Speaker 1:	Ask your kind attention as we have achieved quorum. I have a friendly amendment to the agenda. I wish to strike item 75 since that was discussed at length at faculty senate, and replace that with an info session with Mayor Mark Meadows, who, at some point, will come and he's going to speak about the East Lansing city income tax and potential impacts ... Or not potential anymore, the impacts on MSU faculty, staff, advisers, and students. If I have a motion to approve the agenda as amended.
Speaker 2:	Approved.
Speaker 1:	Second?
Speaker 3:	Second.
Speaker 1:	All in favor, please say aye.
Quorum:	Aye.
Speaker 1:	Any opposed? The motion carries. The agenda is amended with a new 75 for Mayor Mark Meadows if and when he comes. We ask for a motion for approval of the draft minutes for the April 24th meeting of university council. Do I have a motion?
Speaker 5:	[inaudible].
Speaker 1:	A second?
Male:	Second.
Speaker 1:	Approval of the draft minutes for April 24th, 2017 meeting of university council. Please say aye if you approve.
Quorum:	Aye.
Speaker 1:	Any opposed? Motion carries. We still await Interim President Engler, so we'll move on to the provost remarks.
Speaker 7:	Thanks. Welcome to the first university council meeting of the year. I appreciate everyone's attendance and participation. I don't have a lot of remarks. I did want to just bring one thing to the attention of the body, and this is in response to an ASMSU action in spring of last year.
	At that time, ASMSU passed a resolution indicating that they would like to see the creation of a new role on campus, a dean of students, who would manage some of the conduct processes for both the disciplinary processes as well as those related to academic integrity, so that those responsibilities would be joined and be overseen by a third party. There's also third parties involved, but the responsibility would be subsumed under a new role, dean of students.

To that end, a job description is being developed. Dr. Maybank and I have looked at one draft. We're not there yet. There is not a firm job description. But the clear plan is to try to get that with additional conversation to get that created, developed so that the office of the dean of students could begin to be formed, since it involves integrating processes in two different offices now, and setting that off as having someone oversee that perhaps initially as an interim and then post that role as an ongoing position.

But I wanted the body to know that that action was being taken, that response was being made to, I think, what most people saw as a very productive recommendation by ASMSU. Thinking about how to better serve the campus better serve our student body through the organization of that office.

Speaker 1: Do we have any questions from university council for the provost? Okay, we'll move on to my remarks, which are basically to welcome everyone to a new academic year of university council. It's my honor to serve as chair. I want to make myself available by email, phone, whatever, to meet with people on an individual basis, if they would like to, to help facilitate things moving forward in university council.

We're entering a time where shared governance matters more than ever before. There may have been times in the past where university council was a time to check your email, do some recommendation letters, poke at some research writing, sip some coffee, and just go with the motions. But we're at a juncture in the university where our concern for it has to come to the fore, whether our roles as deans, faculty members, or students, staff, advisers. We all need to pull together and make governance matter more here.

I think the university power structures are ripe to have more input from various stakeholders. It's a matter of us to seize that moment. I don't want to belabor that too much, but I want us to all engage as much as possible. I'm going to demonstrate how to engage better. I look forward to working with everyone, especially in this transition year, as we seek a new president for the university, someone who's going to lead us out of the darknesses that transpired while never forgetting about those same darknesses, too. I think we'll just move on. We have an item of new business from UCAG. It says chairperson to be announced. But is that Dr. [Tickner]?

Male: It is, but she's not here. Her representative is Tyler.

Speaker 1: Okay. We have a representative from UCAG that's going to present an action item about academic specialists and FRIB personnel as voting members of faculty senate, university council.

Tyler Silvestri: Good afternoon, everyone. My name's Tyler Silvestri. I'm a law student here and I'm the Vice-Chair of UCAG, stepping in for Dr. Tickner today. Really, a presentation is a generous word to describe what I'm about to do. Essentially what's going on is

that members of the FRIB and academic specialists do have representation on faculty senate. They have seats. They have indeed selected representatives for those seats. The problem is that nowhere in our bylaws is there a specified way for them to select those.

We want a specified way to do that. We think that the best constituencies for developing those mechanisms are the units themselves. At our last meeting, UCAG asked ... We passed a motion to request that FRIB and academic specialists provide their own mechanisms, develop some sort of bylaws language for how they'll select their representatives. That's essentially the motion on the floor. Gary, am I missing anything?

Gary: You've got it exactly. You may want to request a motion for approval to an action item.

