

This transcript was prepared by the Secretary for Academic Governance and has not been approved by the Steering Committee.

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

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

TA Silvestri

Tyler Silvestri
Secretary for Academic Governance



**Chairperson
Jennifer Johnson**

It's 3:16. Let's get started. So, called to order. I don't have a gavel because we are over Zoom.

Our next item is to approve the agenda. And we actually-- Two items got added to it in terms of tentative items for Faculty Senate. So this was the DEI [Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion] group wants to review an item with Faculty Senate for a few minutes. And then Dr. Anthony has a very slight rewording of a resolution we passed last year to propose. So these things got added to the Faculty Senate agenda. So with those additions, are there any objections to the Steering Committee agenda as it stands?

**UCFA Chair
Mick Fulton**

Motion to approve as amended.

Chairperson Johnson

Perfect. And I've actually heard that [Secretary for Academic Governance] Tyler [Silvestri] says that we can say, "Without objection, the agenda passes."

Hey, Tyler, [Executive Vice President for Health Sciences] Norm [Beauchamp] is texting me and saying he doesn't have the password. Can you email him again?

**Secretary for
Academic Governance
Tyler Silvestri**

I can.

Chairperson Johnson

Okay, I'll text him back. Hold on. "Tyler will text you." Okay, great. All right. So then let's try this again. Are there any objections to the draft minutes? They were attached in Attachments A through E, our summer minutes.

**UCUE Chair
Andrew Corner**

No objections.

- Fulton** I had-- Whoops, sorry! I had one correction. This was on the July 7 minutes. It has me as University Committee on Faculty Tenure chair. I'm Faculty Affairs, rather than Faculty Tenure, Tyler. So if you could change that. Thank you.
- Fulton, cont.**
- Chairperson Johnson** Anything else?
- Fulton** Other than that? No.
- Chairperson Johnson** Okay. Without objection, those are approved. So we are going into our remarks. So, President Stanley, you're just in time.
- President Samuel Stanley** Thank you. It's good to see everybody. You know, I was originally going to keep my remarks very short, and I realized that I probably do have a couple of things to say, so they won't be incredibly short, but hopefully I'll leave plenty of time for all the business you have today.
- I think the first thing I want to talk about, obviously, was the beginning of our semester. And of course, this is timely, as students and classes start tomorrow. Students, and they're arriving on campus. In the conversation with the President, I talked about some of the issues and some of the things that went into the decision to move forward remotely. I don't think I'll go into that in detail, but if people have questions, I'm happy to answer them. I think it's really a couple things that are really important.
- One is that we continue to work to make safety the highest priority, and that will continue to be the case during the challenge of the pandemic. Having said that, I do think there's a pathway to opening safely. There's never no risk, so we can't live in a world where there's zero risk. There's never no risk. But I think there's a

pathway by which we can reduce this risk. And so one of things we're doing during this time is taking a number of the things we were working on and really trying to bring them to further scale in terms of the kind of testing and surveillance we could do. And that's going to be very important, I think, if we're going to work to open in the spring, is to have more capacity in that area.

Stanley, cont.

And then learning from what's happening on other campuses. And so as we're watching around the country, we're seeing some campuses, I think, that seem would be navigating this more effectively than others. And what are the lessons we're learning from that? So, it's really a continually iterative process for this. But it's very important, I think, that we understand it.

And I want to say one thing that I think is particularly important. As I talked about, my major concern was transmission between students. And I think I explicitly said that in my first letter I sent out. That remains my concern, insofar in this in terms of safety. We know there's a couple of ways in which we can really achieve high transmission of COVID-19.

So, one is you can bring social gatherings of people together, whether eating, drinking, or talking loudly because of music, and indoors, and that's called a party, basically, or it's called a bar. And we know that's an effective way to transmit this disease. And it so happens that people in the age group of 18 to 24 or so are much more likely to attend those kinds of things and be engaged in those activities. So that's one of the reasons which over the summer, even in the absence of school, we saw a great increase in the number of cases in that particular age group. So that's one real risk that's out there.

And the other at risk, of course, is congregate living. So that's cruise ships. That's, you know, the-- What's happened in terms of nursing homes. You have a very vulnerable population there. And prisons, dormitories for migrant workers. All of these have been sites, essentially, of outbreaks. And so, what we did was to really try and, again, to reduce the opportunities that would take place for those kinds of events on campus and do that.

Stanley, cont.

What I haven't seen—and again, we all should be following this together—but what I haven't seen around the country is, even on those campuses that had significant outbreaks in Alabama, more than a thousand cases, UNC more than a thousand cases already of COVID-19 associated with their opening—they have not seen significant transmission from students to faculty within classes. A number of them had done in-person classes to begin with. And so, I think the precautions that we had put in for in-person classes—the wearing of masks, social distancing—all those, my belief is, probably are effective remedies—or "prevention" is a better word—effective prevention would do this.

And so I just want people to continue to follow this with me to see if that's the conclusion we come from is looking at the data coming forward. So, if we do make a decision this spring, I know there were concerns, important concerns by faculty, by graduate students, and others about teaching, and I take those very seriously. But we really want to be evidence-driven in what we're doing and understand where risk is and where it's not. So that's going to be an important thing, I think, for us to look at as we go forward into the year. There's lots of other things to say about this. The move-in's going well.

Stanley, cont.

I think we've had great cooperation with East Lansing. We are serious when we talk to students off campus. So, one of the things we're concerned about is the students who are living off campus. Many of them have not gone back home. Many of them continue to live in this area. And we're really conveying to them how serious we are, both at the East Lansing and metro area level, and at the university level. And one of the things we've been doing is working with them. We now have gotten reports from them on issue incidents where students were not complying with the executive orders that limit the number of people at a gathering, not complying with things like mask wearing at events and so on. And in that situation, we have someone who is taking reports from the city now, identifying the people who were cited, cited for this, and then we're entering them into our student judicial system. As we talked about, we would do in the Campus Community Compact that we would make this something that we would pursue even though it's taking place outside of campus. We're going to continue to do that. We consider this a threat to health. So it would be considered under the category of a threat to the health of others. And so therefore, that can lead to an immediate interim suspension from classes. That could also lead to anything up to expulsion for repeat offenses. And so, we're taking this very seriously.

I think-- I feel, from the least the initial reports coming out of East Lansing and my conversation with our police force and others, that this past weekend was much less in terms of what they expected, in terms of large parties and we'd seen before. But there were still some gatherings that went beyond the 25-person limit and so on. So we need to continue to watch this very carefully. But it's going to be a high priority for us again, for now and for the future, if we're going to do these things safely.

All of us are hoping there'll be a vaccine coming soon. But, you know, there's no guarantee that vaccine will be a panacea. We'll have to see how effective it is or not effective it is. And I think there's every reason we have to continue to believe that we may be dealing with COVID-19, certainly in the Spring Semester, and potentially beyond. So, I think we need to think about that as we develop our plans.

DEI remains a critically important issue for us. I sent a message out about Jacob Blake, sent a message that also dealt with issues around graffiti around The Rock, which had been offensive to a number of individuals. And talking about, as we move forward this semester, the need for, really, to have many opportunities to communicate on these critical issues. This is, of course, as everybody is very much aware, a highly politicized environment. This is an election year. You know, feelings are running high. There's a lot of conflict around the United States. We want to be able to, as a university, to have the difficult conversations and the discourses, but to try and do it in a civil and respectful manner. And that's not easy to do. And we respect free speech. We have to. We are a public institution. We have to be grounded in the concept of free speech on our campus. But we also really encourage people to engage in civil discourse.

Stanley, cont.

I've learned today about an incident on campus where there may have been graffiti put down on a path of a racist nature, and I'm getting more information from the police on this as we speak. And as soon as I know more and I choose what we're trying to convey to the campus community what happened with that. So, you have my commitment to look into that.



We continue to move on the concrete work of trying to improve what happens on campus. And I hope you got a chance to meet the first two candidates. We'll have another candidate coming this week and then one after that. And again, I appreciate everybody's taking the time to meet with these candidates and asking important questions and hopefully learning, getting to know them and some of their achievements and ideas for how we can do DEI at MSU better.

And the Office for Civil Rights report was released today. That's in the news already in a few places. This is the report that we were required to make by the settlement we had with the Office for Civil Rights, Department of Education, which asked us to review the actions of a number of individuals at Michigan State University. Remember, in their report, they identified about 37 individuals who they felt may not have adequately reported and may not-- They were made aware of that issue around sexual harassment or assault and may not have adequately reported it. We were asked to review that. So that report is out. I encourage you to take a look at it. It identifies about seven or eight individuals who probably, we believe, based on the evidence we have, should have reported and did not report. For others there, they really were not required based on the laws and policies we had at the university at that time to be obligate reporters. So, there may be excuse for that. In other cases, the information they may have received was not, in totality, something that would have mandated them to report based on the policies we had at that time. So this, again, something for you to take a look at. It's really drawn, and the materials in it really come from, all the number of investigations that have been done already. At least 10 or 11, I think, that have looked at some of these issues, and so a lot of the information is drawn from that. But we also did some new interviews of

Stanley, cont.

individuals to try and clarify some issues, particularly when they were at Michigan State. And so, I encourage you to take a look at that, and I'll be happy to answer more questions about that, perhaps in the next meeting of shared governance.

And then I just—I did want to update you on the budget. And so, this comes into the category as challenges, as it has been. I would say, enrollment at this point in time—and the Provost is probably here—remains better than we estimated in our scenarios at this point. In terms of how we're doing, the number of international students is not as low as we thought it would be. So it's still significantly reduced, but not to the extent we estimate it for our scenarios. Domestic out-of-state stayed the same. In-state is higher; we accepted more students. There's still been some drop off on that. Right now, we look like we're close to the number of last year, all total. Maybe a little decline. But the mix is certainly skewed more towards in-state now than domestic out-of-state and international. But again, these numbers are actually better than the estimates we put forward. But until September 28, I think it is, when people can actually, you know, withdraw and still get full refunds, we're not going to know what that actual makeup looks like in total. But that's where we were last time I heard from the Provost, and that was probably four days ago.

