

Faculty Senate

Unofficial Transcript

June 15, 2021



MICHIGAN STATE
UNIVERSITY

This transcript was prepared by the Secretary for Academic Governance and has not been approved by the Faculty Senate. It may contain misattributions and other mistakes.

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

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

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Tyler Silvestri". The signature is written in a cursive style and is positioned above a horizontal line.

Tyler Silvestri
Secretary for Academic Governance



Table of Contents

Approval of Agenda and Minutes	3
Remarks	3
Executive Vice President for Health Sciences Norman Beauchamp	3
Faculty Senate Chairperson Jennifer Johnson	3
Campus Reopening	4
Vaccines will not be required.....	5
Sen. Anthony moves to request that the administration purchase plexiglass barriers and hand sanitizer dispensers for 75% of classrooms	16
Discussion is paused	18
Presentation of Use of COVID-19 Funds by Director of Contract and Grant Administration Evo Pedawi and Controller Greg Deppong	18
Questions and Answers	20
Report to be Shared by July 15	22
Campus Reopening, cont.	27
Senator Anthony's Motion is Defeated.....	27
Resolution on COVID-19 Impact Statements	28
Amendment is Introduced	33
The Amended Motion Passes.....	34
Dispensing with Remaining Agenda Items	34
Adjournment	34



[**Editor's Note:** The approval of the agenda and minutes was inadvertently not recorded. Both were approved as presented. President Samuel L. Stanley Jr. and Provost Teresa K. Woodruff were absent and did not deliver remarks.]

Executive Vice President for Health Sciences Norman Beauchamp Oh, thank you. And I hope everybody's getting some rest. And it's so wonderful to see what's happening with COVID, its decreased prevalence and the world returning a bit to normal. I'll reserve my comments mainly for what I was asked to do, which was to share a little bit about the plans for the fall. Other than that, I don't have anything to share. So I can jump into that when appropriate, Dr. Johnson.

Faculty Senate Chairperson Jennifer Johnson Okay. And then I'll have my comments. This is a reminder, we have the information back from our Faculty Senate survey. Thank you to those who filled it out. We just finished the report today. We'll send that out after this meeting so you can see the summary of what people said. But in response to a few things folks said, like we did in University Council, we've decided to title everyone. So everyone is "Senator so-and-so," or if they're a student on University Council, they're "Representative so-and-so," or if they're a dean, they're "Dean so and so."

People wanted us to more closely follow Robert's Rules, so we will. And the most salient one I think we've been a little lax about is letting people talk more than twice on a topic, so we will stick to that. And on any given topic or motion, you can speak twice.

The other thing people said is that sometimes folks interrupt each other, and I will try to keep a better eye on that, so please be aware of interrupting. And I will try to keep an eye on that too. Like I said, we will send out the Faculty Senate agenda-- I mean, survey response. I wanted to briefly show you one or two things.

So, overall we had 51 respondents out of, I think there are about 77 of us. I wanted to show you the histogram of-- On a scale of 0 to 10, with 0 meaning "not at all useful," and 10 meaning "extremely useful," our mean answer was about 6.1, 6.2. There were folks who found it useful and folks who found it not useful. 78% of people selected 6 or higher, 21% of people selected 5 or lower.

Some highlights: When we asked about the best things, 13 people said that the best thing was the opportunity to hear updates directly from administration leadership. Several people liked our new processes. Several people said that the ability to influence and change administrative decisions was the best time, or the best thing about their time. And a lot of people liked holding meetings remotely. It was interesting. A few people really didn't, but many people did. And a few people said the best thing was the opportunity to get to know or hear perspectives from faculty in units other than their own.



Chairperson Johnson, cont. Worst things: comments from senators sometimes too long, irrelevant, redundant, or otherwise unnecessary. 4 respondents thought that some of our interactions were disrespectful or didn't like the way people spoke to each other. So that was interesting. Something we should definitely keep an eye on. A few thought we were ineffective or inefficient. 5 people thought meetings went too long. And 3 people really wanted—I think probably more—but 3 people identified the worst thing as they really wanted materials further ahead of the meetings.

What should stay the same? Improvements to our processes of communication, holding meetings remotely, continued discourse with administrative leadership. Things that could change: agenda items introduced further ahead of meetings, maybe more efficient going through agenda items, although we've been more efficient than we've been in the past. With a body of 77, there's always room for improvement. And one response read in its entirety, "More action, less talking." And one person said they were really burnt out and didn't want to meet today. So I hope that person actually took today and did not come if they were really burnt out.

Overall, I think there is a diversity of opinions, which you would expect from a body this large, but I think there were a lot of useful suggestions about ways we can improve and things that people called out that I had not known or noticed. So I really appreciate your feedback and the comments. And again, also, people acknowledging that things are and have been-- The processes have been getting better, so we will just keep working together. And those are my comments.

So, should we proceed to new business? Which is about-- People had a lot of questions about campus reopening. And so for that, we will turn the time over briefly to our EVP for Health Sciences, Dr. Beauchamp. I think the idea was for him to give us a three-to-five-minute summary and then for people to be able to ask all the questions that they have with some support from Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Mark Largent.

Executive Vice President for Health Sciences Norman Beauchamp That's great. Thank you. Thank you, Chairperson Johnson. Senator Johnson. And my observation as well, it's been wonderful to see that topics that were brought here by the Senate shape the ultimate decisions by administration and things being brought to the center for consultation. I think it's how it should happen, and I've seen it happen a lot.

In the early spring we shifted away from, as you all may recall—probably some of you served on these committees—we had 20 committees that looked at reopening, and it's really shifted to what was getting back to normal and having people in their university responsibilities make decisions related to how we do reopening. And I'm really happy Associate Provost Largent is here.



EVPHS Beauchamp, cont. What we've been working on is a letter to the campus community about what we see happening in the fall. And I'll go through key aspects of that letter, but you can expect the letter to come out in the next probably two to three days on that.

The president listened carefully and thoughtfully to the guidance and the recommendations of the Faculty Senate and the students, to be certain. Where the planning is now is for a more typical Fall Semester. As you know, the vast majority of classes will be in person. We expect our residence halls to return to a fuller capacity. And we expect to be able to re-engage opening museums on campus and engaging social events, as well as sports.

The plan at present is that MSU will not require COVID-19 vaccines for faculty, staff, and students outside of some limited settings, such as international and domestic university-related travel, as well as for the medical school and the nursing school. There are some health facilities that are requiring students to get vaccinated in order to be engaged in patient interactions.

Faculty, staff, and students who are not vaccinated will still be required to wear face coverings when indoors, per CDC guidelines. Those coming to campus will be required to attest to their vaccination status and, also, if questioned, to be able to document that they have been vaccinated. There's more information that'll follow, some of the decisions about how this will be implemented in terms of things like a campus compact will follow. I think a lot of the emphasis will be on, really, kind of an honor code, right? Where people will be expected to be truthful in their statement about having had vaccinations. But that'll be the approach at present in the fall is that vaccines won't be required but that folks will be asked to follow CDC guidelines. In addition to that, we're going to ask that all people coming to campus that have not been vaccinated participate in the EDP [Early Detection Program] so that we have a way to detect instances of COVID. So that all will come out in a summary letter to faculty, staff, and students later this week, but that's the status at this time.

Chairperson Jennifer Johnson Thank you very much. So, are there questions? This is the chance. Ask anything you've been wondering but didn't have an opportunity to ask.

Senator Karen Kelly-Blake (CHM) Thank you, Chair Johnson. This is Karen Kelly-Blake, I have a question. And I have my hand raised—it's actually clapping. I picked--

Chairperson Jennifer Johnson Oh, great!



Senator Karen Kelly-Blake (CHM) I hit the wrong emoticon. So good afternoon, Dr. Beauchamp. I understand what you said about no required vaccine, but how does the university plan to track compliance with those who are unvaccinated? You're saying you're going to rely on some sort of honor code or compact system. And I tremble when I think about that, because there's no way really to monitor that, it seems like in any reasonable way. So what is the plan then for tracking the unvaccinated on campus? Especially with the new requirement for students to live in residential housing on campus, how is that going to work for those students as well as for the larger university community?

Executive Vice President for Health Sciences Norman Beauchamp Yes. And again, Senator Kelly-Blake, as the messenger I'll share what I know. And then there's also some things that are still to be developed. Our expectation is that students will be reporting to-- At this point the University Physician's Office will have a database where we will ask the students to report their vaccination status. We won't communicate that information widely because it's a HIPAA protected. But we will, depending on what happens with COVID-19, if there are campus challenges or if there is a reason to ask further about that, we will verify the student statements.