Tyler Silvestri: Sure. This time I'd request a motion to that effect, asking FRIB and academic specialists to develop their own bylaws language for selecting their representatives.

Quorum: Second.

Speaker 1:   All in favor, please say aye.

Quorum: Aye.

Speaker 1:   Any opposed? Motion carries. Thank you, Tyler.

Tyler Silvestri: Thanks, everyone.

Speaker 1:   Next up, we have Professor Marci Mechtel from University Curriculum Committee presenting an information item.

Marci Mechtel: Good afternoon. As presented to faculty senate last week, this comes from the end of the last academic year, the approval from UCC for programs. There are three new programs highlighted by, again, as we're trying to work on student success and transition for those that want to continue on to graduate school, there's now an accounting BA-MS linked program effective fall 2018, for a construction management, a BS-MS linked effective summer 2018, and a new teaching and nursing graduate certificate program effective fall '18. We have an additional 31 program changes and six course deletions.

                   For courses themselves, we processed 119 new courses. This includes, as we heard last year, the Math 103 A and B to help again with student success. Those are approved and effective for fall '18. 70 course changes and 31 course deletions. For the discontinuation programs, primarily there are Agriculture Technology Certificate Programs, and they are effective for summer '18: Applied Plant Science, Beef Cattle Management and Grounds Management and Swine Management. Then effective summer 2019 is Landscape and Lawn Management. Then, finally,

Computational Chemistry, a bachelor of science, it is going to be effective spring 2021. Any questions? There's links to both the short and the long report in the agenda.

Speaker 1:   We'll move on. Last week, MSU Associate Vice-President for Technology Services and Chief Information Officer Rob McCurdy came and presented to faculty senate and fielded questions about the IT centralization process. We wanted to come back and get input from a lot of the deans and directors and students who are not in attendance at faculty senate. We have Rob McCurdy here to talk a little bit about the IT transformation taking place, some rationale. Then we'll open the floor to questions, and especially ... I mean faculty senators here had had a chance, but you can come up again and ask him questions. But we really want to hear from deans and students, directors, et cetera, here today.

Rob McCurdy: All right. [inaudible].

Male: [inaudible].

Rob McCurdy: Here it is. Good? Thank you again for having me. Again, I know you have a full agenda, and I wouldn't imagine to be able to answer all of your questions here. A number of you reached out to me after the faculty senate last week. Thank you for that. We've set up meetings. Again, same thing here. If I can't get to all your questions, just shoot me an email. That's why I have that up as the first slide. I realize it says September 11th, because I want to use the same presentation we used last week. But CIO@MSU.edu is an easy way to get a hold of me, easy email address to remember.

               As with last week, I'm not going to read this to you. I really want to give it to open floor, especially since the majority have seen this. Those of you that weren't in the faculty senate last week, I've even spoken with most you at this point as well. But, again, our mission, vision, we're here to enable the university with effective IT. That's what we charge after. Again, between the presentation last week, a number of you reached out to me with exciting new ideas on how we can do that. Please keep them coming. That's what we're here for.

               The MSU organizational alignment principles, we really want to enable students through innovation. At the end of the day, we're here for research, education, and outreach. We're always looking for better ways to do that. My personal opinion is, overall, as a university, IT has not been as good of a partner as we can be with the university in enabling them. We can always do better.

               I think we have a strong opportunity here, and I really value the partnership that we have with some of the students in this room today through ASMSU specifically. We've done really cool things that help enable the students.

               I'm really excited about what we can do with research as we continue to move forward. I think we can do a much better job enabling our researchers, and

education is a no-brainer. We're constantly trying to do more there, whether it'd be with the Student Success side or the Hub. We're always looking for ways that we can enable all of our faculty. The onboarding activities, again, most of you are aware of this. Again, apologies for going quick, but happy to meet with anybody one-on-one or your unit.

We went through hundreds of hours of meetings. I haven't calculated exactly what it was, but hundreds of hours of meetings with different departments. What these consist of is we first start at the VP or dean level and then chairs and then other people that are looped in, to really understand what the IT is currently operating in that unit and then also understand where their needs are or where they might be in the future, to work with them to try and design what that future state IT organization could be, not that we'll be there tomorrow but that we have an idea of what they need so that we can start working towards that.

As we continue to evolve with some units, we met with every individual IT person in other units. We already worked really closely with them, so that wasn't necessarily required for the individual meetings. But with many of whom, we met with each individual IT person to understand the roles. Then we progressed through that, came back to the units with proposal, worked through that.