And then the state budget actually appears to be better. So this is more good news in terms of how much the deficit is-- Decline. Let me be more precise in my terminology. The decline in tax revenue they've seen is less than they expected by a couple of billion dollars. So that's good news, potentially, for us in state allocation. How that will translate, what percent cut, we still don't know. As you may remember, we estimated a fifteen percent reduction in state allocation. So anything that's

Stanley, cont.

better than that will be helpful to us and our dollars going forward. So that's a positive thing.

The federal is a profound disappointment for me. They still have not reached an agreement on a fourth stimulus bill. This is incredibly important for Michigan State University and the State of Michigan. We continue. I've had conversations with both of our United States Senators, with our Congresswoman, Congresswoman Slotkin. All three of those are very supportive of Michigan State University and the needs of higher education in the state. So, they're preaching to the choir, if you will, and in those things. But it's getting others to go along with us because, again, this is really important, in my opinion, for our state and for our ability to continue to be successful at MSU. And so these dollars would make a huge difference to us that they were funded. In the original House Act, I've mentioned this before, it was probably up to as much as 60 million dollars that could have come to Michigan State University based on our students' numbers and their potential need. So that's a lot of money. It would be very helpful in these tough budget times. And unfortunately, there's no progress I'm seeing right now in getting that accomplished.

Two things that have hurt our budget, where the expectations are lower. One is certainly in housing. So the decision to not have as many people in the dorms reduced by about 80 percent or so the revenue that would be coming in to our housing. 88 percent actually. It's higher. So that's something we're working on. Unfortunately, the remedy for that to some degree will be furloughs for individuals. Some more people will have to be furloughed to allow us to have the appropriate-sized workforce for the number of students we have on campus. And that's certainly a major consequence of that



Stanley, cont.

decision. And [Senior Vice president for Auxiliary Enterprises] Vennie Gore is doing his usual outstanding job to deal with that very challenging issue.

And then on the athletic side is that, you know, we've made a decision right now in the Big Ten to not play football in the fall. There's a lot of news going around about this. Apparently, the president [of the United States, Donald Trump] tweeted that he'd talked to the commissioner of the Big Ten today and that we're on the one yard line in terms of starting up again. It's amazing that, you know, this is what they're interested in. But at any rate, if that holds, if there was no football played, that would be a significant hole in our budget. If we played in the late fall or early spring, that might make up some of this. But again, it's all about being able to do it safely. And the Big Ten, I think, has been committed to student athletes' safety and will continue to be committed to student athletes' safety as we look at these issues. But again, there are ways with testing and with new protocols that might evaluate people from myocarditis and other areas that we might be able to do this in a way that everybody feels comfortable and safe. And so we'll keep working in that direction.

So that's kind of the budget, DEI, and the opening that's taking place. Why I stop at this point and answer any questions that you have?

Chairperson Johnson Any questions?

**Vice Chairperson
Anna Pegler-Gordon** So I guess the question I would have is, how can we, given-- During the coming year, how can we best work with you to put in place a sort of discussion/decision about the reinstatement that we talked about when the

cuts to retirement and salary were first introduced?
What would-- Is there a better process for doing that?

President Stanley So are we talking about when we might undo those cuts?
Is that the question?

Pegler-Gordon Yeah, I remember you mentioning possibly establishing
benchmarks.

President Stanley Yes. I mean, I think right now-- I think-- So I'd say the
answer will be that we'll have a much better view of Fall
Semester by the end of September. I don't think the news
is generally going to be positive. So I would not want to
be raising people's expectations. I've talked about two
things that I think are slightly better than we
anticipated and two things that are worse than we
anticipated. And then the federal government being up in
the air. That's probably the decider. So, you know, that's
probably the decider in terms of how that looks. And all I
can say to people is, you know, as citizens, you have a
right to vote, you have a right to contact, you know,
contact your elected officials, and I encourage people to
do that. Whatever your opinion is, I encourage you to do
it as a citizen. But I think, you know-- So I would say
that we would want to defer any conversations until we
have a better look at where we are. But I'm not terribly
optimistic at this point in time, although a lot will
depend on the spring too. So what we do in the spring
will make a difference in the overall budget. But it's a
really good question. I haven't forgotten. I haven't
forgotten that commitment. So thank you for the
reminder.

Pegler-Gordon Thank you.

President Stanley Uh-huh.

Chairperson Johnson Any other questions? All right. Thank you, President Stanley.

President Stanley You're welcome. Thank you, Jennifer. And I have a call that's come up that I didn't anticipate, but it's around 4:30 or so, so I may have to leave a little early, just so everybody knows. No comment on whatever is being spoken about at the time, but I will have to get off at that time. So, thank you.

Chairperson Johnson Thank you. All right. So now we're going to hear from our new Provost.

**Silvestri
Provost
Teresa Woodruff** You're muted, Provost Woodruff. I think if we had bingo cards, "You're muted" would win in any given Zoom day, because that seems to be one of the things that you could put pretty sequential little dots down on. But, you know, I want to thank all of you for, again, a warm welcome. This is the beginning of my second month. And when I was coming here, one of my dean friends said, "Well, the next year is going to feel like two". And I won't tell you what I thought, what I think the relative benchmark is for this first month, but it's been a lot. But I will say, as I look around these Zoom faces, I really appreciate everything that you've done to make me feel welcome and to make sure that-- I've said to Jennifer, I think it takes a village to raise a provost, and you have done a great job to help ensure that we're really in lock-step, and we're moving ahead productively.

But what I thought I'd do is I'd give you a little bit of some of the things that I'm thinking about as we move into September 2nd. Of course, many of our professional schools are have already been in session for the last two weeks, and many of our research graduate students and postdocs have been here literally since the opening earlier this summer. But for many of our

undergraduates, we are all coming back and will have a shared experience beginning tomorrow. And we really remain just aligned on the shared purpose for our faculty of providing a high-quality MSU learning experience. And so I really want to thank everyone for doing the work that's needed to make sure that we can deliver on this promise.

Woodruff, cont.

Of course, this does not come just randomly. There's been an amazing engagement in professional development opportunities by our faculty. Over a thousand hours of work has been done. And so, despite the virus's best effort, we have continued to teach, but not just to teach as usual. There's been intense professional development experiences that really have focused on how to better teach and how to better design pedagogically what we're doing online, and then how to assess learning. And I think those three things are really why the MSU experience is really exceptional for what we'll be providing this fall. And we do have some limited opportunities for students, in particular, select areas, particularly some of our seniors who needed a lab class or a performance class and had already indicated that they would be ready to graduate in December. And so we have the online and we have a few in-person. And I think our faculty have really risen with a remarkable resolve, creativity, and thoughtfulness. And I'm really proud of what we're going to be delivering this fall.

We also have some additional work that's been done. MSU IT, the College of Arts and Letters, the Broad College, and the College of Natural Sciences, as well as our Hub, have really collaborated—and I believe some of you have been accessing this as some of our piloting—to provide timely and easily accessible synchronous and asynchronous support resources. And this is really critical because our students are not just here in

Lansing, but they're around Michigan and literally around the globe. So this has been really inspiring to watch and to kind of play with some of these new tools. And I really, again, thank the faculty for your dedication to really thinking about how we can deliver not just a remote experience, but an MSU educational experience.

Those same modules that have been delivered for teaching our faculty how to teach in this online environment have also been provided free to every district across the State of Michigan for our K-12 schools. I'm really thrilled about that. As many of you know, one of the reasons I really wanted to join the land-grant institution is because of that land-grant mission. And, you know, as I've thought about this K-12 asset that's going out, I can't help but think not only of those teachers who are getting something that is equivalent to what our faculty are receiving in terms of education for online teaching, pedagogy, and examination, but I'm also thinking about that fifth-grader and that ninth-grader, that high schooler who will be touched by this work, and they will be our students one day. And so, this is something that I think is really a great thing for all of you to keep in mind.

Woodruff, cont.

We do have some great teaching websites. "Keep Teaching" is one that if you haven't looked at that, please take a look at that. That does aggregate a lot of the resources that our faculty are going to need to be able to teach across all the different types of pedagogical delivery. There's also some new mental health resources. So if you've been on the Keep Teaching website this summer when it was launched, check back. And we are really planning, and there's a very thoughtful way. We're looking at how we can continue to support the best learning opportunities in this remote setting, but how to support you as teachers.

And then for our students that are coming in—and really thinking about student success—we had a number of students that were traditionally going to be part of our RAs [Resident Assistants]. and we really pivoted very quickly to have them participate with us in a mentoring program for the incoming students.

[President] Sam [Stanley] mentioned that our enrollment numbers are really quite good. There's nothing to really talk about until the end of September. But at the outset, we're really happy that about an equal number of students will be with us within the MSU educational portfolio this fall, as of today, as last year, and they're taking more credits than they did last year. So we really want to keep our eye on student success.

And one of the things that I ask is, “How do we really give that personal, in-touch kind of experience that we can do in a classroom where you see people coming and going, but how can we do that in a remote setting?” And so, Mark Largent, Vennie Gore, and several others, and Genyne Royal really sat down—and we also had this group of RAs, as I started out this narrative that needed something to do. And so, we created literally out of whole cloth in the last two weeks—literally in the last two weeks—a program that we're calling “Circles of Success Mentoring Program.” It reads better than I can say to alliteratively. But it really is a way that we're really thinking about individualized, tailored mentoring, and there's going to be five different circles that are incoming students and transfer students. So those students that are all new to MSU are really going to have a one-on-one, value-added mentoring experience. And it's both with our student mentors as well as with professional advisors. Really extraordinary. And I think, you know, to have seen this go from a real catastrophe, almost, with a group of 400 RAs with nothing that we can do for them to really

Woodruff, cont.

creating this new program-- I just think it's fantastic. So that will actually be formally launched tomorrow. An email goes out to every one of our students, offering them the opportunity to link into these circles. And I have a feeling that's going to be really transformative, not just for us during this during this semester, but really as an enduring asset for our educational modalities.