But the information, we're putting together a database to record that information for the students. We've had some conversations about once that information, that attestation is recorded, if the answer to this is that they haven't been vaccinated, then that would trigger their required participation in the EDP [Early Detection Program]. And we're working on just some of the workflows related to how we do that from an IT side. [Vice President for Research and Innovation] Doug Gage is having these meetings with a number of leaders in the university, as well as IT.

Chairperson Jennifer Johnson Fantastic. So we will take Senator Borcila, then Senator Bunnell, then Senator Crimp, then Senator Pegler-Gordon.

Senator Andaluna Borcila (JMC) Okay. I'm going to see, I'm not sure that you can see me or hear me. The hearing is more important.

So thank you so much, Dr. Beauchamp. I guess I have just 2 quick comments and one question. I think it would have been so useful for President Stanley to be here today, or at least to engage with senators on why the decision was made to not mandate the vaccine. Of course, it's his prerogative, but given the big support for the vaccine mandate on University Council.

And then also, I was wondering, Dr. Beauchamp, you said that the decisions at this point in terms of campus reopening—perhaps I misheard you—are basically now being taken by people who are in position of responsibilities. I'm imagining administration.



Senator Borcila, cont. But I remember that one of the main values for the task force committee on reopening, one of the main voiced values that they had—and actually they put it in writing too—is for when campus reopens there to be a process of shared governance and for faculty to play a critical role in this. And so, that was one of the main values that they came up with. And I'm wondering what faculty involvement in the process is. Thank you.

Executive Vice President for Health Sciences Norman Beauchamp Yeah, thank you. And it's always difficult to comment and channel what the president would say, but I'll do my best to share.

I think that in this, the idea that listening carefully to the Faculty Senate and the students in garnering their input was one part of this. I think having the chief diversity officer do outreach, the provost's office do outreach, discussions with legal counsel, have all been factored into this.

I do know the president wishes that he could be here. He had a conflict. But those are some of the sources of input. And again, I think he took the comments to heart.

Some of the challenges with this included-- Requiring it for students but not being able to require it for staff—right?—could send some message of unfairness to the students. It still being in EUA [Emergency Use Authorization] status, I think, was a data point as well.

I think the idea that there has been a large uptake of vaccinations, and the effort that not forcing students and others who have vaccine hesitancy to get vaccines. And that we, again, doubling down on our efforts to encourage and educate was really felt to be the approach.

I see that the comment that UC [University Council] argued that we should require to have all students, faculty, and staff, and that's right. I agree with that. And as we had conversations, as I understand it, respectfully, with the bargaining units, that although you can mandate potentially this to the bargaining units, there's still a lot of discussions about when that happens and how that happens. And so there was a risk that those would be discorded.

Chairperson Jennifer Johnson Alright. Senator Bunnell.

Senator Jane Bunnell (Music) Hi. Thank you for allowing me to bring the School of Music into this, Dr. Beauchamp.

Executive Vice President for Health Sciences Norman Beauchamp Yeah.

Senator Jane Bunnell (Music) We're not going to feel safe teaching in-person in our studios if our students aren't vaccinated. So then that means we have another year on Zoom if the students aren't vaccinated? I mean, that's my question to you, because I don't know how we can teach if the students aren't vaccinated.



Executive Vice President for Health Sciences Norman Beauchamp Please know, I hear you. And I understand your perspective. And part of what we've seen with the labs at least, as Doug Gage has shared, is that they have put in place a policy that if you get vaccinated there's certain things that can be relaxed in the lab. Right? Whether or not you wear a mask, how many people can be in the lab. And so some of the thinking would be that in some of the settings where students want to be in person and sharing their voices, that to participate in some of those activities, asking them to make sure that they're vaccinated could be a path to do that.

Senator Jane Bunnell (Music) Thank you.

Executive Vice President for Health Sciences Norman Beauchamp You're welcome.

Chairperson Jennifer Johnson Senator Crimp.

Senator Martin Crimp (EGR) Yes, I've had a number of people ask me if they should continue participating in the Spartan Spit program when they're fully vaccinated. I brought this up at our last Faculty Senate meeting, and at that point the president indicated that we should. Has that changed?

Executive Vice President for Health Sciences Norman Beauchamp What I would see coming into the fall, certainly, Senator Crimp, is that if one has been vaccinated, we wouldn't ask students and others to participate in the EDP [Early Detection Program]. That's going to be the communication later this week.

Chairperson Jennifer Johnson Alright. Senator Pegler-Gordon.

Vice Chairperson Anna Pegler-Gordon Yeah. I wanted to draw attention to a couple of comments as well from Senator Guzzetta and also Senator [Robert LaDuca (LBC)] in the chat. But I will say I share Senator Borcila's concerns that-- I posted in the chat the three values that were supposed to guide reopening about transparency and openness, trusting and safe, caring and accountable, and empowering everyone to be engaged in a community that is inclusive and equitable being with actions responsive to all members. And, frankly, I don't see how this decision meets any of those values. And I'm also really concerned about-- I was willing to teach, and signed up to teach in person last fall. I am going to obviously be teaching a large—well, not obviously—a large lecture course this fall. We've been asked, can we lift the 100-person limit on that lecture? And I'm wondering, what are the safety requirements? Like last year I was told in these rooms there can only be a very small number of people. And even in my office, I can't have anyone else because it's not safe. And so now I'm wondering, are you telling me to go back into these rooms not knowing how many students in my class are unvaccinated, and just whatever? It's okay now? I mean, this seems this extraordinary discordance between where we were this time last year and where we are now.



Vice Chairperson Pegler-Gordon, cont. Now I understand that many more people are vaccinated, but if large number-- Like say if a significant number within my class, and I have no idea how many, are not vaccinated, how does that protect me? I'm unclear on the privacy protections, which I absolutely understand and respect, but then I'm wondering if we're requiring students to wear masks in class if they're not vaccinated, can I be told how many students in my class are not vaccinated so I have at least some idea of whether they're complying? They're going to be participating in Spartan Spit, but nobody else is, so it seems like that is potentially a privacy issue there in terms of they're picking up the things from a public location. So I'm just very confused and concerned about all of these issues, but particularly the safety question and as it relates to the privacy question. How do you balance those?

Executive Vice President for Health Sciences Norman Beauchamp Yeah. What we're trying to do, Senator Pegler-Gordon, is adhere to CDC guidelines and MIOSHA guidelines. And what we see is in public settings now, people are vaccinated. And if you're vaccinated, it's felt to be a safe environment for individuals to be in. And so we're trying to adhere to those guidelines in keeping the classroom safe. We can ask Associate Provost Largent to talk about the classrooms. But as we're seeing the vaccines be effective, the idea that a faculty member who's vaccinated, students who come to the classroom and they're protected with face masks and social distancing if they're not vaccinated and participate in the program, we think that's consistent with guidelines and with keeping the classroom safe.

Chairperson Jennifer Johnson If I could just-- And I see in the chat, I think that the take-home though is—partly to summarize—is that I think that there are a lot of faculty that still don't really feel safe. I mean, we were locked down for so long, and it's hard to just about-face. And I think, faculty, at least many of them do not.

I saw a hand. Oh, well, Associate Provost Largent, did you want to say anything before I call in the next faculty senators?

Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Mark Largent I'm happy to follow-up a little bit on that. And I would agree wholeheartedly that there is a distinction between people being relatively safe and feeling relatively safe, and that we need to respect both the fact of people's safety and the affect of whether or not people feel safe. They're both critically important. It is disorienting, I think, to be operating in this environment because two things have changed. One: the science has changed over the last 12 months. We understand the virus much better. We understand how it's spread. And we understand when and where people contract it to a much greater degree than we did 12 months ago. The context has changed radically with the introduction of absurdly effective pair of vaccines, with the 2 mRNA vaccines. They are effective beyond our wildest dreams.



Associate Provost Largent, cont. I think the other disorienting thing for us is the fact that we all grew up being told that you vaccinate in order to protect the public health. And that there's a secondary benefit of vaccinating to you personally. And so it's the forwarding of the public health as why we vaccinate, and then the secondary effects of you benefiting from both the vaccine and from other people being vaccinated as secondary. And the CDC did a kind of flip on us about a month and a half ago, and it's very disorienting. Because what they're saying is, this vaccine is so absurdly effective that if you get vaccinated you are safe. You are safe regardless of if you are surrounded by unvaccinated people. You are safe if you are surrounded by unvaccinated people who have the virus. And that's disorienting for us, because we have, I think, wisely and properly taken a large number of precautions to keep ourselves safe, and the rapidity at which the vaccine has been provided to us and its tremendous efficacy is difficult for us to really grapple with the cognitive dissonance between last year and this year. So there's fact and affect buried in there.

There's also the fact that we've had a year to make the classrooms a safer place. And so at this time last year, I can tell you, we did not have an inventory of what the ventilation was in our buildings in the way that we do right now.