Once the dean, VP agreed, the dean or VP communicated to their team and then we communicated about three days later, and then started walking them. We have a full onboarding process the kicks off after that. There is the people alignment, which is really what has been happening over this past summer.

Then we really have the process and technology alignment as well. We have to look at all the different processes we have around campus. One example that you probably are burdened by on a regular basis is our onboarding processes. When we have somebody come on to MSU or you switched apartments, you need to access for things, and how you get IT access is different in every department and then you also have your central access. We're really looking to get a better understanding of all the processes that are out there so that we can better align them and just make things easier so people can do work, remove some of the hurdles.

Technology, I'm not telling you anything you don't know, but we have a very large technical debt. We have a lot of legacy systems, and we're trying to gain an inventory of where all those exist so that we can go forward strategically. Instead of solving it in one department one way and in another department another way, we consider if we can solve at once together. That's not always going to be the case, but at least we thought through it and made that decision.

Another question that came up from the faculty senate is how do we make sure that we're actually delivering on what we said? I'm going to need your help with that. Right now we already do monthly metrics reports at the university layer, so it's the whole university rolled up. These are examples slides. These aren't real slides, but you can show the green and the red dots and the percentage. We have

key performance indicators that we try and meet.

What we're doing now at each MAU level is customizing them for those as well. Obviously, some of your units ... Although EBS is important to all of you, some of you may not want to measure that on a monthly basis and you may want to measure your electronic medical record system instead. That would be on there instead.

Customer response time is a big one that we always have to work on and we have to measure. We want to measure that at the university level, but I also want to be touching base at the MAU level as well. I could be 90% in compliance at the university layer, but with your unit, I could only be 40% in compliance. Then we need to drill into why. If we're measuring, it enables us to start to dig into why and then solve the problem together.

One thing I want to address here, which, again, faculty senate heard this before, but our method or our approach is not to move people from their local buildings. The overwhelming majority of people sitting in buildings are sitting there for a reason. That's where they need to sit to do their job. Many of the faculty, the staff, the researchers rely on them to be down the hall to quickly solve something, especially if it's in your classroom or whatever the case may be.

We don't want to break that. We're trying to do the exact opposite. We want you to have all those same connections that you had yesterday and we want to enable you to have more connections tomorrow as well.

But we're not going to break that. We're not doing anything such as all of a sudden you have to contact the Service Status to get help. You can always contact Service Status to get help, but you can also contact the person you've been contacting for the last 10 years and have them sit down the hall. We're not removing that. We're not breaking that relationship. All we want to do is enhance the relationships and the communication or the ways you can get IT help.

One example, that is the tech bar. If you haven't seen these or heard of them, we have a couple locations: one's in the Computer Center, one's in IPF, and one's in CVM. Then we have pop-up tech bars as well. If you've ever been to an Apple store, that's where we copied the idea off of the Genius Bar, and a number ... Well, I know of at least three other large institutions that do this, like USC, Ohio State, and somebody on the east coast I can't remember right now. But we've had a lot of success with these.

Again, the general idea is that some people like calling, some people like emailing, other people like just walking over and seeing somebody. That's what these are meant for. Since our campus is a large campus, and many of you have to travel all over, we want you to be able to get help and good help no matter where you are on campus. If you happen to be over near the Computer Center, you can walk in there and have somebody there help you right away. If you're in your building,

keep going to the person that you like going to as well.

Then these pop-up bars, these pop-up tech bars, are meant for if we have a major implementation that impacts a number of your department or your building, we will stand up a pop-up tech bar there for a week or two weeks or three weeks. That way you can run down the hall and get help. Maybe it's not necessary to do long term, but short term that's our goal.

Our location strategy, again, just to show the point, this was in May. We are already in over a dozen buildings. As we've gone through this integration, it's even more ... I just want to overemphasize the fact that we're not trying to move everybody into the Computer Center. One, we don't have the space anyway, but, two, we'd start breaking those connections that you rely on in order to do your job.

Then relevant quick updates, if you'll entertain me again. These are some of the things, at the university council specifically, some of you have asked me for. It's been a couple of months now, but I want to give you the updates. The first is Eduroam is live. This presentation will be available so you don't have to write down links or anything.

But Eduroam is live. What that means is when you're traveling to another university, you can sign on to their wireless using Eduroam. Also, when other faculty are traveling here, faculty research staff, anybody with a university ID, when they're traveling here, they can log on. That's a huge benefit to those traveling and works in Europe, all institutions that have signed on to it.