Of course, we've been reviewing, as you know, the practices and policies related to academic work. There's a number of ways that we're doing this. We're looking at teaching technologies, of course, and I've spoken to that. I did send a letter to the University Committee on Faculty Tenure, and that's been forwarded, I think, on to the Steering Committee. And that really is to applaud you for what's happened with the support of it with a tenure clock delay. That, of course, was something that I think all of you participated in to really think about how we can make a positive evaluative ecosystem and how we emerge from this current time of constraints into an academic setting that will be changed. And so, I think this gives us time to be able to reset and really help our entire faculty be able to succeed.

The Provost Office Honorifics Program-- I've begun to meet with folks in offices across the campus. And what I'm really discovering is just, I've said this before, but there's really a deep underlying strength at MSU. We just have it so that it's a little bit covered. And so, we're trying to actually develop strategies by which we can make that great scholarship and creativity, that performance art, that research really visible, and making it visible, viable, and valuable are the “V”s that I'm thinking about for this program. And I've just been amazingly impressed at the folks who really put up their hand and say, “I want to help do some of this work and help make sure that we're maintaining the intellectual

Woodruff, cont.

vitality of this great university.”

Work-life support is really something that I walked in the door very anxious to be a positive part of. And as you know, many K-12 districts are delivering online instruction, and this really alters our families and how they're able to do work. And that's both in terms of where you do work and who's running into the Zoom meeting. And of course, we've all seen that with some of our colleagues. They keep saying that background on many of our Zooms is kind of metadata for our lives. And so it's interesting to watch this. But our work-life team, we've really been thinking very, very cogently, I think, about how we can make a difference in this. And this, of course, includes a lot of COREM [Coalition of Racial /Ethnic Minorities] teams, and there are a lot of COREM teams that have come together around child care, really thinking about how parents work within the home setting, but also offering office settings when they can come into a workspace and have that time for their own teaching and research. And so really thinking about that. But also but also recognizing that there are many extra hours and new responsibilities that are associated with the pivot to online. And I think that awareness by your Provost, and certainly by all of you, is something that's really critical. And we're working really in an atomized way. How can we help individuals as we go through this next quarter?

And then-- Let's see. I think I've been talking a lot. I'm not sure, but it seems like I've been talking a lot. So, the last thing I'll say is I really just want to encourage everybody to extend grace and empathy. This is something that is really a phenotype of this MSU faculty committee community. It is a time when people are stretched in new ways. And much is new to everyone. And so there are going to be missteps along the way. And

Woodruff, cont.

so I'm really appreciative that everyone is so supportive of each other.

Our students, of course, are feeling already the strain of the unknown. And in a remote setting, that unknown is really pressing on them. And so thinking about how we address student mental health concerns is something that we have done, and we have some new materials that the Provost's Office will be releasing tomorrow.

And I also think of this in terms of the faculty. That-- I really want to help us all realize that even as you're taking care of these students, we want you to take care of yourselves. And there's one line that's in this "addressing student mental health concerns and online courses" that we'll be sending out to you tomorrow. And I just thought I'd close with this particular quote, which is, "Be mindful of the extra stress you are under as an online educator, and reach out to colleagues and friends to share your experience and ask for support taking on this additional burden on behalf of students is hard work, and on top of an already demanding job, don't forget to take care of yourself as well." So with that, Jennifer, I thought those were the kind of bullet points that I thought I would bring to you, and I hope this gives you some context and some excitement that I feel for what's happening within our faculty community as we get ready for tomorrow morning. So thanks a lot. Happy to take any questions you might have.

Chairperson Johnson

So, questions for the Provost? All right, well, thank you. It does sound like-- I don't know what your one month feels like, but it does sound like it's more than one month of work that's been happening. So thank you. All right. Our EVP for Health Sciences.

**Executive
Vice President**

Thank you, Jennifer. Teresa, it has been delightful to have you join us as a colleague. You are a tour de force



**for Health Sciences
Norman Beauchamp**

with all the right core values, and it's been wonderful.

Beauchamp, cont.

In terms of my update, you know, so much of my attention units have been to the reopening of campus, and President Stanley did a nice job of covering that. You know, I want to just reflect on-- When we started, we said we were going to use a values-based approach, and I've touched on this before, but I'm just really proud that I do believe that that's what we've done. We committed that we would together make decisions that would make our campus and our community as safe as possible. And I think our approach to these dedensifying the campus in the ways that we have, you know, have followed that in a really positive way. And setting up the ability to test symptomatic patients, you know, symptoms app, the committees delivering reports, you know, that brought in input from across the university, I think really helpful. We've asked our committees to go on a pause for two weeks as we all roll up our sleeves to respond to the students actually coming back, you know, coming in classes, and just be ready for that. And then two weeks from now, we'll take our learnings, roll up our sleeves back up, and, you know, do some specific work within the subcommittees as we get ready to prepare for this or the next semester and take what we learned.

I might share a few of the things that we've been working on the colleges. The professional colleges have been back in session. Those are going well. A lot of our work is really, you know, to minimize, you know, any efforts that aren't-- That go beyond really acquiring the necessary knowledge to complete the curriculum and, you know, utilizing simulation as a tool to give students hands-on experience, but do so in the safest possible environment. The hospitals have been very welcoming. And then we've been able to keep our students safe. Our students have participated, students from Human Med, as well as

Beauchamp, cont.

students from Vet Med, in a pilot for our saliva surveillance program. And that was very helpful information as we prepared to deploy that for campus. One of the areas of focus that the three colleges are working on is, “How do we further improve clinical care research and education opportunities in our community?” And I think by coming together as three health colleges interacting with Sparrow and McLaren, we've been able to identify better ways to work together, to do clinical trials and to build some areas of expertise. So, for example, we're in conversations with Sparrow related to a neurosciences institute. McLaren is building a hospital on our campus and a cancer center—I should say “directly adjacent to our university”—and that'll open in 2021. And we're working side-by-side with them. We're also exploring new relationships in discussions with Henry Ford, again, with the idea of increasing our impact in diversity, equity, and inclusion in southeast Michigan, as well as expanding our opportunities in research, education, and clinical care. So, things are so far, so good with the return of our medical students and our nursing students, and again, having a good effort at, you know, strengthening our clinical, education, research mission.

So I'll stop there.

Chairperson Johnson Fantastic. Yeah. Questions? Go ahead. Oh, President Stanley?

EVP Beauchamp I think you're gonna put a circle in a square.

President Stanley Yeah. Yeah. I didn't mean to interrupt the questions, but Norm mentioned something that I want to emphasize, and that is that we really are interested in having people sign up for the saliva testing. At this moment in time, because of the way the test has been constructed, we

can't mandate it on campus. Most places that are using this are mandating that people take it because it's a very important tool for surveillance. And particularly for faculty and staff who are going to be having student contact. So if you're still one of those people who are teaching in person, you're coming to campus for other reasons, small group sessions, whatever it is, I really encourage you to sign up for this because I think it's going to be helpful for us going forward. And certainly in the spring, we may still need to be relying on this kind of signup. So, the more people we get, the better. So, I'm signing up for it. I'm hoping I'll be tested as part of the surveillance. And again, I encourage other people to do it as well.

EVP Beauchamp

And for all of you that are about to sign up, and I will post that, it's really a simple process. It's essentially just spitting in a test tube, sealing the test tube, and turning it in. And we're able to, you know-- First week, we'll be able to do up to 5,000 tests a week; the next, 10,000; and the week after that, 20,000 tests. So it gives us incredible scale to do this process. And at a really low cost, we developed the capabilities to do this. Jack Lipton and his lab. And it's a technique that can actually be reproduced across a number of labs on the campus.

That said, we can't require it. So, we need all of your help and encouraging. But I will share that we are going to apply for emergency authorization and move it to a CLIA [Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments] lab. So we're hopeful that we'll have that in, you know, in the next month or so. And Doug Gage has been remarkable in leaning in and helping us with that.

Chairperson Johnson Questions about any of that?

Aaron Reifler Norm, I was wondering about the turnaround time and how people are notified.

EVP Beauchamp Thank you, Aaron. The saliva test, we expect to be able to turn that around in less than 48 hours. And what would happen is individuals would be contacted with the recommendation that they should call a help line. And we have that well-staffed. And that help line will give them guidance on how to get a CLIA-approved test.

President Stanley So, to be precise, if they tested positive on the test, they would be contacted?

EVP Beauchamp Correct. That's exactly right. Otherwise they will not be. And, you know, the other thing that we're doing, Aaron, is we're working with the Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, as you probably know, to come up with an optimal sampling method for that. The other process that I think is wonderful is Joan Rose has developed a sewage surveillance test where she can look at the output of right now, we know on the order of multiple dorms. And we're going to-- We have three sites right now and we're going to move that to thirteen sites very quickly. And so, we'll have multiple ways.

Beauchamp, cont.

The other thing that we thought was really important—President Stanley stressed—was having access to the CLIA-approved tests. And so the campus came together in a really wonderful way to work with our veterinary diagnostic lab and then get it CLIA-approved to do human testing. And we'll have-- We have the capacity, as we speak, to do 500 CLIA-approved tests, all internal to MSU. And we'll have that moved up to a thousand tests a day, we believe, in about three weeks. And in addition to that, we have a commitment from Sparrow and then another lab to each provide 500 tests a day. So we really have stressed being ready.

Chairperson Johnson Any other questions? I saw Meagan in the chat asked if it was pooled testing.

EVP Beauchamp Yes, exactly, Meagan. That's what it is. And there's a deconvolution method where you take-- Right now, I think the samples-- We would do samples of twelve in the process. And that's really calculated based on the prevalence in the sampling population, and as the prevalence changes, the pooling methods, the numbers in the pools would be modified. Yeah, and that's also how we get the scale that we do, and the low cost.

Chairperson Johnson Any the other questions? All right. Thank you so much, Norm.