We also have spent the year investing large amounts of money in making that ventilation safer, not just safer for the COVID pandemic, but safer for the annual influenza epidemic, for colds, for everything else. So we've got MERV-13 in almost all of our classroom settings now, and we know precisely which rooms don't have it.

So the space is safer, the vaccine has changed the context. And then the last thing that's incredibly important is, we're down to a community transmission rate right now of below 3 per 100,000. That's profoundly different than it was last fall. So those things combined really matter.

I think the last thing that I would point out is this, if you are vaccinated, it doesn't matter if the students are vaccinated. The breakthrough rate on this at the end of May was 1 in 10,000, it is tremendously low. And if you are to contract it after you have been vaccinated, your hospitalization rate is extraordinarily low relative to not being vaccinated. And the death rate is effectively 0. So it is a very different context than we were facing a year ago. And we have to explain that to people I think in gentle ways, because ultimately we did a really good job of convincing people that we should go remote last March and that we should stay online last fall. And we did such a good job that this about-face is very disorienting.

I think Representative Pegler-Gordon asked the question about the 100-seat cap. Late last week, the Provost Office lifted the 100-seat cap. It had been there for a variety of different reasons. All of them related to the pandemic directly or indirectly, and as the conditions have changed, we felt it appropriate to lift that cap.



Associate Provost Largent, cont. So, provided that the spaces are appropriately ventilated, as most of the classrooms are, if the class is better taught with a larger number of students in a given room and again, to Representative Pegler-Gordon's particular situation—which I know well because I've taught that class, MC 201—gathering those students together in that room serves a very important purpose that can never be met online. And if they choose to do that, if that meets the learning outcomes, then the provost's office supports it. And I've already had the conversation with the interim dean in [James] Madison [College] that I would certainly support it as well.

Chairperson Jennifer Johnson So Senators Gould, Gasteyer, and Guzzetta, in that order.

Senator Daniel Gould (EDUC) Three questions. First, will the faculty be informed if their classroom has been updated in terms of the ventilation system? So that's one. The second one is in terms of accountability—for example, we know students shouldn't cheat, but they cheat like crazy on exams—if a student lies about their vaccination status or a faculty lies, will there be consequences? And the third, it's very non-humanistic, I guess, but have we talked to our insurance providers, and what effect will it have if people are not vaccinated and they get COVID and spend 50 days in the hospital? Will that affect our rates for our health insurance?

Executive Vice President for Health Sciences Norman Beauchamp Those are three somewhat broad questions, Senator. Obviously. I think the first is that keeping the classroom safe and making the classroom safe is a commitment that I've heard Provost Largent as well as Dan Bollman in facilities share with us. And so I have confidence in their attestation about that.

In terms of all the comments that Mark made about safety, low transmission rates, and safe spaces, I wouldn't anticipate that this would be something that would affect our insurance rates for that as a university. And your third question, forgive me, was--? Oh, "How we will hold people accountable?" Yeah, and that's where some of this gets difficult. And I think that some of the answers that we're trying to work through, is if-- Could you expel a student if they stated that they had the vaccination and then it turned out they didn't? Well, that could be fraught in some ways, in trying to understand why they made the comments that they did. I think it will require a bigger conversation to figure out how you would punish. And that is where I see this gets difficult because we've spent a good bit of time saying, well yeah, is it something that you would get expelled from or would it more likely be that you will be excluded from participating in events that are public, and maybe you'd be required to take classes online or something? But there haven't been decisions on that. And certainly if there were recommendations from senators on what would be appropriate and just.



EVPHS Beauchamp, cont. And I want to be sensitive to Senator Pegler-Gordon's comments about if there are inputs into what would be mechanisms of accountability, certainly we want to want to incorporate those. Another factor, President Stanley, as an infectious disease clinician, cares deeply about students, faculty, and staff. I think he said to said to me, I think he said to all of us that his preference would be everybody gets a vaccine. Everybody gets one. But it really was the feeling that it would be difficult—not difficult—that it wouldn't be possible to do so. And one of the things that I will take back is greater clarity behind what specifically are those difficulties, and maybe that would be helpful as well.

But in conversations with [General Counsel] Brian Quinn, there was discussions about some of the legality around it, in discussions with the represented units, there was concerns that this really wouldn't be something that you could mandate, which then created this disconnect between requiring it of our students but others not being required, and some of the issues of power and fairness that should be factored in. But I think President Stanley would be most delighted if everybody was vaccinated, to be certain.

Chairperson Jennifer Johnson I lost track if Guzzetta or Gasteyer was next. I'm just going to go in the order on my screen. I think it was Senator Guzzetta, then Senator Gasteyer, then Senator Anthony.

Senator Juliet Guzzetta (CAL) Okay. Thank you. I think it was Senator Gasteyer, but if you don't mind, I'll just take it then.

So I just want to give voice to what I think has been said in the chat a little bit, but people don't feel safe, not only because they've been vaccinated and there's that small percentage that they'll still contract the virus, but because they live in a house with kids under 12 who haven't been back vaccinated, because they live in a house where they're taking care of their elders who are immunocompromised and haven't been vaccinated. So people feel unsafe doing their jobs when we say you don't have to get vaccinated, even though we recommend you do, because they're around people in their lives and their communities who haven't been vaccinated because they can't be yet.

And I just don't understand. So this is the question I raised in the chat that Senator Pegler-Gordon flagged-- The logic. So I'm just curious to-- I just want to understand a little better what went into this decision, because I thought we were really coming together as a community. We had an extra University Council meeting. The ASMSU took more time to think about it, poll their constituents. I mean, we came together and we said, as students, as faculty, as staff, this is what we believe in, and this is how we can do our jobs best. So I don't understand the decision to kind of go against that.



Senator Guzzetta, cont. And then kind of actually pursuant to my first point on this, Dr. Beauchamp, hopefully is a softball as a scientist because I feel the CDC has actually not done a good job at explaining the mask situation, because for the first year it was, you wear a mask to protect other people, right? But now it's saying, if you're un-vaccinated, you should wear the mask, right? So my little two-year-old is trying to wear her mask and it's a little bit nerve-wracking in public because she's not so good at it. The five-year-old's a little bit better, but nobody else is masked, so it's fingers crossed that they're vaccinated. But this is the sort of logic that the CDC hasn't really explained well in terms of masking and unmasking. So maybe you can just answer that.

But really, I would love an answer to, if you know from President Stanley, what went into this decision, given the way the community really came together to ask for a vaccine requirement, especially with all the exceptions that were okayed.

Executive Vice President for Health Sciences Norman Beauchamp And if I asked, Senator Guzzetta, because I feel I've done my best to represent the things that went into the decision. And I can tell that in sharing those, there wasn't a moment where you said, "Ah, that makes sense to me." So I could share again the concern about-- Like if we said, would it be possible to require vaccinations of all of the staff at Michigan State? The answer that I heard was that wouldn't be possible. So if that's a fact, if that's a truth—and my understanding is that's a truth—so I'll give you just what I, my framing of it, not and some of that comes from what I've heard from [General Counsel] Brian Quinn and from the represented units would be able to negotiate that, is what I've been told. And so--

Chairperson Jennifer Johnson Dr. Beauchamp, at the risk of-- I know, I don't want to interrupt you, but can I try to help you?

Executive Vice President for Health Sciences Norman Beauchamp I would appreciate the help. Again, I'm trying to represent someone else's perspective.

Chairperson Jennifer Johnson I think you're saying it's super diplomatically. I don't have to be that diplomatic. So I'm going to summarize what I heard you say undiplomatically, and then you can say if it's right or wrong, okay? Basically, I think what you're saying is because of some of the union agreements of collective bargaining, that they decided that it's not possible to force people to be vaccinated as a condition of their employment. So it's a union issue in that the president felt like if you can't make the staff do it, it's not fair to make the students do it. Is that--

Executive Vice President for Health Sciences Norman Beauchamp I think that is an important component of it, yes. I do. Some of it's also then how do you-- What's enforcement look like, and how do you do that? And some of the issue is there's vaccine hesitancy, where there's not trust. And so what do you do in that circumstance? But I appreciate your succinctness in summarizing that. That's right.



Chairperson Jennifer Johnson Did that answer the question, Senator Guzzetta? I just-- Sorry to jump in the middle of that, but I just-- I think--

Senator Juliet Guzzetta (CAL) Yeah, I appreciate giving me a chance. I just, to me, then it's like, well, why can't we just talk with the unions then? I thought there was communication with the unions then.

Executive Vice President for Health Sciences Norman Beauchamp Yeah, no, it's fair. There's--

Senator Juliet Guzzetta (CAL) And people have-- I totally understand, there's a lot of vaccine hesitancy, but there were many outs. I mean, the philosophical out was really an open like anybody, right? So it didn't have to be medical. So there were really many reasons to not have to do this. To me, it was coming together. I mean, every leader, like the top, top leaders at the school are all scientists, right? Yourself, the president, the provost, right? This is a big science school. So I just am surprised that we don't come together on this.