Also, the MSU mobile app is live, which was a huge collaboration with ASMSU. It was actually developed by computer science engineer senior students in the capstone course and then our internal team, which I think was actually made up of all MSU CSE graduates as well. But our internal team took that live based on the majority of the ASMSU requirements.

We're constantly coming out with updates. If you haven't downloaded that, I recommend it. But there's going to be some really good updates that are coming there in the next month or two such as publishing more resources there. Some of our mental health resources are going to be linked through there just so it's more visible, people have access to it faster.

You've also heard about the res halls all have wifi. That, again, is huge from an education standpoint. The learning doesn't stop at the classroom doors, tag line. But it's really important for our students to be able to have access, especially more and more devices. You can't plug in even if you wanted to.

Amazon web services is really big for researchers. We have a university-wide contract. You can easily use Amazon web services to host a virtual server up there. It already has the HIPAA and other protections built in. Then on top of that, we just got a 20-gigabit connection. A little technical, but the short of it is those

researchers that have large datasets, they now don't have to go all the way across the internet and around when they're transferring data there. It's as if we're directly connected to Amazon because we are now with the 20-gig connection. That's big.

Service Status is live. If you haven't been there before, you can sign up for an alert via SMS or via email for any status of any service that we currently monitor. An obvious one is D2L. If you rely heavily on D2L and you want to be notified as soon as there's an issue, this can send you the alerts there. You can sign up for them. Or you can just go out and check it anytime you want.

Then our CRM, constituent relationship management, I want to mention that here because it's something that you will all benefit from. We sent a lot of communications out. We engaged our community in a lot of different ways. This will help us tile those together and make sure that we're reaching out to our community in a more intelligent way and we have more options to us.

Lastly, an enhanced VPN coming soon. That's another big one for our traveling faculty and researchers when they're in countries that they don't want to be policed or so that the countries can't see what they're looking at. They'll be able to VPN into MSU, and all the traffic will route through there. That's another big one you guys have been asking me for. I just wanted to give you that update. That's coming this semester. Then I really just want to open for questions as well as more links for you, but they'll be in the presentation.

Speaker 1:   If we have any questions, just feel free to come up to one of the mics on either side and introduce yourself and ask your questions.

Rob McCurdy: We had a lot of questions last time, and all the deans I've spoken with mostly.

Lisa Lapidus: Hi, Lisa Lapidus, Physics and Astronomy. I'd like to give you two examples that I think demonstrate how IT gets in the way of research and teaching. The first one is the two-factor authentication on D2L, which sometimes I have to do multiple times in one day, including almost every time I walk into my classroom. I'm trying to get my lecture started, I'm trying to get started and then I have to go type in this number in front of all the students. There is absolutely no reason for that. I realize that we need the privacy for grades, but there has to be some way that this is not so intrusive.

Number two, you rolled out an antivirus, Symantec, which was then installed. Then it completely disabled our local Windows file sharing, which was essential for moving data around between computers that collected the data and computers that analyzed the data. It was also used for backing up locally. It just doesn't work. We asked you to turn it off, and you didn't. Go ahead.

Rob McCurdy: Sure. Thank you, first. I'd like to reach to you after this as well, if you're open to it, to dive into the second one, make sure that that's-

Lisa Lapidus:	We already told you about this.
Rob McCurdy:	... resolved. Me specifically, though, I want to ... But, anyway, the first is the two-factor authentication. It's a good example where I think we need to figure out how we work better together and collaborate on solutions. The two-factor, it is there for a very good purpose, but at the same time I do understand specifically for D2L. I do understand how that can cause impacts, especially if you're in a classroom, you need to log in quickly, whatever the case may be. You didn't sign up yet or whatever the case may be. You can't get in.
	If you're not familiar with that, the reason that that's there, the reason that's in place is because there's been a large uptick in grade changing and grade stealing. There was one famous institution two years ago, or one famous case of it two years ago, where thousands of grades were changed. What's happening is people are installing keyloggers on the workstations or the kiosks in the classrooms and when a faculty member or somebody that has the ability to change grades logs in, they get the username and password and then go and change grades within the system.
	In talking with our peers, our other CIOs, our Big 10 institutions, we're all struggling with the same problem where we balance usability and security. One alternative is to completely lock the system down so you can't touch it physically. Well, of course, that impacts teaching as well. If you can't plug in any USB drives or anything, that can impact the way some people teach.
	The solution most institutions are going with is the two-factor solution to help protect that. Now how we make that more usable, I'm always open to. We are working on some advancements there so you don't have to type in the code. You get a pop-up on your phone and you just click 'Okay'. We're always looking for ways to improve it, but it's that constant balance between usability and security, and it really is difficult to find that right balance. Yeah, it is. But I'm happy to-
Lisa Lapidus:	[inaudible] multiple times in a day every time I [inaudible].
Rob McCurdy:	It can't tell that you're the same person. It depends on if ... Are we talking about if you're signing in from different computers?
Lisa Lapidus:	This laptop goes between my office and my ... Yes, I know. [inaudible].
Male:	Yeah.
Lisa Lapidus:	That laptop sitting on my desk, that laptop goes between my office, my house, and my classroom. Every time I change a network, I have to type in that stupid number. I somehow think there's got to be a way that I type it in once a day and I don't have to keep telling it that I'm the same person.
Rob McCurdy:	There is. There's a couple of different ways you can do this. With the current