EVP Beauchamp Yeah. Thank you, Jennifer.

Chairperson Johnson So my comments, most of you know the Steering Committee and Faculty Senate had several meetings over the summer, mainly focusing on budgeting issues, diversity, equity, and inclusion, and some discussion on policing.

Johnson, cont. One of our big accomplishments over the summer was we hired our new Secretary for Academic Governance, Tyler Silvestri. Really excited to have him. And I think, you know, his task this last month, and our task going forward in the fall in that office, are-- Part of hiring him was getting a full-time person who could devote all their time to the office, and he is hitting the ground running getting the office organized. We're working on getting more efficient triaging, tracking, and responses to issues that are brought to Academic Governance. Make sure that they're all followed up and looped back to the person who brought them, you know, shared file space for

documents and handouts, a budget for the office. There was a budget, but no one in office had it. So now we actually have the budget, and we can, you know-- Tyler's been busy streamlining it and finding ways to save us money so we can do other things we need to do.

We went to the President in August, and the Office of Academic Governance now has the ability to email the entire faculty, which is great. That was a barrier to us communicating and getting things done before. So that's exciting.

Tyler's working on a kind of manual of operating procedures. They are not bylaws, but it's sort of the soft ways we get things done. So, if you need IT support, you call this person. If you need to hire somebody, you talk to that person. It's those sorts of things so that we don't have to keep reinventing the wheel every time we need to do something. Because, you know, the president of the Faculty Senate turns over every year, and a lot of us turn over. So having that written down, I think, will really help so that we don't have to figure it out anew every single year.

And just in general, working on improving transparency, organization, and responsiveness, including helping with knowledge about how people get chosen for academic governance and what those processes are so people can participate. And over the year, this is more of a long-term project, but working on making the academic governance website a little more user-friendly and accessible to folks who don't know the structure of academic governance here. So, I'm really excited about all that. Hopefully that will allow us all to work more efficiently and more responsibly and help bring issues forward and make the university better.

Johnson, cont.

The other thing, Faculty Senate orientation on September 8. For those of you who are on Faculty Senate, please come. You know, that will let us sort of talk about the processes, procedures, and everything so we can hit the ground running in our first official meeting. And please also, you know, bring motions, issues, suggestions, encourage your constituents to do this, where, like I said, we're building up this infrastructure so we can handle more things and do it efficiently. So, you know, please, if you have ideas you want to bring forward, please do that. You can e-mail me, email any of us, or email Tyler at acadgov@msu.edu. We'll see if we can move them. So, you know, I'm excited to come into this next year.

I don't know-- Does anyone have questions on any of that? Okay. Fantastic. So, let's move into our new business. We have several people on the call who are new. So, I thought that we could go around with very brief introductions. Your name, your role in academic governance, and your department or college. Just so that people know who all of us are.

So I'm Jennifer Johnson. I am the Chair of the Steering Committee and the Faculty Senate, and I'm in the College of Human Medicine.

And the next person on my screen is Tyler. I'm just going to call people's names. You don't want to introduce yourself? You've gotta introduce yourself.

Silvestri

I'm the Secretary for Academic Governance, as established. My name is Tyler Silvestri, and I'm very excited about that as well.

Chairperson Johnson Stephanie?

- At-Large Member
Stephanie Anthony** Hello, my name is Stephanie Anthony, and I'm the Director of College Access Initiatives, and I'm also an at-large member.
- Chairperson Johnson** I have Ben, then Meagan Abel, and then Laura.
- UCGS
Vice Chair
Ben Van Dyke** Hey, everybody. Ben Van Dyke, Department of Art, Art History, and Design, College of Arts and Letters, and I'm the incoming Vice Chair for the University Committee on Graduate Studies.
- COGS President
Meagan Abel** Hi. Meagan Abel, President of the Council of Graduate Students, fifth-year Ph.D. candidate in criminal justice. I forgot for a second.
- Interim UCAG Chair
Laura Dilley** Hi, I'm Laura Dilley, Interim Chair of the University Committee on Academic Governance, from the College of Communication Arts and Sciences, Department of Communicative Sciences Disorders.
- Chairperson Johnson** Fantastic. Then I have Rebecca, Megan, and then Emma.
- Rebecca Yang** Hi, my name's Rebecca Yang. I am a junior at Michigan State University. I work for Tyler.
- At-Large Member
Megan Donahue** I'm Megan Donahue, Professor of Physics and Astronomy, and I'm an at-large member of the Steering Committee.
- Emma Grace** Hi, I am Emma. I am a junior at Michigan State University studying Social Relations and Policy, and I also work for Tyler.
- Chairperson Johnson** Fantastic. Welcome! We have Suzanne Lang, Andrea, and Anna.
- Interim Associate** Hi, everyone. I'm Suzanne Lang, I'm the Interim

- Provost Suzanne Lang** Associate Provost and Vice President for Academic Human Resources. And I think I started my position about two weeks before Teresa Woodruff did. So we're both on the big learning curve. My academic home is in horticulture, in the College of Ag and Natural Resources, where I served for the last nine years as the Associate Dean for Faculty and Administrative Affairs.
- Lang, cont.**
- At-Large Member Andrea Kepsel** Hi, everyone. I'm the newest member of Steering Committee, an at-large member, and I am from the MSU Libraries, so I'm non-college affiliation.
- Pegler-Gordon** Anna Pegler-Gordon. I'm a professor at the James Madison College and also Vice Chair for Faculty Senate.
- Chairperson Johnson** Thank you. I have Andrew, Mick, and then Sherry.
- Corner** Hello, everyone. Andrew Corner. I am Chair of the University Committee on Undergraduate Education and a Professor of Practice in Advertising and Public Relations in the College of Communication Arts and Sciences.
- Fulton** Hello, everyone. I'm Mick Fulton. I'm the Chair of the University Committee on Faculty Affairs and I'm a Professor at the College of Veterinary Medicine.
- Sherry Lott** Hi. I'm Sherry Lott, and I'm the Assistant Secretary for Tyler in the Academic Governance Office.
- Chairperson Johnson** Thank you. Marci, and then Gwen?
- UCC Chair Marci Mechtel** Hi, I'm Marci Mechtel. I'm an Assistant Professor in the College of Nursing—Pediatrics specifically—and I am the Chair of the University Committee for Curriculum. This is my fourth year.

- Gwen Wittenbaum** Hi, Jennifer. I'm actually not on Steering Committee anymore. I'm the outgoing UCGS Chair, in an act of solidarity with the incoming Vice Chair, Ben Van Dyke, on UCGS. So, hello. Welcome, everybody.
- Chairperson Johnson** Hey! Thank you. We'll miss you, Gwen. And then Greg Koerner is our IT support. I don't know if he wants to wave or--
- Greg Koerner** Hi, everybody. Greg Koerner here at MSU IT, manager of the Digital Classroom Services Team.
- Chairperson Johnson** Thank you very much. All right. So we have several Standing Committee reports, and I have it written in no particular order. We usually go around the room, but there's no room. So maybe UCC, and then UCFA. We'll start with those two, if you have anything to report. If you don't, it's fine, too.
- Mechtel** Of course I have something to report! I told Tyler, "To make it easier this year, can I just be a standing action item for Faculty Senate and information item for University Council, just so that I don't have to do it every month?" But because we do-- We met, actually, at the end of the last academic year, and we actually are meeting again on Thursday.
- So for the-- Our last meeting, we approved the following for programs. The committee approved seven new programs, effective Fall 2020 and include Communication, Leadership, and Strategy Bachelor of Arts; Cyber Criminology and Cybersecurity Graduate Certificate, very timely due to increases in crimes during COVID; Games and Interactive Media Bachelor of Arts; Information Science Bachelor of Arts; Music Cognition Graduate Certificate; and from the College of Social Science, a new-- It's called a 3+3. It's a B.A. or B.S. and J.D. So it's done in conjunction with the College of Law to

allow timely completion. So again, it's one of those linkage programs that we have here at the university.

Furthermore, there were 51 program changes—and this is really to align the curriculum with the new [Student Information System—and four deletions. For courses, the committee approved, 21 new courses, 54 course changes, and seven deletions.

Mechtel, cont.

For moratoriums, one was placed on Conservation Law Graduate Certificate. The University Committee on Graduate Studies was consulted, and the Provost approved. It's effective Spring 2020 through Fall 2022. The discontinued programs include—after appropriate consultation with the University Committee on Undergraduate Education or UCGS, as appropriate, and approved by the Provost—and they are an Italian secondary disciplinary teaching Minor, effective Summer 2020; Corporate Master of Business Administration, effective Summer 2020; Environmental Science and Policy Graduate Specialization, effective Fall 2020; and, finally, Judicial Administration Master of Science, effective Fall 2020.

And for the-- My motion is to place this on Faculty Senate as an informational item and same for University Council. As a reminder, per bylaws, not to hold programs over the summer, what is approved by UCC at the end of the academic year goes into the catalog. And that's my report.

Chairperson Johnson

So I think-- So there's a-- Tyler has been reviewing *Robert's Rules of Order*, and there is a thing we can do where I essentially just say, “Without objection, this is approved.” And that can cover the Faculty Senate and University Council agendas. So, Tyler, now that she's said that, can we just slide it there and cover it with that

later? Do we have to follow-- Okay, perfect. So, we'll put it there, and then it'll be covered under that. Without objection, that's approved. Perfect. All right. Thank you so much, Marci. You guys have indeed been busy.

Mechtel Right. Yes. We're going to be very busy this year, too. Our agenda is already packed for fall for September.

Chairperson Johnson All right. Fantastic. Thank you. All right. So, we have UCFA.

Fulton Hi, again. The UCFA just met prior to this meeting, we are establishing the structure of our committee for this year and working on a couple of items that eventually will come to you. But we-- Last meeting of Spring Semester, we completed a Code of Professional Standards and Behaviors. We wanted it to be a faculty-driven document. It was composed of four members of the University Committee on Faculty Affairs, but we had advisors who helped us in that. And Provost Woodruff wrote a memo to the Faculty Senate commending us on our actions and what we've done. So we would like that to be considered for Faculty Senate for action item.

