

"Irritant"?

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Okay. Dr. Crimp.

**Sen. Martin Crimp
(EGR)**

Yeah, I've been here a long time, and I certainly remember after a number of basketball games, probably around the turn of the century, having pretty significant riots on Grand River, and in Cedar Village, and the associated areas, where there were overturned cars, lots of broken windows, and things like that. And the police had to work pretty aggressively to overcome that. And so I think motion number seven has the potential to tie our hands in those situations.



Sen. Crimp, cont.

Quite honestly, I understand what you're trying to do here, but the reality is that it was a bunch of spoiled white kids doing that. I'm going to be frank about it. It has nothing to do with, you know, disadvantaged groups or anything. It was just people misbehaving. And a lot of spoiled kids misbehaving. And I think, at some point, you've got to be prepared to take control.

**Sen. Danielle DeVoss
(CAL)**

And, remembering those days, a LOT of the problematic action was by visitors/guests, not MSU students.

**UCFA Chairperson
Mick Fulton**

I have concerns about motion seven. If a terrorist locked themselves in one of our buildings and is killing people, does that mean they can't use their armored vehicle to rescue people?

**At-Large Member
Stephanie Anthony**

So is motion seven then problematic, period, for members of the Senate? Or is there something that could be adjusted?

Sen. Rob LaDuca (LBC)

"when unlawful assemble is declared"?

**Sen. Jane Bunnell
(Music)**

May I speak, just for a second?

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Go ahead.

**Sen. Jane Bunnell
(Music)**

I cannot find how to raise my hand. So, if you remember in our police-- We had a major policing presentation this summer, and they were very careful to assure us that this only deals with the things that they got as surplus from the government. So it doesn't really tie our hands in other ways. And they assured us that the rifles that they got, they use only for target practice.

And I don't think-- And no monies were exchanged. But I mean, I think they were pretty careful in their presentation to reassure us that these were things that were useful but only in training ways. It doesn't mean that we don't have our own Michigan State resources to look out for any riots or anything like that. It's just the militarized equipment that we got from the government. There was a lot of concern in



- Sen. Bunnell, cont.** the comments, and the questions that were given to the police, that they responded in that presentation. So I just I want to reassure people on that issue.
- Sen. Brian Roth (CANR)** *I could see motion 5 and 6 as being problematic given their specificity and potential intrusion into privacy. Could they perhaps be generalized to protected groups (motion 5) and those listed by the Southern Poverty Law Center hate group list (motion 6)?*
- Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson** And I would say-- So, I'm watching the comments and trying to summarize for you guys. There was a suggestion in five and six, instead of listing those specific organizations to say something like "organizations categorized as hate groups by the Southern Poverty Law Center".
- At-Large Member
Stephanie Anthony** Love it.
- Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson** You know, have something like that. And then there's some suggestions for wording for seven can mitigate seven a little bit. So, other comments?
- Sen. Stephen Gasteyer
(SSC)** *Could we amend motion 7 to insert the language "against unarmed demonstrators"?*
- Sen. Danielle DeVoss
(CAL)** *"We, the Faculty Senate of Michigan State University, recommend that vehicles such as the Bearcat and/or chemical irritants or agents only be used in dire situations that threaten the overall health and well-being of the campus community...?"*
- Sen. Alison Bernstein
(CHM)** *There are organizations for police reform that have specific language regarding when deadly force can be used and when it should be not. So maybe those can provide guidance for how to amend #7.*
- Sen. Danielle DeVoss
(CAL)** *But 7 isn't about deadly force...*



**Sen. Alison Bernstein
(CHM)**

Just an example. They have language about many of these things. "Use of force," not only "deadly force."

**At-Large Member
Stephanie Anthony**

I think I did see one that popped up related to-- I think it was Stephen, that mentioned about changing the language against unarmed groups. Because-- And I appreciate, with Dr. Crimp mentioning about spoiled white kids, they still, they still deserve some love, too, now. I'm not saying I don't want to give them some love. I guess my feeling there is the unarmed piece-- I don't know how anyone else might feel about that, but I think that will kind of take-- Do you think, Martin, that would address your concern? What was said there? In instances where individuals were-- I don't know.