system we have, which we are working on replacing our single sign on solution, right now it's limited based on IPs. When you're jumping around buildings, your network IP is changing, so that's why.

Lisa Lapidus: The whole point is we're supposed to be able to walk around and be connected on campus.

Rob McCurdy: I fully agree with you. The solution we're looking at would allow us to tie it to basically your browser session, so similar to what Google does today as an example. You could be good for a day from that same machine.

Lisa Lapidus: When?

Rob McCurdy: We're working on those. It's not procured yet.

Lisa Lapidus: Okay.

Rob McCurdy: We have massive amounts of legacy systems that we have to replace. I can't change them all overnight. Oh, and then your second question, the file share question. Yes, Symantec Endpoint Protection or our endpoint security solution, that is a solution that we've been working on deploying all around campus, all around the university. We block anywhere from 1,000 to 10,000 viruses a month with that solution. But, again, it's balancing that usability versus security.

                  With every single department ... Well, pretty much. That may be a bit of an exaggeration. But almost every single department having their own IT environment with their own Windows file shares, with their own standards, it's hard to tell what it's going to impact when we deploy it. When we deploy it, we work with that department to try and identify the impacts. But, unfortunately, there are cases where we cause issues. We try and jump on it as quickly as possible.

                  But we do have to run endpoint security. We have regular attacks that otherwise would get through, and then that same file share would be fully encrypted with ransomware and you wouldn't be able to access it. It's that balance that we're trying to strike, but you shouldn't be dealing with an issue where you have an outage. That we need to fix. Thank you. If you don't mind, I'll reach out to you.

Lisa Lapidus: Okay.

Speaker 1:   Any other questions for Mr. McCurdy? I have one. We have a lot of ... Oops! We have a lot of chairs and deans here that spend a lot of time working with incoming scholars, incoming faculty members to develop startup packages. If we could have a website that is open, that lists all of the site license software that we have for the university. That way an incoming faculty member can see that and say, "Oh, I have it already. I don't need to have that $15,000 line item to have my research group have access to X, Y, or Z." If we could have that ASAP as we recruit new faculty members, potentially there's a lot of cost-savings that departments aren't buying

software or ever done a copy of a software that we have a university-wide site license do.

Rob McCurdy: Yes. Dr. [Haduca], thank you. You mentioned similar last week. I actually have a draft available already, but I'd love to work with you or others on a one-pager that we could have available, both with the software and other things. The data center comes in handy as well, so from grant requirements, it can meet a lot of the grant requirements. We have a paragraph that shows researchers coming in, what it can meet. That's been beneficial in the past with other researchers we've tried to help recruit. But, yeah, thank you.

Speaker 1: There might be vast cost-savings right under our nose.

Rob McCurdy: Yeah.

Speaker 1: Yeah, yeah. Come on up.

Dan Gould: Dan Gould, Education. I can't remember the exact time frame, but I think it was three or four years ago when we had the data breach with social security numbers. I know I've had a false income tax filed and disability, social security. I can never now use social security online. I always have to go to the office. Do we know how widespread that was? I went and reported to the university detectives. If we had any other attempts at breach ... And it counters why we have two-factor solution and other kind of things. Do we feel pretty confident that that personal data ... I mean so much got out. It's maybe an update or report on that, please.