Fulton, cont.

Chairperson Johnson And it is there on our tentative agenda. Fantastic. Thank you so much. UCAG, and then UCUE?

Dilley Yes, briefly, in terms of agenda items that we have set for fall, UCAG will be examining the issue of university bylaws as they relate in particular to the proposed new Committee on Administrator Review, where we'll be considering what the composition of the committee should be in more depth. We also are planning to examine the *Bylaws'* requirements for committee membership. We had a bunch of discussion this past year regarding the possibility that some of the restrictions on being involved in committee membership may be too

restrictive, and or there may not be enough information to go on to appropriately decide. So those are two things we'll be looking at.

Chairperson Johnson Thank you. And Tyler, just for me, I thought when we did the *Bylaws*, the Committee on Administrator Review was not passed.

Silvestri Yeah, so that was one of the ones that the President sort of referred back and said he didn't want to forward that to the Board [of Trustees]. University Council approved it, sent it on. The President sent it back. I'd have to check the minutes. My recollection of it, though, is that the University Council voted to essentially create this sort of ad hoc committee to do essentially Laura's talking about, which is look at "Well, what might this look like?" And UCAG will obviously be involved in that. But-- Did that answer your question?

Chairperson Johnson Kind of. So where the process went is, it's-- UC passed it, it went to the President, and he said, "Not in favor of that part," the letter came back to UCAG and to us, and **Johnson, cont.** UCAG sort of looking at what was proposed, looking at the President's concerns about it, and coming up with a proposal. Is that the gist?

Silvestri That's essentially right. There's actually one more step where UCAG did do that again, University Council saw it again, it went to the President again, and he said, "Still no." [Crosstalk]

Dilley My recollection is that President Stanley did not say no. He merely, as I recall, wanted more detail. And the devil's in the details.

Silvestri "Not yet," rather than "no." Not to speak for him.

Chairperson Johnson Okay. So that that's where we are with that. Okay. Thank you. There's a lot of back-and-forth. All right. Thank you very much. Anything else, Laura?

Dilley No.

Chairperson Johnson Okay. So UCUE? UCGS?

Corner Okay. For UCUE, our first meeting of the year is Thursday. We don't have any holdover items from last spring for you to consider, so I'll have a report next time.

Chairperson Johnson Okay. Thank you. UCGS?

Van Dyke Thanks. Briefly. UCGS meets for the first time on September 14. I'm the incoming vice chair and our incoming chair stepped down, so we'll be electing a new chair on September 14. And we're expecting Denise Hershey from Nursing will serve and be reporting to the Steering Committee starting in October.

UCGS approved a motion in April 2020 this year to create an academic calendar task force with UCUE. We began in May and worked through the summer, providing recommendations to administrative leaders regarding both Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 calendars. Expect a report from this task force at the next University Council meeting.

Chairperson Johnson All right. Thank you and thank you for stepping in this month.

Van Dyke My pleasure.

Chairperson Johnson And then, Tyler, we have UCFT, but they don't report. Is that accurate?

Silvestri They just don't have a chair right now. They report.

Chairperson Johnson Okay. All right. Well, so thank you. Thanks to all the committees for their hard work. So next, we have a few comments from our new Secretary for Academic Governance, who got certified this summer in *Robert's Rules of Order* and has some suggestions and instructions for us.

Silvestri Did we want to do the COGS report before that?

Chairperson Johnson I'm so sorry, Meagan. Please. Yes, do the COGS report.

Abel No worries! I don't have much, but our first meeting of the semester is September 16th. We're onboarding our new reps. And then we have—I've been swamped this semester, this summer between my qualifying exams and all these reopening committees—but we still have some pending items that we moved through academic governance last semester, including an ad hoc committee to look at a campus bullying or harassment policy and proposing to add DEI statements to faculty tenure and annual reports that I hope to follow up on this semester and get rolling. Or at least in these next two weeks, while the subcommittees are all on pause, maybe that's when I'll get that done. So, there's three things I'm hoping to get done in this space.

Chairperson Johnson Thank you. Yeah. Thank you very much. That's great. Okay. Now, Tyler.

Silvestri Thanks. So, the *Bylaws for Academic Governance* say that all the academic governance bodies are supposed to be following *Robert's Rules of Order* wherever the *Bylaws* themselves don't address, sort of, a question of procedure. We play pretty fast and loose with that for a

few decades, and we're going to continue to play a little fast and a little loose, but we'd like to slow down and tighten them a little bit. Just because-- A lot of people think of *Robert's Rules* as sort of this thing that bogs things down and adds to it-- Really, if you're doing it right, it can really make things so much more efficient and get everyone home. A couple things to think about.

The first is just sort of-- The idea is to have discussion during discussion. How many times on Steering have we heard, "All right. Motion? Second? Discussion? Of course not. We just spent half an hour discussing it." That's because generally, the motion should be the first thing out the gate. Now, of course, sometimes it might take some discussion to figure out what we're moving. Other times it's much more obvious, sort of immediately, what the issue is. And so, sort of, as soon as there is a cognizable motion to be made, it should be so that it's seconded. And then we can discuss it, because then, you know, there are all sorts of rules, which are pretty intuitive, but there are, sort of, guidelines to ensure equity, to make sure that people are treated fairly in the way that they're discussing things, that certain views are reflected, to give everyone a chance. And so, doing that in sort of the structured, motion, second, discussion format tends to work the best.

Similarly, if you know you're coming into the meeting knowing you're going to have a motion, if you could submit it in writing, that would be great. For the purposes of taking the minutes and, sort of, just administratively it's very, very difficult when someone says, "And I move to that effect" when that effect was a discussion of three people. And now it's, like, little old me trying to summarize what you meant. If we have really, sort of, written, or at least very well-articulated, stated, this is what my motion is, it makes it much easier, and

Silvestri, cont.

no one gets confused about what we actually did. The worst position and deliberative body can be in is, “What did we just do?” And that will eliminate that.

This is just a nitpick, but friendly amendments? There is no such thing as a friendly amendment. This is made up. It is completely nothing. *Robert’s Rules* flips out about it, and I am learning to flip out about it, because-- So, once motion's been made and seconded, it no longer belongs to the movant, to the person making the motion. It is the property of the body. And so any change to that has to have the body's consent. Now, as we're talking about, the chair can always say—if it's an easy one—say, for example, make helpfully correcting me that it was UCFA, instead of UCFT in the minutes—we don't need to go through the whole thing. She can say, “Without objection, it’s amended.” But there's no, sort of, “You're the one who introduced it, so you can change it at will” That's not really a thing. So keep that in mind.

I should also note, I guess, I'm saying all of this based on the 11th edition of *Robert’s Rules*. The 12th edition came out today and the mailbox hasn't come. First one in nine years, and the mail hasn't come yet. So, I guess, I’m confident that this basic stuff will be the same. But I'm going to read that pretty quickly this week.

Giving voice. This is an important one. So, sort of-- There are folks like me who have voice but not vote. There are folks like, I don't know, Anna, who have voice and vote. And there are folks like Aaron today, who has voice for the limited purpose of the agenda item he's been assigned to, and we gave him voice by adopting the agenda with him there. And there are folks like Emma, one of our assistants in the office, who has no voice whatsoever. If she wants to say something, she can raise her hand to be recognized. But the body actually has to



Silvestri, cont.

give her voice to do that. It's all about-- We're going to work on try and make it more-- Basically Steering seminars, but with all the members as panelists. But keeping in mind that you have to have voice to have been on the committee or participate in its deliberations. And then five—and this will be the number one thing that gets us out of Steering earlier—is remember the purpose of Steering. It is to steer it to the correct body. We all have all sorts of opinions on all the stuff that comes up, and they're all, sort of, not relevant, except to the extent that it affects where the thing is supposed to go for the people who are supposed make those decisions. There are exceptions. So, when it's an emergency, then we can act in more substantive ways, and that's a whole thing. But by and large, remembering the purpose of Steering, both sort of in our presentations to one another and in our deliberations about where things go, that'll get us out of here much, much quicker. And, honestly, more important than that, making sure we're relegated to the role we're supposed to have.

So those are all my points on rules of order, unless anyone has any questions about any of that.

Chairperson Johnson

Questions? All right, so, Tyler, if you could, if we start to break one of these rules, will you let us know?

Silvestri

Yeah. So this was one of the things that [former Steering Committee Chairperson Deborah Moriarty] and I talked about. Deb was my boss for like four days before I got a new one, because this job's insane. But technically, under *Robert's Rules*, the parliamentarian is really not supposed to be heard. Sort of just must be whispering advice to the chair. That's why at University Council, when it's real, I'm next to President Stanley. Because I'm supposed to be able to tell him, like, “No, no, no. You need a second.” Particularly, given the environment, we

all sort of thought it made more sense for me to be a little pushier. It is extraordinarily hard to whisper from this distance. But yes, I will indeed speak up.

Chairperson Johnson All right. Thank you. Yeah. And it's my goal, too, that meetings will end at 5:00, at least Faculty Senate and Steering Committee. We're going to really work to move through things efficiently. Thank you for that, Tyler.

Johnson, cont. The next is just really a question that I'd like to put out, which is that we are trying to come up with an internal tracking system within academic governance for issues that come in, where they go, who brought them, what their contact information is, where they went and what happened, and then to report back to the original person. The tracking systems I'm used to in research are much more linear than that, like I've used Excel, and Access, and FileMaker, and Redcap. But for people that all, sort of, have the same flow through a process-- In academic governance, something could go to a committee, then a different committee, or it might never go to committee. So I'm less familiar with that non-linear flow. And I just wanted to know if anyone in this group, including our executives or students or anyone, have ideas for, you know, what software we would have our hands on that can be used to, kind of, track things that don't flow through in a super linear way.

Nothing?

Silvestri I will keep looking.