Executive Vice President for Health Sciences Norman Beauchamp Mark, I see your hand. Largent, you may have other thoughts to add on that.

Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Mark Largent So if I could for a second speak not as an administrator, but as a disciplinary expert on precisely this question. So my scholarly research has on vaccine hesitancy and on increasing vaccine uptake. And I never imagined when I was doing it and then moving into administration that it would ever have any relevance. So it's the sort of shocking serendipity for me.

I think we can all agree that our goal is to have as many people as possible on our campus be fully vaccinated. I can't imagine that there's anyone who disagrees with that. And I think the idea of mandating it is a means to an end of maximizing the number of people who would be vaccinated. But in order to have that mandate in place, you have to have a large number of carve-outs, philosophical, religious, and medical. And there are simply no ways around that. Even if we could overcome the logistical, the legal, and the political barriers to implementing a mandate, which I think it's pretty clear that those are not overcomeable, but if we could, and we mandated this, the philosophical, religious, and medical carve-outs for it would leave a very big opening.

We have seen in states that have implemented vaccine mandates, have gotten rid of philosophical and religious exceptions, a small increase in the number of under-vaccinated children. We have seen a much larger increase in vaccine compliance in those states that have implemented incentives and disincentives that are strategically placed to create more work for people who want to not be vaccinated, or in that case, want to not vaccinate their children.



Associate Provost Largent, cont. So at the exact same time that California got rid of everything but medical exceptions, Michigan implemented a new policy whereby to get a philosophical or religious exception, you had to go to a vaccine education session at the county health department. They happened in the exact same year, in 2016. And the result of it was Michigan had double the increase in compliance that California did. That is, if your goal as a community is the increased compliance of your community members, use incentives and disincentives, not mandates and carve-outs.

So that's precisely what is on the table now, is that people who are vaccinated do not have to be weekly tested, are not expected to wear masks, and will not have to quarantine if they're exposed. That's a very powerful disincentive for people who want to avoid vaccination, and I believe will result in a higher vaccination rate on campus than you would get from a mandate.

Chairperson Jennifer Johnson Thank you very much. We have Senator Gasteyer and then Senator Anthony. You're muted.

Senator Stephen Gasteyer (SSC) I took my hand down and left the mute on. Anyway, okay. I don't have to say very much, but I do feel like I need to ask the question that was posed to me by one of my constituents, which has to do with the presumption of a pledge of having been vaccinated. And what people were concerned about are those who were interacting with subsectors of our student body and subsectors of our society who outright flouted the rules and regulations in the spring to the point where they were not-- Where they were outright lying when people would ask them about having done things. And so can we really-- My caveat is I actually agree with where this is going as a sociologist. My work on compliance in the agricultural sector actually mirrors some of what Mark Largent talked about in terms of vaccine hesitancy. Having said that, I think some of my constituents are a little concerned about trusting people to voluntarily give you an honest and straight up answer. Not the large majority, but there's a minority out there who might well just say, "I've been vaccinated," and then scream and yell if you ask them to prove it. So that's the one part of this that I think is a little bit concerning, or at least my constituents do.

Executive Vice President for Health Sciences Norman Beauchamp Yeah. And we hear that. I think that that's a legitimate concern. And I think the feeling is, is that with incentives, that that'll be one way to encourage, with education that will be another, with high vaccination rates, with low transmission rates, and then that small number of individuals, Senator Gasteyer, that it would be a very small number of people. But you're right. There will always exist people trying to be unfair in the system. And so then you could say, "Well, we're going to require individuals show their vaccination card." But that also is not hard to gain.



EVPHS Beauchamp, cont. And I think that there's ways, unless we actually did a blood draw and a titer, that if people want to get around the system, they can. So the goal would be what we have been trying to do, is to really educate and talk about the importance of it. We'll come out with a series of incentives and encouragements. And then just a statement that people need to be prepared to verify if asked about their status, to your point, that they will be asked to prove it. And so we see that as another encouragement. But again, it's not 100%. And unless you're taking titers, there'll be a way that people can gain this.

Chairperson Jennifer Johnson Senator Anthony.

Senator Stephanie Anthony (At-Large) So my question is, Chairperson Johnson, would it be appropriate to make a motion at this time?

Chairperson Jennifer Johnson You can make a motion.

Senator Stephanie Anthony (At-Large) This is in light of the fact, it appears, that the administration has stated its case.

And if in fact that is the case, that there is no changing this perspective, I have thought that we've discussed the use of vaccines. We've discussed the use of face masks. We've talked about social distancing. We've even addressed the fact that the work that has been done related to ventilation systems has occurred. We've talked about compliance data. And even after discussions with the MSU unions, it appears that the administration is steadfast in its desire to not mandate. I'd like to make a motion that the administration purchase for 75% of its classrooms, any or all classrooms or greater, portable plexiglass workplace barriers that can be used at the discretion of the instructor as he or she comes into the classroom. And I'm sure we've all seen them on some level. They can actually be cut to size. We can configure them basically to fit to the classroom, how it is set up.

In addition to that, I'd like to, as part of this motion, a simple gesture, but also request that the administration purchase for each classroom wall-placed sanitizer units so the students can use those coming into the classroom. And this motion is based on the fact that we've covered so many of the things that still do not give us all confidence that we're in safest of environments. But I'm hopeful that it might have some bearing and would relieve some of the concern that individuals have, that faculty might have. Thank you.

Chairperson Jennifer Johnson Is there a second to the motion? Oh, there's a second. Fantastic. Okay. So now we'll have discussion related to the motion. And let me just note, we have 2 guests here to speak and answer questions about the use of COVID-19 funds who have a hard stop at 430, and we're pushing up against the time for that. So I guess I just wanted to note that they have to leave at 430. So is there a discussion related to this motion, for or against? Senator DeVoss, does your comment relate to the motion?



Senator Danielle DeVoss (CAL) It sort of does, if y'all won't mind hearing me out just for a moment, because I was thinking about this question. I'm really inspired by what Senator Anthony just suggested. So I'm a bit curious ... and we may not have time to open up this whole conversation, but I'm curious about what discussions people are having in their units and in their departments and if there's room in or via Faculty Senate for us to have some conversations about how units are addressing reopening plans and needs.

For instance, to me, the plexiglass dividers seems to be more of a unit-based decision. So if there's room for some people in some units to go to their chairs or perhaps their college deans to make such arguments for their safety, I'm wondering if that's a possibility. It seems like based on our conversation today that units do have some agency in protecting themselves and their students and making unit level decisions that might be necessary, like for instance, in the context of the College of Music.

So I would love to hear more about how people are creating and engaging community norms, but having conversations in units so that we have a conversation that's both university-wide and global Faculty Senate, but that's also localized to our units and departments. I'd be really eager to share what others are doing.

Chairperson Jennifer Johnson Alright. Thank you very much. Is there other discussion for or against or related before we take a vote on Dr-- or Senator Anthony's motion?

Oh my goodness. There's a lot. Okay. So we will do this. Let me-- But like I said, if we don't vote on this before 415, we probably won't be able to hear about the COVID funds and how they've been used. Senator Juzwik.

Senator Mary Juzwik (EDUC) Thank you. My question relates to the evidence about plexiglass, really about plexiglass screens as a mitigation for the spread of COVID. In my understanding of the evidence—this isn't absolutely up to date, I feel like I'm always behind on learning—is that it is very minimal in preventing the spread of aerosols. So perhaps somebody who knows more or who's more informed on this could comment.

Chairperson Jennifer Johnson Alright. Does anyone have an answer to that? Because I don't know personally.

Executive Vice President for Health Sciences Norman Beauchamp Yeah. I can comment that I haven't seen data that suggests that it's effective, but I haven't studied that specifically. What you see is the greater than six feet, contact less than 15 minutes, handwashing, and getting vaccinated as keys. But you do see organizations that use plexiglass. But what I've seen about that is that the spread of droplets often travel not just in a straight distance.



Chairperson Jennifer Johnson Alright. Thank you.

So why don't we do this? Unless there's some objection, let's hear from Senator Hauser, and then can we just bookmark this, hear from our COVID funds presenters, and then come back to this at 430? Is there any objection to that?

Okay, great. So Senator Hauser.

Senator Alex Hauser (Non-College) Thank you. So I'm non-college, representing the libraries. I wanted to say two things.

I would like to hear what the university's already done in terms of classroom safety and preparation, and a lot of us have been working from home. Does stuff like this already exist in the university setting? Also considering that the library faculty members are on this Senate from the library, PPE and protection looks very different in the library. We have classrooms, but it's all very open and otherwise.