**Sen. Martin Crimp
(EGR)**

That does not address my concerns. Those students were unarmed.

**At-Large Member
Stephanie Anthony**

They were. Yeah, they were.

**Sen. Martin Crimp
(EGR)**

And the only way to get them under control was to use tear gas or pepper spray, or whatever it was, and to have police lines come in with riot shields and all that, what appears to be very military.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Alright, we have--

**Sen. Martin Crimp
(EGR)**

And if I could add just another interesting point. As someone-- You know, I have guns, and I do target practice, but I don't know why the police would practice with certain weapons that they're never going to use. I think that just makes no sense at all to me.

**At-Large Member
Stephanie Anthony**

That's why I mentioned the situation. If something were to happen at the State of Michigan Capitol building along the same lines. And we have had some incidents there. I do know that different police jurisdictions will get together and call for reinforcements. And that, to me, would be the type of situation that MSU police officers might be called in to assist with.



- Dr. Anthony, cont.** So that would be why the practice might have value.
- Sen. Andaluna Borcila (JMC)** *It is about militarized equipment. I would leave the motion as is.*
- Sen. Catherine Grosso (Law)** *“Decommissioned military equipment.”*
- Sen. Danielle DeVoss (CAL)** *As far as I know, the Bearcat is NOT actual militarized/military equipment. Are there other vehicles? Do we have a tank?*
- Sen. Rob LaDuca (LBC)** *What about “reject the use of chemical agents if an assembly remains lawful”?*
- Sen. Catherine Grosso (Law)** *They explained the use of the weapons in their presentation to us. It has to do with complex training exercises.*
- Sen. Stephen Gasteyer (SSC)** *The police themselves would say that they now have improved tactics to deescalate unruly crowds.*
- Chairperson Jennifer Johnson** So, we have President Stanley and then Dr. Ewoldsen.
- President Samuel Stanley** So, I'll just make two very quick comments. The first is that there's two situations I think that we need to consider.
- One is when we have counterdemonstrations, essentially, on our campus. It took place in Charlottesville. There's a potential, again, that crowd control would be needed and people might actually be armed who were counter-demonstrating, even though, of course, our campus does not allow that carry of weapons on our campus. But people may disregard that. So I think that that's a reason to consider, one, what people can do or not do in response.
- And then the second thing, which I think remains important-- Well, what was the second thing? Oh, the shooter on campus. Obviously the issues around shooters on campus. And the particular vehicle, the Bearcat, is, again, designed to provide safety, essentially, to move



President Stanley, cont. people in the event the shooter or something on campus.

So I think those things I think at least need to be addressed that are important.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Fantastic. Thank you.

**Sen. Danielle DeVoss
(CAL)**

Again, I fully support the 1-6 motions, but have we ever had an issue of an MSU police representative misusing a weapon?

**Sen. Andaluna Borcila
(JMC)**

Lots of people had problems with MSU Police "helping out" the Lansing Police Department by using tear gas against Black Lives Matter demonstrators.

**Vice Chairperson
Anna Pegler-Gordon**

We saw the police escalate the situation in Lansing during BLM demonstrations, including MSUPD.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Dr. Ewoldsen, would you still like to comment?

**Sen. David Ewoldsen
(ComArtSci)**

I guess the only thing I would say is twofold. One is, we know from decades of research and psychology, when you have weapons around, it increases the likelihood that they're going to be used. It's called the weapons effect. It's one of the most robust effects that you find in that area of research. And so the simple presence of weapons increases the likelihood of weapons being used.

And oftentimes when we look at riots and riots going out of control, it's because of how the police responded to them. The Washington Post report this summer on the Black Lives Matter protest, the reports from the Kerner Commission on the civil rights protests during the '60s, and most particularly what happened in Detroit—that had there not been an escalation of what happened and by the police in Detroit, you wouldn't have had a hundred city blocks burned. And so those are some of the things that you need to think about as well, so that when you have weapons to deter,



Sen. Ewoldsen, cont.

sometimes they're going to be almost inevitable that they're used in context where it's not to deter and they make the situation much worse.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Alright, thank you very much. Dr. Crimp? Okay. Errant hand. Other comments? We've got our president again.