Chairperson Johnson Okay. Well, we'll look. Yeah, I'm kind of-- Go ahead, Anna.

Pegler-Gordon I'm just wondering if there's a way to, sort of, adapt to more linear so that we make it broad enough that it's like, first step, you know, is like, you know, first location to send it to, whether that's UC, UCFA, or, you know, somewhere else. And so you can broaden up the sort of linear categories in order to allow for some kind of tracking within something that you're already familiar with. I guess that's my one suggestion.

Chairperson Johnson All right. Broaden it. Yeah. Anybody else? I mean, what do you guys use to track big university things? I know Norms says supply, the supply chain stuff. Other ideas?

EVP Beauchamp I obviously love my Gantt charts as a tool to track things and dependencies, and I could find some software from industrial engineering system designs that I've used. We use Microsoft Teams. But you're familiar with that. That's a reasonably good tool to archive and track, and keep documents as well. But I'll send you some software, and you can see if you like it. Some project software.

Chairperson Johnson Yeah. I just know-- And, like, when I do big studies, it's impossible for one person to track all the details until we program things and REDCap alerts and all of that. But like I said, none of that really seems to-- This is almost like a ticket system for a help desk or something. All right. Well, we'll keep looking. If anyone has ideas, email me or Tyler would be really helpful.

All right. So, process for setting Steering Committee agendas. There has not been a formal process. And again, this is not bylaws thing. I think informally in the past, the President sort of set the agenda and the at-large members would have input into it. I'd like to suggest having Tyler put out a call to the Steering Committee



for agenda items at least, maybe, a week before. Then any of you can submit items. Also, when things come in, so whatever issue it is, they'll come to me or you or we'll send it to Tyler. He will put them-- All of that will automatically be on the Steering Committee agenda unless we triage it off somewhere else. So, it'll be anything people bring in. Plus calls for items from all of you. And then the question is, like, I'll look over it with Tyler. Should we have the at-large members look over it? Does the Steering Committee want to look over it to finalize it? Or do you guys have thoughts about that process, the extent to which you want to be involved in the agenda other than submitting items? Anna?

Pegler-Gordon

Sorry. I'm trying to square this with the fifth point that Tyler made, that the purpose of the Steering Committee is steering items to various governing bodies. So isn't part of our purpose as a Steering Committee, as a whole, to steer matters that are relevant to University Council to University Council?

Chairperson Johnson

Yes.

Pegler-Gordon

So why are we breaking it up into smaller things? Why aren't we just kind of, like, doing that in Steering Committee? Is that-- Or maybe I'm not hearing correctly.

Chairperson Johnson

Yeah, I think I didn't explain it very well. What I'm saying is that everything that comes in would come to the Steering Committee, to this meeting's agenda, to put on whatever other agenda. Right? Because we're just triaging everything out. And then Tyler would also, in addition to just whatever came in, ask you guys the week before, if there are other things that we should consider. Like it's a call for any other agenda items we don't already know about to make sure we didn't lose anything.

Pegler-Gordon

And for Faculty Senate, don't we-- I can't remember because I'm on the email, so I don't know if I'm on the email as a Faculty Senator or as a Steering Committee member. I feel like we do send out—the Secretary for Academic Governance does send out—a call for agenda items for Steering Committee. But who does that call go to? I'm not sure.

Silvestri

So that does go to the University Council. So Faculty Senate, the rest of them. I'm trying to pull the exact language. Yes. So, from the *Bylaws*, it says that before each meeting of the University Council, “The Steering Committee . . . shall hold a duly announced open meeting at which suggestions for agenda items will be heard.” So, sort of in-- How that has shaken out practically is this call for agenda items, right? They are suggestions for agenda items. And so the question is-- So, in some sense, there is an implicit, “Well, if the Steering Committee doesn't think something should go anywhere”—and I've seen Steering Committee do this once or twice in the two or three years I've been doing it, where it was like, “This is silly. This is not an effective use of anybody's time. We steer it to the trash can.” The question is sort of—

Silvestri, cont.

There's a mini version of that. How does Steering get all of those things? Because the *Bylaws* also contemplates—It says Steering can do that or “a subcommittee designated for matters of agenda.” So, it's sort of, well, what gets in front of Steering? And that's the question. How does that happen?

Abel

I would argue that Steering needs to be the open sieve that takes anything and everything. So at some point, somebody has got to take it all. Steering is the body designated to take it all. I think it's ridiculous if we start creating a subcommittee of steering to review things, to then pass on to Steering. I think we take anything and everything that people throw. That's our job is to vet it

and make sure it passes, like, a smell test to go on to UC or FS. And so I'd say, you know, unless someone sends, like, blatant spam that's like, "I pass a motion to have MSU change their flag to a pile of doo doo," you know, I think we take everything.

Chairperson Johnson All right. I mean, I'm fine with that. I mean, essentially, that's what I'm thinking. So, Tyler, it would be the week before. I guess it's you send it out to UC, right? Or maybe before that. Items to consider. Please send in. And in general, you know, as Faculty Senators and representatives, we should be encouraging people to send things. So we'll send everything to Tyler. It will appear on the Steering Committee agenda. I may work with him around the order. Just for efficiency and grouping things, if you guys are comfortable with that. But unless it's something like Meagan was saying just completely, you know-- We'll just put everything on. And then this committee, like I said, our job is to put it different places.

And, you know, for this meeting, part of what we did is that we just put things that we knew needed to go to Faculty Senate on the Faculty Senate agenda as a proposed agenda. And then this body approves. Are you guys comfortable with that or do you want to go through every single item? Like, is something sort of looks like it belongs on Faculty Senate, we put it there on the agenda under the tentative agenda for Faculty Senate. You guys okay with that? Okay. All right. Do you have what you need, Tyler? Okay. Thank you so much.

Johnson, cont. All right. So next item, 5.6, Postdoc Representation in Academic Governance. This is our visitor, Aaron Reifler. Is that the right way to say it? All right. And then, again, I think our job with this is to figure out where this goes. So this is probably going to go to UCAG, but we wanted to give you a chance to tell us a little bit about what it's about so we can get it to the right place.

Reifler

Thanks, Jennifer, for recognizing me and Tyler for helping me get in. So. Basically, the proposal and the letter that we sent is to identify a couple of areas where we could increase recognition of postdocs at the academic governance.

The two areas where I feel like we could see some increases in participation from postdocs would be one, in having postdoc representatives on committees, and in a way similar to how COGS is represented. The second would be to have some sort of advisory committee for postdocs. And in the letter, I gave a little bit of background from the National Post-Doctoral Association, which has offered some recommendations to that extent and some of the history in terms of researching it. But as far as Michigan State University, we don't have a very long history of having-- The Office of the Postdoctoral Affairs just started in October of the last year. So, it's not a surprise that there's not a large awareness or representation. But I think that the time is good to at least look at where postdocs could fit in in academic governance. And these are two parallel initiatives, I think, that make sense to investigate and see which way forward.

I'm happy to answer questions on it or I could go into more detail about my vision for either those initiatives.

Chairperson Johnson

And along with what Tyler said, I mean, I think we're probably not the body with the ultimate deliberating body on this. I think this is a UCAG issue. But, Megan, I know you've been working with them. I wanted to see if you had suggestions about where this goes.

- Donahue** No, it sounds like that's right. And we're not redirecting you because we don't want to deal with it. This is what we do.
- Reifler** Yeah! I appreciate it.
- Silvestri** So is there a motion to send this to UCAG?
- Abel** I move to send this to UCAG.
- Chairperson Johnson** Is there a second?
- Donahue** I second.
- Chairperson Johnson** Is there a discussion? I'm sorry, Tyler. We did your pet peeve, we discussed before we moved. We'll learn. Go ahead, Anna.
- Pegler-Gordon** In terms of discussion, I think this is a really important idea, and I fully support expanding representation of post docs. I think it's interesting for me to think about, also, how that might be connected to some other issues that we have been, over the summer, at least considering with the discussion around academic specialists as well. There was a letter that sort of went out to academic specialists about the cuts that they were facing. And I know that originally came from that, although it's much broader than that with the postdocs as well. And that, you know, they were sort of concerned about sort of their lack of representation as well.
- So I would absolutely support the motion to send it to UCAG. But I wonder if it might be helpful to think about. Or maybe it's completely different. But there are these groups of people who kind of fall in between because they're sort of academic staff, but sort of staff, but not faculty, and therefore their representation may not be as

Pegler-Gordon, cont. strong as it should be and similarly for postdocs. So that would be my only kind of, sort of, thought about that, is whether we should maybe at the next meeting also can sort of address academic specialists and, sort of, perhaps, possibly tie, not the same, but, like, consider issues. Like, one of the issues for academic specialists is that they have representation in the way that you're talking about, Aaron, in that there are a couple of people on, I believe, Faculty Senate. But the question is, "Is that number representative of the number within the university?" And then also, they don't get to vote in many colleges. So also, it could maybe be helpful to understand what difficulties of academic specialists face and what would happen to postdocs. Like, how would they vote for, you know-- So that those are, I guess, the sort of issues I'm thinking perhaps it can be productive to consider some of these areas together.

Chairperson Johnson Other discussion or thoughts about where and how to triage this?

Abel I would just say I feel like that is such a huge issue that it might need like a formation of an ad hoc committee or something to consider that, that consideration of academic staff. And non-tenure track faculty, I think was another issue you raised earlier, representation.

I do want to caution talking about proportional representation in terms of population, because then you're going to trigger an issue with the students in that, you know, we talk about University Council, I get five graduate students and ASMSU [the Associated Students of Michigan State University] gets five undergrads. We outnumber the number of faculty members on this campus. So, the proportions are incredibly out of whack if we're going to talk about University Council. So, I just want to caution starting to go into proportions, because

then we're going to get some pushback, really, from the students there.

But anyway, I just wonder if maybe for another agenda item or if it's worth seeing from University Council if there's a desire on the part of University Council to put together a committee to consider this issue.

Abel, cont.