And secondly, this motion and a lot of the discussion that we've had today seems to continue to target students and not our colleagues, and our faculty members, and staff members of the university, who are also incredibly prone to the hesitancy and the resistance that I think we are worried about the students having. Personally, I teach in the classroom, I'm in the library as well. Every time I've gotten sick, it has been from a coworker and not a student.

So I would just-- When we make motions and we discuss things, I would again, urge us to not have two standards, one for our colleagues and one for the students. And with that, I yield.

Chairperson Jennifer Johnson Okay. Thank you so much, Senator Hauser. Yeah, it's important that we remember that.

Alright, so we will change directions and then come back to this. We have invited, and they graciously agreed to come, the Director of Contract and Grants Administration, Evo Pedawi, and our University Controller, Greg Deppong.

And the task we gave them or the request was to help us understand what has happened with the COVID funds. Because I think that there are faculty who the salaries are getting reinstated, which are great. The retirement funds are not getting all reinstated. They're not getting reinstated yet. And I think there were faculty representatives who felt like it'd be helpful for the administration to show their work a little bit in terms of what has happened with the COVID fund so when our colleagues ask us, "Where did all the COVID money go and why aren't our retirement benefits restored?" we have an answer to that.

So thank you very much for visiting and taking time to come to Faculty Senate today.



Controller Greg Deppong Sure, sure. It's my pleasure. I'll start. I'm Greg Deppong, University Controller.

And I'll start with introducing a little bit on the timing, that the federal awards we received have come over the last couple of years, we had an award that we recognized last fiscal year on the student's side, about \$15 million, and as well what they call an institutional share, about \$15 million. So the student awards, we don't have to spend much time on that. That goes to students of the highest need and have been very effectively distributed so far to the students. The federal awards that we've received for the institution have, again, it was about \$15 million last year, and then this year, we've received word on what they call HEERF II, which is the second wave of funding that was about mid-February. I'm going to look right here. I believe that's about \$30 million, I believe, for the university share. Yeah, about \$31 million for the institution and for students.

By and large what the restriction is on this funding, it's for the things you would imagine. PPE certainly is in play, as is the air handling systems, things like that to help the university to mitigate the virus, all of the things you would imagine with cleaning and so forth with those type of expenses.

What came to us in the second wave of funding that was in February is the ability to recapture lost revenue, and so we have the ability to, for example, compare on a baseline year, let's say fall of 2019. We're able to compare that to fall of 2020, see where the shortfall on a reasonable revenue, this is tuition revenue, where we fell short, and we're able to collect the funding on that.

One final thing I'll add is that for HEERF I last year, we had a large amount of housing refunds. As you'll all recall, the students had to go home in March. We refunded to the students the pro-rata share of their housing and dining plans. That was reimbursed as well. What the university is not able to capture as far as expenses would be the types of things like unrelated salaries and retirement contributions and things like this. So just wanted to clarify what the university is allowed to use the federal funds on, and we can go from there with questions.

Chairperson Jennifer Johnson Alright. I'm not sure what your title is, Dr. Pedawi. I'm sorry. Do you have comments to make before we open it for questions?

Director of Contract and Grant Administration Evo Pedawi Again, my name is Evo Pedawi, Director of Contracts and Grants. I go by Evo, so if you guys have seen that. One of the things I'd point out is that the HEERF I funds have been fully expended. We are working through HEERF II funds right now, and then we just recently in May were awarded the HEERF III funds, but we've not received the funding yet. We just received the award.



Director Pedawi, cont. So what's important to also realize is that these are all like many of the sponsored program awards that you receive, they're on a cost-reimbursable basis. We have to incur the cost, we have to charge the account for the cost, and then we have to request the funds from the Feds. So it's not something where we just get the award and now suddenly we have \$30 million in our bank account. We don't have any of the funds unless we've actually incurred the cost. So we're transferring expenses.

There is a lot of work to make sure that there's some effort put into reviewing the type of expenses, making sure that they're allowable. We've been told upfront all of these will be audited. We've already had two audits on them, and because the grant requirements, because the regulations keep changing, the audit requirements keep changing. So we've spent quite a bit on making sure that we have the right documentation and support to minimize the risk to the institution as we charge these expenses.

Chairperson Jennifer Johnson Alright. Thank you very much. Senator Pegler-Gordon.

Vice Chairperson Anna Pegler-Gordon Yes. Thank you so much. So I was the senator, along with a group of other senators, who sort of raised this question, and we had originally asked for a sort of written report in advance of the meeting. I understand that budget and planning are actually planning the budget right now that is going to the Board this Friday, so they were busy with that. But as an aside, I do want to say how important I think it is for us to be able to get written reports on what's been happening. I appreciate the kind of verbal reports, but they're pretty general, and a lot is at stake for faculty.

So when we were first told the proposed cuts to faculty salary and benefits, this was at a Steering Committee meeting back in May 6th, 2020. We were informed, and this is a quote, that the general fund disruption results largely from projected lost enrollment and related tuition income, anticipated loss of appropriation support, and changes to investment income. Those were the 3 areas. The best-case scenario was \$150 million loss, and the worst was a \$300 million loss. So the tools that MSU implemented were anticipated to take care of \$97 million in general fund losses, and \$45 million of that, so a substantial proportion, was on the backs of faculty, sort of reaped from faculty salary and benefit cuts. The faculty salary cuts resulted in 15 million and the benefit cuts in 30 million. So as an aside, I'll point out that UofM, Wayne State, and Oakland University also faced losses without cutting faculty salaries, and I don't believe they cut faculty benefits, either.

We were told at the time that these would be lasting for a year, possibly longer, depending on enrollment and revenues. So I know that Senators Bunnell and Meier had sort of wanted to speak about enrollment.



Vice Chairperson Pegler-Gordon, cont. But my understanding is that those losses were not as substantial as we thought and also that we have been able to reap some of the losses that we faced. We've been able to recuperate that from the COVID funds. So I'm wondering, sort of we saw the budget in February last year, what we were projected and why. Sorry, February earlier this year. It was sort of like, "This is what the budget is now and kind of what we're looking forward to for the coming fiscal year." But we haven't actually seen any of the numbers of what the actual numbers were. We saw the projected budget. Now we haven't seen, what are the enrollment losses?

Also, in terms of revenue, the loss of appropriation support, we initially back in May 2020 expected a 20% reduction in state funding, and then when it was budgeted, that was going to be a loss of \$60 million. Then later it was budgeted a 15% loss, but we have not received any losses in state funding. So we've received \$43 million more in state funding than was budgeted. So I'd like to point out that that's a significant difference from what we originally budgeted.

Then, of course, in the federal funding, that wasn't even part of what we budgeted when we said, "We're going to cut. We're expecting sort of that we need to take care of this \$97 million in general fund losses by cutting \$45 million from faculty." So we've received all this money that's covered things like the enrollment revenues and so on. My understanding is maybe with all three, I know the third one is projected. You didn't mention the third one, but my understanding, I may be wrong, is that's \$140 million, \$141 million, roughly. So I guess the question I have is why are we still paying for this?

Director of Contract and Grant Administration Evo Pedawi Sure.

Controller Greg Deppong Go ahead, Evo.

Director of Contract and Grant Administration Evo Pedawi Well, I was just going to say for the HEERF III funds, we've been notified that it will be about 80 million, 40 million for student support and 40 million for institution, which we have the award. We don't have the funds, as I explained. So I don't know, Greg, if you wanted to go ahead. I'm sorry about that.

Controller Greg Deppong Sure. Senator, you bring up an excellent point, and it's an excellent summary of what we ought to be able to do and can do is to reconcile some of the things that were discussed with actual. I think that would be a very good exercise, and that's something that we can do. One of the hurdles we had with the state appropriation, you're correct it was not cut, but what the State of Michigan did do with about \$32 million is they withheld the state appropriations from the university that belonged to the last fiscal year.



Controller Deppong, cont. That's fiscal '20, and they did not provide that to the university for a period of months until the next fiscal year. So there was a delay in the funding, and the funding was not at the university, but then it was subsequently recaptured.

So there were some timing things, I think, that were involved in many of the decisions. With that, what we will be able to do is to summarize the kind of things with the federal money that the university has applied to the federal award. One example is our figure was about \$19 million in lost tuition. We were able to put forth that request in the second HEERF funding, which has representative of, as I discussed, the baseline number from 2019 and the impact into 2020.

Chairperson Jennifer Johnson So it sort of sounded like a commitment to get us a written report. Is that accurate?

Controller Greg Deppong That's absolutely accurate. We can provide and are happy to provide the flows into the grant, what the expense is. Evo said, aside from the revenue shortfalls, we have to incur expense, record that against the grant, and then reflect that back with the federal funding provides the recaps of that. We absolutely can provide a summary, and we would be happy to do that and put it through the channels that Evo and I need to go through and get that to the group.