**President Samuel
Stanley**

No. Nope. Lowering hand.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

No? Okay. Alright. I don't see other comments. So, you know, I will leave it up to the policing committee. It sounds like one through six, if we make that change about those listed as hate groups, might be fairly easy votes. But I'll leave it up to you. Would you like to vote on 1 through 6? 1 through 4? 1 through 7? How would you like to vote? And to say that regardless of how we vote, I think a next step would be to bring these motions and these ideas to meet with the new Chief of Police and to talk with him, and that you guys would be the right Faculty Senate reps to do that.

**At-Large Member
Stephanie Anthony**

I would like to do the amendment to five, if we take one through six that was just mentioned.

**Secretary for
Academic Governance
Tyler Silvestri**

Amendment to 5 (assuming no objection) - "in groups designated as hate groups by the Southern Poverty Law Center."

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Okay, yeah, and Tyler put it in the comments.

**At-Large Member
Stephanie Anthony**

Thank you.

**Sen. Ryan Scrivens
(SSC)**

Or the ADL

**Secretary for
Academic Governance
Tyler Silvestri**

"by the Southern Poverty Law Center, Federal Bureau of Investigation, or Anti-Defamation League."

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

So would you like to vote on 1 through 6? What would you like to do?

**At-Large Member
Stephanie Anthony**

Sure, if these best and brightest minds are open to that, I'd like to vote on 1 through 6.



**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Alright. Are you comfortable with voting on them as one? Do want to vote on them individually, or can we vote on them as a group?

**At-Large Member
Stephanie Anthony**

I'd like to vote on them individually.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Okay, Tyler, if you could help us with that.

**Secretary for
Academic Governance
Tyler Silvestri**

Yeah, so, what I can do is there will be a screen with seven questions for the seven motions. I guess just put "abstain" for the seventh, or we'll just ignore whatever comes up. But it'll all be on one screen.

**At-Large Member
Stephanie Anthony**

Thank you.

**Sen. Jane Bunnell
(Music)**

Tyler, could you add "or the FBI," not just the Southern Poverty Law Center? I mean, I think the FBI also designates terror groups.

**Secretary for
Academic Governance
Tyler Silvestri**

I mean, it's not my decision.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Yes, that's added. Like it'll be, "designated hate groups by" the ones we've mentioned and any others that seem appropriate. How about that?

**Sen. Andaluna Borcila
(JMC)**

I think we will need some careful consideration of what groups we include or not as these are not all necessarily "neutral" groups

**Secretary for
Academic Governance
Tyler Silvestri**

Give it 10 more seconds. Can folks scroll through this themselves, or do I have to?

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

No, it looks like 1 through 6 all passed. So thank you to the work on our policing committee. Much appreciated.

You know, it is work that all of these groups brought motions today are doing to take people suggestions, their ideas, put them into motions, and bring them forward. So, just thank you so much for all the work you've been doing.

Faculty Senate

Transcript

February 16, 2021



MICHIGAN STATE
UNIVERSITY

**Chairperson Johnson,
cont.**

Tyler, maybe you and I can stay on after to help with all that and make sure we get all the follow-up everywhere it needs to go.

We'll try to-- Anyone who is still discussing motions, we'll try to scrape the chat and send it to you. We will try to follow up with the budget presentation, the groups whose motions have passed today or not passed, we will try to arrange conversations with the policing group and the new chief of police, with the OCR group and [Associate] Vice President Jachimiak, and others.

And thank you for your patience in sticking with us until 5:30 today. We've tried to get out by 5:00 all year, but today was important. Is there anything else before we adjourn today?

**Sen. Jane Bunnell
(Music)**

Mardi Gras.

**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

Alright, well, without-- If there's no objection, the meeting is adjourned. And thank you very much, everybody.