And I think I'm wrong about ASMSU having-- I think-- ASMSU, I'm realizing, does have more than COGS, but it's still not proportional to our numbers altogether. So-- I wanted to correct myself.

Pegler-Gordon

No. And I think that's helpful. So basically you're saying, "Let's just deal with this because this is a much more straightforward issue, and then let's deal with that." And I take that. Thank you.

Chairperson Johnson

Other discussion?

Reifler

One additional point I just wanted to mention is that I've been working closely with the Postdoc Association on this matter and their co-chair, Christina Reppucci, has drafted up a number of recommendations that expand on these ideas based on current bylaws and the structure of how academic governance interacts with COGS, and other groups as well. So we've definitely done more research than is represented in this letter, but that, obviously, would be for further presentation.

Chairperson Johnson

All right. Thank you. Other discussion? Okay, so let's vote on the motion, which is to send this to UCAG. All in favor, raise your hand, on screen or electronically. All right. Anyone opposed? Great. So, Tyler, can you send it to UCAG for us? All right. And Anna, based on your

academic specialists, do you want to make another motion about academic specialists?

Pegler-Gordon

I am waiting to talk to the chair of ASAC [the Academic Specialists Advisory Committee]. And then I think after I sort of talked to them and sort of find out what it is, the areas that they actually think are the main concerns, then I think it might make more sense to wait and bring that to the next Steering Committee meeting.

Chairperson Johnson

All right, great. Just email it to Tyler and he'll get it on the agenda. And you know what? I just realized I am doing something that used to make me nuts when I started on academic governance, which is using all these acronyms like COGS, and UCFA, and UCC, and all of that. And if any of you are new and don't know what all these things are, email me at jjohns@msu.edu or email Tyler. We have a sort of a guide. And it's sort of funny. You realize the degree to which you've become assimilated, because I was just doing it without even thinking about it, and I had no idea what half of it meant for the first six months. So, ask somebody. All right. Thank you.

Johnson, cont.

Okay, so "Status of the Executive Vice President for Health Sciences in the *Bylaws*." There was an attachment G. The issue is that the *Bylaws* were created for a university with a Provost, but not EVP for Health Sciences. So now that we have an EVP for Health Sciences, the question is which of the things that, say, Provost or EVP for Health Sciences or which they both are or that sort of thing? That's the issue. And I think our goal here—Tyler, correct me if I'm wrong—I think our goal here is just to update people or send this somewhere. Oh, Meagan?

- Abel** Can I make a motion to send this to University Council? Or no, I don't get to?
- Chairperson Johnson** No, no, no. You can. Go ahead. University Council?
- Abel** That's where this has to go right? Or do we need UCAG to look at it first? Okay. Motion to send it to UCAG. Sorry, Laura. You get another thing.
- Chairperson Johnson** Okay. Is there a second?
- Corner** Second.
- Chairperson Johnson** All right let's discuss it. We almost discussed again-- Tyler, you were making a face, so we managed to avoid it. Okay. There's a motion to send it to UCAG, so, discussion?
- EVP Beauchamp** And would you like me to recuse myself, Jennifer or, no? I'm glad to stay or I'm glad to go.
- Chairperson Johnson** No, you're completely fine. I think we're just trying to figure out where to send this. And I can't imagine UCAG will do this without any input from you and the Provost. I mean, I can't imagine they would act on this without getting you guys' suggestions anyway.
- Dilley** So I think that's just it. You know, in order for UCAG to be effective in doing anything with this, there needs to be input that UCAG will have received from relevant parties. So is there a way that the process, as envisioned, can proactively involve or reach out to those relative constituents? Or do you want to just give everything to UCAG? We're going to have a very full agenda. So I just want to see if anyone has ideas around who to ask for input.



Donahue Well, it seems like the President will have something to say about it too?

Chairperson Johnson Yeah, I mean, I think that the Provost, President, and EVP should have input, and I would think if he reached out to them, they'd be responsive. And then, I do think, Tyler, as the outgoing president of UCAG, I'd love to hear your next sort of-- If you have thoughts about the process making it smooth.

Silvestri Yeah. So certainly, I will work with Laura and whoever the permanent UCAG chair is—maybe Laura. I don't know—to make sure they have all the information that they need to reach out to stakeholders. They might have ideas, right? UCAG, on who do we need to talk to about this?

Silvestri, cont. And this very well might not be, like, a one meeting thing, because it in some sense it's a big it's a big question, right? To what extent do you want to add—and of course, it's not about Norm—but to what extent do you want to add a new administrator to faculty governance? That's a big question in a lot of ways. And so, yeah, UCAG will probably want to spend a lot of time with this. And I suspect they'll have, sort of, thoughts on who they should have information from and opinions. But theoretically, whatever it is, is a *Bylaws* change. Right? And so it will end up at University Council. But as far as the question, “Where should it be referred? Where should a question about the composition of Academic Governance be referred?” Committee on Academic Governance makes more sense to me.

Chairperson Johnson Yeah, Meagan?

Abel I think the reason why my first instinct to send was to send this to University Council is because some of this

seems pretty straightforward. Right? Like adding the EVP to Steering. We're already doing this. Like, there's some things we're already doing that we just haven't reflected in the *Bylaws* because this position has already been created. So having Dr. Beauchamp at UC, you know, he's already given speaking time and is like-- So I think there's bits of those that we could probably, you know, could probably be gotten through because they're already a practice that's just not codified anywhere. So that that's why my first thought was UC. But I totally understand why UCAG would want to take a greater look at, like, where the other places were.

Silvestri

Part of it being because some of those decisions you're talking about that made it that practice, you know, some of them were just sort of the unilateral call of like the prior chair. And it's, you know, even if I agree—and I do, that it should be there—you know, it's sort of, “Well, is that the way that it ought to happen?” Right? On this episode of “Law and Order: Tyler’s Procedural Concerns,” like-- And this is what UCAG was worried-- When Deb asked, UCAG/me to make the list of the bylaws that it affects, it was sort of with that in mind, that we should probably talk about what it should look like.

Chairperson Johnson

Right. Any more discussion on this? Okay, so all in favor? The motion was to send it to UCAG. I think if UCAG, thinks that some of them are easy, they could send it UC pretty fast, the easy ones. But let's vote on the motion is send it to UCAG. So, all in favor, yes? That's the University Committee and Academic Governance.

Johnson, cont.

Anyone opposed?

Okay, Laura, what-- Is there anything you need from this group to be able-- What do you guys need to be able to do this?

Dilley Well, I think we can anticipate needing input from the President and other individuals that have been mentioned in this discussion. Tyler, do you have any specific thoughts about how to make this an effective process?

Silvestri So, sort of a handful, but a lot of them are sort of-- I don't want to waste everyone else's time. You and I can chat about, sort of, how we get people to the UCAG agenda. But nothing, like, shocking.

Chairperson Johnson Yeah, I would say feel free to reach out to the Steering Committee, anyone on the Steering Committee or anyone.

Dilley Sounds good. Thanks.

Chairperson Johnson Anything else on this before we move on?

Okay. And 5.9. We've got eleven minutes and three items, but two are easy. So, Tyler, you want to talk about to us about the minutes and transcripts for future meetings?

Silvestri Sure. Very briefly. You might have noticed the minutes for this meeting were very much shorter than they have been for a little while. That's very intentional. *Robert's Rules* are very clear about what should be in the minutes and what shouldn't. It says, unequivocally, do not summarize officer reports. Say they reported, then call it a day. But of course, there are concerns about transparency. Right? For some, we post-- Some meetings we post unedited transcripts to sort of balance that.

Silvestri, cont. Of course, an academic governance body could always do a standing rule of order and say, "Well, no, we want you

to summarize officer reports,” and that's fine under *Robert's Rules* if it's affirmatively said. Right? Because if we don't have a rule about it, then *Robert's* applies. And *Robert's* says we can make rules that are against it. That's fine.

So I'm going to go ahead and keep doing them the way *Robert's* says do, which is real clean, real short, sort of just including-- Not summarizing debate, not summarizing guest presentations, except inasmuch as you need to make clear what a motion was. But ultimately, minutes are a reflection of what was done, not what was said. If the body wants to, we can start posting-- Honestly, I think we are going to start moving to edited transcripts to make-- There's been a lot of kerfuffle about that because unedited transcript misrepresent things. So if the body wants to do that, that's fine. It's really sort of up to Steering, what level, what Steering wants the records of Steering's meetings to look like. But until I hear otherwise, I'm going to keep doing the minutes the way they were today, which is shorter, the way *Robert's* wants to.

Chairperson Johnson Go ahead, Anna.

Pegler-Gordon So on all other boards that I am on, the reason why we don't summarize the reports is because they're written reports. And is that true for *Robert's*? Because it is really problematic to say, “So-and-so reported” and have no written record of what was reported in either a written report or in the minutes. So, for me, I think say, you know, UCC always provides a written report. Obviously, we don't need to summarize that. But I think we either need to have a summary in the minutes or chairs will have to provide a written report. That was that's what I would say.

Chairperson Johnson Go ahead, Andrew.

Corner I can speak only for UCUE, University Committee on Undergraduate Education, but we publish minutes of every meeting. So reports exist. They don't exist as part of the Steering Committee's record, but they are part of the UCUE record, and they could be referred to that way.

Chairperson Johnson Other thoughts? Suggestions?

Silvestri Just to answer your question, Anna. Yes, it does contemplate it for oral reports as well. Part of the concern being that's sort of a weird power to have is to say, "The President said the following." And then who is responsible for summarizing the remarks? Well, the secretary. Okay. But if the secretary's interpretation of it isn't—say someone, the body has a problem with that—the body can amend that, I suppose. But now ultimately what we're doing is saying, "This group of people is summarizing what someone else said." And that's sort of the issue with it. And now in the permanent, written record is this summary, which may or may not, in theory, match what was actually said. That's why I think the balance, in my opinion, would be clean minutes, and then if you want to know what was reported, the edited transcript. Right? You can at least see-- At least that way, it's closer. Obviously, you have it here there. But that's why *Robert's* sort of has the problem with summarizing even oral reports.