Chairperson Jennifer Johnson When is reasonable, given your current commitment?

Controller Greg Deppong Why don't we say give us a month and we'll make sure we can have the folks who need to take a look at things review it for us. My guess is it coming in quicker than that, so I'll over-deliver in that case.

Chairperson Jennifer Johnson So July 15th?

Controller Greg Deppong Yes.

Chairperson Jennifer Johnson Alright. Thank you. Other questions? Oh, Senator Bunnell.

Senator Jane Bunnell (Music) Thank you so much. So to just add to what Dr. Pegler-Gordon has brought to the fore today, one of the things that we want you to know in the financial areas, while we don't understand quite where everything is going, what we do know is that we worked twice as hard, three times as hard, four times as hard as we ever worked in our lives. We worked yearlong. We taught last summer for free in our area. We bought mics ourselves. Our units had to purchase all sorts of equipment on their own while being asked for a 4% giveback. We took our salary reduction. We took our retirement reduction, and we were psychologists. We were sociologists. We were doctors. Like I say, we worked seven days a week. We worked 24 hours a day. We had students in China that we had to teach at seven in the morning or at seven, or at eight, or at nine at night.



Senator Bunnell, cont. For the feeling of disregard, we get thanks in a verbal way, but our financial needs and the financial extensions that we made to our students, i.e., having to pay for Internet, having to teach on the phone for kids that didn't have Internet, all sorts of things that the university wasn't quite able to provide, we stepped in. We stepped into the void. I think what's important and we want you to know that we brought in what? We're going to have an exceptional freshmen class. We brought in an exceptional graduate class. We recruited like mad. We retained. We retained students like mad.

Somehow we'd like to see that noted, and we would like our retirement back. We would like the administration to realize what incredible steps and what incredible energies were extended this year on behalf of the students of MSU.

Thank you.

Controller Greg Deppong Absolutely.

Chairperson Jennifer Johnson To our guests, I know one of you has a hard stop at 430. Controller, are you able to stay, or do you have to leave right at 430?

Controller Greg Deppong I can stay.

Chairperson Jennifer Johnson Okay. Thank you. Thank you very much. Alright. So we have Senator Meier, Senator Ewoldsen, and then Senator Borcila.

Senator Joyce Meier (CAL) Okay. I'm going to second what my colleague just said. I'm also going to cite a recent, not recent, but according to the 2021-22 budget development guidelines, a budget provision specifies that if revenue projections improve, cuts to salary and retirement would be paid back last, but only after paying back \$90 million on a one-time resource, which includes funds taken from reserves and delays to capital projects. We read that as faculty being placed last, and what I want to do is suggest that we reverse that and place faculty higher on that list of budget priorities.

I'm going to second what my colleague just said about students are our bread and butter, and I think that the faculty this last year has done a stellar job, at least in my own department, to hold onto students and to teach them well.

So real quickly, when word came through way back when in March that our classes were going to be canceled in-person, our very own Danielle DeVoss instantly made a video in about an hour's time and distributed to our listserv, and a bunch of us used it that same evening, afternoon and evening, on how to teach online, how to use Zoom. We found two faculty members with online teaching expertise who ran numerous workshops for all of us so that we could do a good job at this. We crowdsourced pedagogical concerns on our listserv. A whole bunch of us attended those Soiree and Aspire courses. So lots of work in terms of teacher preparation.



Senator Meier, cont. Once the semester started, I think what Dr. Bunnell said is absolutely on track about a lot of us being psychologists in terms of supporting our students. A number of us who taught classes with high proportions of international students actually taught twice a week, because we divided our students into pods so we could meet some of them at one time during the scheduled time and then another time that was conducive to the students either in China or Indonesia or wherever they happen to be, 12 hours away from us.

Numbers of us also had developed courses in Google Docs, and we changed it when we learned that that was not available to international students. We changed to [Microsoft] Teams. There's just so much behind the scenes work. We have a couple of faculty members who taught with handheld cell phones on speaker next to their laptops so their students who did not have good Internet connection could participate in class discussions. So what I'm saying with all this is that we have really done, I think, a stellar job this last year. I'm also thinking that that's why in the survey that Mark Largent shared with us, the survey of students, it wasn't perfect, but many students said in that survey that their online experience had not been as bad as they thought it would be and that the majority had teachers that had been accommodating and flexible.

The other last point I want to make is that we already know in first year writing, we are seeing a big uptick of students coming in in fall. So we know that we're going to recoup financial losses that way with tuition.

We're already scrambling like crazy trying to find funding to get five new teachers to help teach all these new sections of first-year writing, because we've got as many as 1,000 new above and beyond the normal 7,000 students coming in this fall. So we're anticipating good numbers, and with that, I'll stop. I'll yield my time.

Chairperson Jennifer Johnson Thank you. Senator Ewoldsen.

Senator David Ewoldsen (ComArtSci) First of all, I apologize for the background noise. I'm traveling, and this is where I could get wifi. Two quick points. First of all, when we get money from the federal government, it's not a zero sum. If I write a grant and I write in my salary, that money doesn't just disappear. That pays my salary. That money can be copied someplace else. I mean, recouped other ways. So please, we understand these things.

The second thing is one of the things I enjoyed during this year teaching at home was getting my part of the settlement against Ohio State University for when they cut their matching for our retirement. So they cut part of the matching for retirement to help with budgetary concerns, very similar to what's going on right now, and we won a class action lawsuit against them for that. I am not advocating that for Michigan State University, but I think the faculty need to be a priority.



Senator Ewoldsen, cont. I mean, last year, when we were talking about budget raises, we were saying, "Okay, we will not take a raise, but keep us in mind in the future." It certainly appears that has not been the case. Thank you.

Chairperson Jennifer Johnson Great. Senator Borcila and Senator Logan.

Senator Andaluna Borcila (JMC) Can Senator Logan speak before me? Because I think her hand might've been up before mine, and then I can speak after. Is that okay, Senator Logan?

Senator Sandra Logan (CAL) Mm-hmm [affirmative].

Senator Andaluna Borcila (JMC) Okay.

Senator Sandra Logan (CAL) Okay, great. Thanks, everyone. Yeah, I just want to pick up on a thread or two that have been put forward here. I think that I want to emphasize that this time of COVID, this last 15 months, I think it's been experienced by faculty as an experiment in immiseration. Our jobs became significantly more demanding even as we experienced increasing stress and challenges in our personal lives, and we lost forms of support, such as childcare and classroom education, that had made it possible for us to devote the necessary time to our jobs. We've worked longer and harder, as Senator Meier was pointing out, over the last year and a half. We've worked longer and harder to our own detriment and to the detriment of our families, and in the context of these negative intensifications of our work lives and our personal lives, we also suffered pay cuts and cuts to our benefits. We have experienced worsening economic conditions and reductions also in the quality of our lives overall.

We appreciate that the cuts to our wages are slated for retraction. That's an important step toward normalizing our compensation. But the real impact of the cut to retirement benefits is long-term and vastly more significant than the lost wages. Even the investments that we have already lost represent the loss of thousands of dollars to each of us over time. We ask that you restore those benefits now at the beginning of the new fiscal year and that you develop a plan to restore to us the 5% matching investment that we lost during this time. This neglect of faculty wellbeing and these financial losses are not a sustainable approach. We need to know that you recognize that this immiseration is unacceptable and that you will make immediate steps to reverse these policies and restore what we've lost. Thank you very much.

Chairperson Jennifer Johnson Thank you, Senator Logan. Senator Borcila.

Senator Andaluna Borcila (JMC) Thank you so much, everyone, for all the comments and all the research that you have done. I want to make a couple of points. One of them is that when we asked for a central administration response to the institutional crisis that caregivers at this institution have faced and have been facing and continue to face, we were optimistic.



Senator Borcila, cont. After that, I believe I heard President Stanley say that we cannot prioritize caregivers, whether he said this directly or indirectly, we cannot prioritize caregivers at this point because we need to reinstate salaries and benefits. It seems to me that basically one aspect has been used against the other. We are not seeing our benefits restored. There has not a central administration financial commitment to rectify the crisis that caregivers in this institution have been dealing with and facing by ourselves, on our own.

So if you are a faculty caregiver, which many of us are, or staff caregiver, if you're a faculty caregiver, since we're on a senate, what has happened is in addition to what you have all experienced and people have come to our meetings to talk about, the wear and tear, the tremendous pressure and stress on all of us, the financial intensification of our obligations, what has happened is that our benefits are cut as well and continue to be cut. So if you make \$80,000 a year, let's say, and I make around that after working at this institution for 20 years, and I recognize that I'm much more privileged than some, these last two years have also been a significant hit on my retirement.

Some of us, like me, also have young children, an 11-year-old, and older parents that were helping us as well. So then we have been hit in 3 different ways, and there has been no institutional attempt to correct this.