Pegler-Gordon Yeah, I mean, you do-- Obviously, that's why you review the minutes. Right? It's for that problem that you identified that people may not agree with how their words summarized. I'm just, you know-- Yeah. Okay. I mean, it's like there I think there are also places, and I may be wrong-- Yeah, so, I just-- I'm a historian, so I like records. Records are good, and that-- But they have to be

- Pegler-Gordon, cont.** accurate. And so I guess what I'm wondering is, is if the minutes are there for the, you know, is it so hard to provide a sort of short written report? I mean, would-- Have to have the reports always been envisioned, or are they specifically articulated as oral reports and not as written? Because I must admit, when I first came to Steering Committee, I was really surprised that the reports were done in that way.
- Chairperson Johnson** So, Anna, can I ask sort of a, kind of a question? But if we're posting the edited transcripts, which has everything word-for-word, is there additional value in anything besides fairly perfunctory minutes?
- Pegler-Gordon** Yeah, no, if we have if we have, if we definitely have the written transcript, the edited transcripts, then yeah, I can see that makes sense. But the transcripts aren't mentioned anywhere in the *Bylaws*, and now you're in a situation where we've established a practice. Then down the line, someone says, "Well, we don't need transcripts. There's nothing that says we need to have transcripts." And so now we're back-- I guess that that would be sort of my only concern. Right. Transcripts aren't envisioned at all in the *Bylaws* or in *Robert's Rules*.
- Silvestri** That's true. Neither, though, are summaries of reports. Right?
- Pegler-Gordon** No, because you have written reports.
- Silvestri** Sometimes. But-- So the example would be, like, the President's remarks at the beginning of these meetings. That's something that before we've summarized them sometimes, at length. And, you know-- And then there's questions of like, well, "Do people read the minutes now?" But, well-- Yeah. I'll leave it there. So it's not just the committee reports, it's also, sort of, remarks. And

then some people summarize debate, even sort of what's said in debate on motions. And I think a transcript is probably the better way to do that. If there were a standing rule of order from the committee—so, say someone were to, for example, move that there be edited transcripts as a standing rule of order, then you do have that authority you can go back to—but of course, that can always change if the group decides to change.

Chairperson Johnson So in the interest of time, why don't we do this? I mean, Tyler, for this month, do it how you're going to do it. Let's keep talking about it and thinking about it. And Anna, if you have, you know, something comes to you that think is, you know, an amazing idea, just talk to us. And if anybody else has particular opinions one way or the other about the minutes, email Tyler, but we'll just keep talking about it.

Pegler-Gordon I think Tyler gave us that amazing idea. Right? Next Steering Committee, we can put a standing rule of order on the agenda.

Chairperson Johnson Okay.

Abel I do want to raise one concern very briefly here about-- And I don't know that-- About the transcripts. Not saying that I'm not in favor of them. But the need maybe to institute some norms around Steering Committee. I had an issue in the spring where we had one of the rare instances where we sent something to the trash can, where a faculty member then identified me as the particular individual who sent that thing to the trash can and then told the faculty member whose idea was that I was the person who sent it to the trash can. Rather than it being a Steering Committee decision, it was my fault. And then was like, "Hey, you need to talk to this girl

because she's the one who sent your idea to the trash can." And it was incredibly uncomfortable. You know, I'm a big girl, I handled it. Whatever.

Abel, cont.

But I think we need to, if we're going to have transcripts-- And this was before transcripts. This is because someone was sitting in our meeting, saw discussion, and then decided, "Well, I'm going to go tell so-and-so that the grad student was a jerk, I guess, and shot down their idea." I don't know what was going through your head. But I think we need to do a little bit of norming around that. That it's not-- That when we take a vote, that's the decision of the committee. And it's not fair to single out one person just because maybe they got the conversation rolling that it's like their fault that your idea got thrown in the trash can. I'm concerned-- So, again, this is a bit of an amorphous norming concern that by putting transcripts out there, you could read a discussion and say, "Oh, well, so and so was the one who started the conversation that led to my thing not happening." And said the negative thing about, you know, this. Because this experience happened to me.

So I'm just wondering how can we create a culture where we have transparency, but we also don't have people being singled out? Because we want people-- Because then we're not going to be able to be open in these discussions. Right? Then people are going to feel like-- I'm going to feel like I've got to hold my tongue and I can't speak out against when I think a faculty member might have a bad idea, because I don't want then to be like, "Well, here's that uppity grad student again. You know, it's a tricky balance between us being able to speak freely and this idea of transparency.

Chairperson Johnson Yeah. No, I completely agree. And this feels like a bigger issue. Like, it feels like a bigger issue than today. So my

question is, do you want to discuss it next week or do you want a few people who have strong opinions to just sort of wrestle with it and come up with suggestions for us?

Abel I'm open to whatever. Again, I just put it out there. It's a problem to put a wrench in it all.

Chairperson Johnson So Tyler, can you work with Meagan and Anna and anyone else who wants to e-mail Tyler, but just to sort of figure out and come up with something to suggest for us? Can you just work with them? Thank you. Okay, great. All right. So let's look at the Faculty Senate agenda, the University Council tentative agenda, and are there any objections to any of this? Let me know. Okay. Then I would say that without objection--

Abel Wait, wait, wait.

Chairperson Johnson Go ahead, Meagan. Thank you. And thank you for speaking up about that issue. I completely agree that we shouldn't be targeting people, especially students. So, go ahead.

Abel Yeah, it was weird. It was really weird. But anyway, this DEI e-learning presentation. Can you speak to me briefly a little bit more about what that is? I'm wondering if it might be more helpful for University Council, because I'm wondering if grad students might want to hear about it, and non-faculty members or people who might also be there.

Chairperson Johnson So, Tyler, can you speak to that? I know they reached out to us. I know it was-- They said five minutes. They specifically requested Faculty Senate. But to be fair, I didn't look really closely at why. Do you remember,

Tyler, what it was and if it might make more sense for UC?

Silvestri So, I'm not-- I'm looking at the e-mail now. All I would share is exactly that, that they had specifically requested Faculty Senate. I wonder-- I know they're on a very quick timeline there. This has to do with, sort of, the modules for e-learning that the President has required. So they're on a very short timeline and want to get it done sooner rather than later. That might be part of it too. It's just that sent to Faculty Senate is earlier.

Chairperson Johnson "Office for Inclusion will be delivering the President's mandated DEI Foundation MSU e-learning for the campus this semester. Reaching out to you and the Senate as an important constituency to determine if we could provide a short presentation about what's coming and some brief discussion.

Abel So this sounds like the mandatory DEI training for every single faculty/staff person on campus that was part of the BSA's demands from the spring. Yeah. Okay.

Chairperson Johnson I think we could move it to UC.

Abel That seems like a UC thing. If it's everybody, you know?

Chairperson Johnson Tyler, do we need a motion to move it to UC or can we just put it on UC?

Silvestri If there's not an objection to move it to UC, then we can do it.

Chairperson Johnson Okay, without objection we're moving it to UC.

Silvestri I would add that Anna had her hand up.

Chairperson Johnson Oh, go ahead, Anna.

Pegler-Gordon Oh, I was just supporting what Meagan said, that I think that they met with faculty representatives, but also student representatives and staff representatives about this. So it should go to UC.

Chairperson Johnson Okay, great. Any other questions? Concerns about the agendas? Stephanie?

Anthony I think Tyler and I had a conversation about a resolution coming into the university for our Provost. And my understanding was that was going on. So I'm wondering if Tyler could update.

Silvestri That's item four. Oh, I'm sorry. The resolution to the Provost?

Anthony Yes. That resolution. That's something different than the amendment to the 2019 committee.

Silvestri So that appears in full in the minutes, which would be approved at this meeting. That appears in full because it was already passed at a prior Senate meeting. So that's located in the minutes for the meeting where that happened.

Anthony So we are talking about two separate statements. One a resolution and one a formal statement. I just want to make sure that we're on the same page.

Silvestri I think so. The resolution being the one that was directed to Woodruff with the several commitments?

Anthony To Dr. Woodruff, yes. Requesting that she do several things on behalf of underrepresented persons, marginalized communities or populations on campus. Just different things. It was very specific, and this was

voted on. But I don't know what happened with it. I've not seen it. And unless Dr. Woodruff has seen it.

Silvestri So, yes, that appears in full in the minutes from the meeting where it was passed.

Chairperson Johnson Was it emailed to her, Tyler?

Anthony There you go.

Silvestri Was it emailed to her? I have no idea.

Chairperson Johnson Okay. Can you just-- I mean, my guess is she's seen it. But can you just make sure that she's seen it? Just send it to her and say that it was passed. Sort of give her the background and just make sure she sees it.

Anthony Yes, thank you. And just for Dr. Woodruff, just for your benefit, it's a statement in support of those that I mentioned within in MSU's community.

Chairperson Johnson So, yeah, I think she left right at 5:00, but yes. Well, so, Tyler, if you could make sure and just copy the Steering Committee, just so we know it happened. Any other questions, concerns, suggestions about the agendas? Okay, without objection, then, these pass. Anything else before we get off?

Pegler-Gordon Can I just, if we're going to do the agendas this way, rather than kind of building them from the discussions as we've done in the past. Is it possible just to share them in advance so that we can review them?

Chairperson Johnson They were on the Steering Committee agenda that was sent out.

Pegler-Gordon I downloaded all the attachments and I didn't see them, but maybe--

Chairperson Johnson It was at the bottom. So, there's a Steering Committee agenda, and then they were like on the Steering Committee agenda, second page.

Pegler-Gordon I did not see that. Okay. Thank you.

Chairperson Johnson All right. So, thank you guys all for your time. Thank you in advance for all your participation this year. If you have ideas, suggestions, things you think of later, email me, email acadgov@msu.edu, or email whoever. But please be in touch, and just let us know. And for those of you to which Faculty Senate orientation applies, we look forward to seeing you, and we'll see the rest of you at UC.