I guess the answer is why? We've heard from Dr. Pegler-Gordon what the financial situation is such as we understand it after doing research, because there's been little transparency in terms of the budget, and is the reason why that humans are not a priority for this institution, is the reason that faculty are not a priority for this institution, because what we've lost financially seems to be less for our institution than we thought it would be. What individual people have lost has been more tremendous than the institution has anticipated. Thank you.

Chairperson Jennifer Johnson Controller Deppong, would you like to respond to any of this?

Controller Greg Deppong Sure. I appreciate and thoroughly respect the comments from the group and will endeavor to take these forward as well as through other channels of reports of this meeting really attempt to be transparent with the federal funds. The point was made that it's not a zero sum. That's absolutely correct, and when we realize federal stimulus money in the case of the third HEERF of \$41 million, that's funding that we're able to use at the university for things that we thought would be cut. I do appreciate it. I take it to heart, and the comments, I will convey to our new CFO. Lisa Frace was not able to join today. I will have a conversation with her after this meeting and share with her some of the things we talked through. So I do thank you.



Chairperson Jennifer Johnson Thank you. Two things. The first is these meetings are recorded and transcribed.

Controller Greg Deppong Good.

Chairperson Jennifer Johnson You can always link her to the meeting transcript.

Then for the faculty senators, if you have comments or other thoughts or things along this line, if you want to send them to acadgov@msu.edu, if you could do it in the next week, by close of business next Tuesday, we'll collate them and forward them onto the powers that be, just to sort of reiterate the message. Is there anything else I missed? I'm mindful we have about 18 minutes left before we go back to our other agenda items.

Alright. I see a lot of "Thank you for coming," so thank you so much for coming.

Controller Greg Deppong Well, it's my pleasure. Thank you for having me.

Chairperson Jennifer Johnson Alright. Thank you very much. Alright.

So, again, I'm mindful of people's time, especially given that this is an irregular meeting. So if there isn't an objection, let's have the vote on Senator Anthony's motion. Is there any objection to doing that? Oh, I see our EVP-- Dr. Beauchamp.

Executive Vice President for Health Sciences Norman Beauchamp Yeah. I wanted to comment. Again, the applause went when I meant to raise my hand. Just I wanted to acknowledge what everyone is saying about how hard people worked over the last 15 months. It's really extraordinary, and it's working beyond the break so often. I just want to share that sitting in the room when the president is pushing on the budget and seeking to garner resources, he is leading with how hard the faculty have worked and how much that's respected and appreciated. I'm not just placating. I think that I would hate for this meeting to end after people have done so much hard work for so long, with a sense that the president doesn't recognize, and he is trying to garner additional resources to support the faculty. And certainly you heard that the controller will take this message back, but recognize the disappointment but just want to make sure people heard that. Thank you.

Chairperson Jennifer Johnson Thank you. Thanks for sharing that with us. Is there any objection to calling the vote on Dr. Anthony's motion? Great. So why don't we have a vote? Tyler, are you able to put it up for us?

Secretary for Academic Governance Tyler Silvestri 10 more seconds.

[**Editor's Note:** The motion was defeated.]



Chairperson Jennifer Johnson Okay, and I don't want to over-interpret but given the comments, that might reflect less that-- I mean, I think people are welcoming protection. I think there was some question about the efficacy of plexiglass barriers. Alright, is there any objection to moving on to one of our next agenda items? Okay, great. Alright.

And I'm looking at these things and obviously we're not going to get to everything before 5:00, but some of these are actionable and a little more time sensitive. So is there any objection to going to the resolution on COVID-19 impact statements, because that's something that we could potentially discuss and pass before 5:00, and then some of this brainstorming we could push to September? Is there any objection to going to the resolution on COVID-19 impact statements? Okay, great. Let's do that. Senator Donahue.

Senator Megan Donahue (At-Large) Yeah. This is, I think, just really quick. You remember that the provost asked the units to collect COVID [technical difficulties] I think variation across campus. It was also quite useful for the provost to follow up on that request and report to the Faculty Senate on the collection and review of these COVID impact statements and report on mitigation or support planned for faculty that were disproportionately affected. And this is to support people in units that are more affected or less affected, or they're more responsive or less responsive. If we just leave it up to the individual units, I think there'll be a lot of disparity. So this is one step to try to elevate, raise all boats, I guess. Float all boats.

Chairperson Jennifer Johnson [Associate] Vice President Lang.

Interim Associate Provost and Associate Vice President for Academic Human Resources Suzanne Lang Yeah, I don't have a problem with the resolution. The only issue is that all of the COVID impact statements were completely voluntary and none of them were submitted for annual reviews to the provost's office. We don't have any idea how many people actually wrote an impact statement for their annual review, and we do not collect the annual reviews unless someone is going forward for reappointment, tenure promotion, and that's when you see an annual review from a unit. So we don't have those. In terms of people who-- And I believe that the resolution is about annual reviews, is that correct?

Senator Megan Donahue (At-Large) To follow up, I know that they weren't passed forward but they were asked for and there was a big, big range of responses from people, especially people who are caregivers, and I think it would be quite useful since they were requested by the provost that the provost could--

Associate Provost Suzanne Lang We did not request them.

Senator Megan Donahue (At-Large) Yeah. Yes. I mean, it was voluntary. I'm sorry, you're splitting hairs. It was voluntary, but they were collected--



Associate Provost Suzanne Lang No, they were not collected, not by the provost's office. We did not collect them.

Senator Megan Donahue (At-Large) Again, you're splitting hairs with me.

Associate Provost Suzanne Lang No, I'm not.

Senator Megan Donahue (At-Large) They were collected by units.

Associate Provost Suzanne Lang We don't have access to them. I'm sorry.

Senator Megan Donahue (At-Large) You can ask--

Associate Provost Suzanne Lang We don't have access to any of them.

Senator Megan Donahue (At-Large) Can I finish?

Associate Provost Suzanne Lang Sure.

Senator Megan Donahue (At-Large) You can ask the units to summarize what they got. What did they learn? Rather than dropping them into a black hole, you could ask the units, the provost could ask the units, or the deans could ask the units what they learned. How are you going to help people who are caregivers if you don't learn what you've learned? Are you dropping it on the chairs to provide COVID support for caregivers? I mean, ask the question. You can ask the question because the chairs did collect the answers.

Associate Provost Suzanne Lang Well, if I might respond. I don't want to interrupt you. I'm not splitting hairs. I am being honest and truthful that at least Academic HR and others in the provost's office have not requested any of the statements to be forwarded to the provost. Certainly we could ask the chairs or the deans to forward them from annual reviews, but the statement in the resolution is incorrect because the provost's office did not request that any of those be forwarded.

Chairperson Jennifer Johnson So is it the chairs or the deans that have them?

Associate Provost Suzanne Lang I would say the chairs have them. I don't believe that they've been forwarded. I'm unaware of any dean that has requested them. I have seen COVID impact statements from RPT dossiers. There were people, some people, who included those and so I did see those but I have not seen any from an annual review.

Chairperson Jennifer Johnson Alright, I have Dr. Amey.

Interim Associate Provost for Faculty and Academic Staff Development

Marilyn Amey I'm sorry. I'm very slow. I don't mean to be. I just wanted to address the senator's comments that are in the chat, but also the original comment from Senator Donahue, that Dr. Lang was correct that these were not collected uniformly at all across campus. Some units did have more academics who provided such a statement. Many, many did not.



Associate Provost Amey, cont. It seems entirely appropriate to understand what was learned this year and this is part of also a very broad national conversation of persons who are focused on academic and faculty staff development, because no one had such a plan in place. But many institutions were caught as we were and trying to come up with guidelines for how to look at and include a statement that was provided. How do you understand what was said?

The important thing perhaps was for those who wrote them, who were disproportionately affected and quite differentially affected across campus, that they had a record of their perception of what happened with them this year so that two years from now or three years from now or five years from now, the memory is not lost. And that documentation really does matter since nationally, as we know, this was our first experience with such a pandemic and the consequence. We have a lot to learn and information to gain from academics who did and didn't write them, from chairs and annual evaluation committees who did and did not see them, and then how might we better support anyone who was affected this year since it was quite a differential range. Some quite disproportionately, so I do think that the provost recognizes that the remedy is a little less clear but, again, the proportion of people who submitted anything was not very high for many different reasons, including the overwhelmedness of writing anything when I hadn't written something before in an annual evaluation and feeling put upon to have to further spend time on something.

So my thought is that your concerns are incredibly valuable. They are the kinds of things that we have been talking about all year long with the academic advancement network and with colleagues nationally to try and get a better strategy for this, because the impact is significant. We have to be able to account for it and it manifests itself in many, many different ways. Right now my opinion would be from what I've heard from chairs and FEAs and others is that there wouldn't be a lot of documentation to have, which does not mean that a year from now that would not be true and much work to be done in between now and the next set of annual evaluations. But if you think about it logically also for those who went up for promotion and tenure this year, depending on how they were situated, the impact of the pandemics, plural, I would say, may have been marginal because their paperwork may have already been in process by last spring.

But again, I think this is not something that's going to go away with a light switch turn on for way too many people, so I appreciate all of your comments. I would encourage further suggestions coming about ideas that you have and ways that we might tackle this together, because it does matter a lot.

Thank you very much.



Chairperson Jennifer Johnson Thank you very much. Yeah, so I mean, the goal of, I think, Faculty Senate in doing this really was to brainstorm around ways the administration and maybe even the senior faculty could better support the junior faculty, especially caregivers but just in general, in light of coming out of the pandemic. And so I see privacy concerns in the comments. We have yet to have a vote, but it may be that there's a more direct way to get where we want to be which is we could conduct our own survey, potentially, of faculty, and just say, "Hey, if there was anything that would help you come out of COVID let us know and we can try to advocate for that." Or we could ask that one of the other offices conduct a survey, but there may be another way to get to where we want to get to, if the chairs have information if there are privacy concerns. I see Vice President Lang and then Senator Pegler-Gordon.

Associate Provost Suzanne Lang Thank you. I'll be very brief. I support everything that my colleague Marilyn has said. We do appreciate suggestions and brainstorming and ideas for how to deal with this problem and it's not a one-year situation. I would also like to let the senate know that Academic HR is hoping to partner with AAN to provide training for RPT committees. Academic HR will also be working on training chairs in terms of how to interpret and use impact statements, because I think that even though the provost's office came up with guidelines on how to use them, this is something that is so unprecedented. We're all grappling with how can we take into account the incredible difference in impacts that faculty have faced in terms of the effect of the pandemic on their lives, on their work, on their careers? So I would hope that we could partner with the Senate in terms of coming up with effective ways to help people understand how important the impact statements are in terms of providing context and helping people not feel quite as vulnerable in terms of what they're sharing, but also help the people who are doing the evaluations and looking at the impact statements understand how important they are. So with that, thank you.

Chairperson Jennifer Johnson Thank you. Senator Pegler-Gordon.

Vice Chairperson Anna Pegler-Gordon So I don't want to speak on behalf of Senator Donahue but I think that some of the motivation for this came out of both the fact that there is this rich and important information that's much broader than what we could get from a survey, for example, but also from the fact that Faculty Senate did pass a resolution calling upon the administration to provide support, financial support, and stronger guidance to chairs and colleges and units because there was such a sort of differential response that they were having. And so sort of this is coming back to that, right, and the fact that essentially that resolution-- We've been told, "Well, we can't provide any financial response," as Senator Borcila mentioned earlier, "because we're going to be looking at reinstating your benefits and also we sort of want this to happen on the sort of local level."



Vice Chairperson Pegler-Gordon, cont. So there's both these things sort of happening at the same time. So it does concern me they'll sort of lose this data, but I do understand the sort of privacy concerns. Yeah, and I see also Senator Donahue's comment because you saw in your own review of these patterns that were very broad and able to sort of anonymize, and very profound, so I've expressed some frustration, I think, on every agenda item so far so I apologize for that, but it does feel a bit like thoughts and prayers. It's like, "Yes, this is such an unprecedented situation," and we don't know what's going to happen so I think it will be really important for us to monitor what is happening in each of the units.

And we did reach out to [the Faculty Excellence Advocates] before this meeting to try and find out what each unit is doing, and we know that some units are not doing anything for caregivers. And so that is a huge concern because we will see all of the efforts, particularly in relation to gender, but not only also racial and class diversity, we will see those investments lost if we don't do anything. And I think we will sort of need to monitor where those problems are, but we also need to do more than just provide guidance on sort of annual evaluation reviews, even though that's really important. I feel like we made a resolution to provide more substantive support and some units are doing that and other units aren't, and I haven't heard back. We did get a commitment from, I can't remember if it was the president or the provost, to kind of emphasize the importance of this at one of their meetings, but we haven't heard back on sort of where things are.

So it seems like faculty are trying to scramble to find out what is actually happening, where the administration could be doing so much more on this. And I guess that's, again, I don't want to speak for Senator Donahue, but I think where a lot of this concern is coming from.

Chairperson Jennifer Johnson Thank you very much. I know there has been a lot of concern about follow up with the caregiving resolution and making what can happen, happen, and feedback and look back about that. It's been a continuing issue. Senator Donahue, do you want to respond to any of that or say anything?

Senator Megan Donahue (At-Large) I guess what I would suggest is, think about what's happening. And we did ask people to write statements voluntarily, and many of them did, and probably did with the expectation that something would be done with them. And certainly the chairs were at liberty of individual, say, departments to read those statements, but that's not where the buck stops really. And so by not even asking after them, in a way that would not compromise someone's individual situation, but asking after them like, "Did you see a lot of responses from people who were prevented from going to the labs? Did you see delays in repairs?" There were other things that were collected in these statements.



Senator Donahue, cont. The complete picture though is suppressed if you never ask after what you collected though, and so that's my worry is that we ask people to perhaps pour their heart out and then I think the most disrespectful thing would be to go, "Well, your chair will take care of you. Your immediate supervisor will handle that for you." It's a missed opportunity and I think we need to hold up our administration to account.

Chairperson Jennifer Johnson Great. Thank you, Senator Donahue. Are there any comments on this before we vote on this motion? I'm aware that it is 5:05 [p.m., and the meeting was scheduled to end at 5:00 p.m.]. Senator Juzwik.

Senator Mary Juzwik (EDUC) Thank you. I very much support the spirit of this effort to learn from the statements that have been generated. But as someone who actually did write such a statement and spent quite a bit of time with it, I could understand people feeling vulnerable about it potentially being identifiable in the provost's office. And so what I would like to propose a second amendment, I guess, of the resolution in addition to what Dr. Pegler-Gordon proposed, which is that the provost receive-- Let's see, Dr. Pegler-Gordon proposed that the faculty senate request that the provost receive anonymized information based on COVID impact statements. I would like to add with the proviso, with the permission of those who submitted the statements. I would like to propose amending the resolution so that those who submitted the statements give their permission before they move forward. Thank you.

Chairperson Jennifer Johnson Is there any objection to that amendment? Okay. Is there any more discussion of the amended resolution motion before we vote?

Secretary for Academic Governance Tyler Silvestri I would just like to note that Dr. Pegler-Gordon's proposed amendment hasn't been moved, or seconded, or voted on, for what that's worth.

Chairperson Jennifer Johnson But I got Senator Juzwik's. I didn't get Senator Pegler-Gordon. Did you amend the resolution?

Vice Chairperson Anna Pegler-Gordon I put something in the chat, but I would second Senator Juzwik's proposed amendment, or yeah, if that--

Chairperson Jennifer Johnson Is it okay to just go with that one, then? Does that cover it?

Vice Chairperson Anna Pegler-Gordon Yes.

Chairperson Jennifer Johnson Okay, great. Anything else before we vote? And we never got a second to this motion, so if someone--

Senator Megan Donahue (At-Large) I'll second.



Chairperson Jennifer Johnson Okay, perfect. Alright. Anything else? Okay, great. Let's vote.

Secretary for Academic Governance Tyler Silvestri 10 seconds.

Chairperson Jennifer Johnson Alright. Motion passes. Thank you very much.

So here's what I would suggest for other agenda items is that there's some that we can continue to try to follow up with over the summer because they were report backs on questions that we can continue to try to get and email people. Some of the brainstorming, maybe we could push till September and try to do some of the rest of this by email. Is there any objection to that? Alright, so we will try not to let any of these agenda items slip through the cracks, but we'll either address them by email or address them in September.

We did have a DEI item that was a general discussion, but I guess I just want to briefly note that it is Juneteenth this week which I didn't know about till I moved to Flint and was, I don't know, sad to realize that there were groups of people who were enslaved that didn't know about the Emancipation Proclamation until years later because the people who were enslaving them just thought, "Well, if we don't tell them, then nothing changes."

So Juneteenth is important and happy Juneteenth and thank you for meeting in the summer and taking the time to engage these issues thoughtfully.

And if there isn't anything else, without objection, let's adjourn the meeting.

Secretary for Academic Governance Tyler Silvestri Dr. Johnson, the only thing, and it's up to folks, obviously, but we did have Director of Academic Human Resources Kathy Lewless here for a brief thing on the sick leave policies. I just wanted to plug it but-- Oh, nevermind. She's saying we're good so--

Chairperson Jennifer Johnson Okay, yeah, and I thought we could do it by email if we had to. Any objection? Alright, great. Thank you very much. Thanks for your service this year. We'll see some of you back in the fall.