Rob McCurdy: Yeah, absolutely. Thank you. With the tax fraud, those are up ... I think the latest number nationwide is about 4% to 6% of people experience tax fraud. Those are up nationwide. When we look at our numbers, they're not out of norm with other institutions in the State of Michigan or even in the Big 10. We haven't seen Michigan State be targeted specifically.

At this point, I don't believe that it is in relation to the data breach we had. I can never prove that, it's proving a negative, but the reason I believe that, and we've been working with the FBI and with the local and state, every single tax fraud that is filed for every single person at MSU, we work with the FBI and the IRS and local and state.

But we don't have all the pieces of information that require a tax fraud, like driver's license number on those other pieces. One, those weren't involved in the breach and, in many cases, we don't have a lot of these other pieces that were filed. In some cases, they filed a dual tax return that included a spouse and their salary and their workplace, which we wouldn't have. Now it's not to say that they didn't leverage some of the data they got from us and combined it with another breach, because you've all seen all the many breaches that have happened, including one of the credit bureaus, which has all of that information.

Now what we do see is, yes, on a regular basis, we are getting attacked. The one that did cause our breach was fairly sophisticated. They leveraged an unknown vulnerability. It's not like somebody was missing a patch and then they were able to do privilege escalation and a few other things start to get the data out. They did only get 447 records, but we notified all 400,000 because, again, I can't prove a negative. The university wanted to make sure that they offer the protection to everybody. But that's another reason why I don't believe it's related to the tax fraud.

But we're constantly increasing our defenses there and we have been working with the IRS. If you'd notice, the IRS has improved some things as well. They have their version of a token that you get. They do a couple other checks that they didn't do before. Some of the things the attackers were doing were doubling your salary and then getting a better return. Well, now the IRS has a check like, "Huh. That looks weird. Your salary doubled in a year or tripled in a year." They're doing more and more.

But the hard part is this aligned with when they started giving returns via Amazon gift cards and other ways. When they used to mail you a postal check, tax fraud was basically zero because they'd have to do postal fraud as well and physically steal your check. Once they started doing that, the attackers focused on it, and it's just far too easy to execute. We've been trying to step up our communications campaign around that as well, to file your taxes early, to check, to check. We're hoping the IRS does more and more of their red flags to identify when tax fraud is being committed. But we're always looking to step it up.

One thing through the integration, I mean I hate to say it, but just yesterday I found another repository of thousands of social security numbers that don't need to exist there, but somebody had copied them years ago. Every place we have, it exists all around campus, and some of these have varying levels of security. It's easier for people to break into. We're trying to eliminate that everywhere we find it. Thus far, every place we've eliminated it, it didn't have any business impact, which means it didn't truly need to be there.

Speaker 1:   I have a question. Today I received an email from an organization in Florida that said it was going to manage our open enrollments. It looked legit, it looked like it was from Michigan State, but I've been conditioned to not open those. Is there a way where we ... Say we're going to get one of these third party communications for legitimate interests, that there could be a blast email saying, "Hey, this is coming. You can trust this"? Because if you legitimately need me to go in through that link on that email to change benefit information, fine, but I would like to know in advance that this is legit and this is coming.

Rob McCurdy: Yeah. It is such a difficult balance here specifically. It goes back to usability and security, balancing security here. I'll tell you how corporations are solving this. Not that that's relevant here, but it's so much easier. What they're doing right now, the latest advancement there, is every email that comes in from an external person,

they tag it in the headline external so that you're on high awareness, or actually they modify the message body. Before you even start reading, "Hello," it says, "This is an external message. Proceed with caution."

That just wouldn't work here because how many of our messages are external? I mean so many. That's what we do is collaborate with all these other institutions. All people would be doing is getting all these external alerts and it would quickly not even raise them to alert. We're always looking at ways we can improve that.

Speaker 1:   Was that a legit email we got today, or was that-

Rob McCurdy: No. Not too my knowledge, no.

Speaker 1:   Okay. See?

Rob McCurdy: Yeah.

Speaker 1:   Maybe if there is, we could have blasts about, "Don't open this." Did anyone else receive that email today?

Michelle: Yeah.

Speaker 1:   Okay.

Rob McCurdy: We do-

Michelle: I don't know how they work. [inaudible].

Speaker 1:   Well, I'm going to log in and get your SSN, Michelle.

Rob McCurdy: You can always forward to abuse@msu.edu. That's the standard at any organization. You can basically forward things to Abuse. We took that as well. You can forward it to abuse@msu.edu, and we'll investigate it. If you have anything concerning, you can always reach out to me as well at cio@msu.edu. Then our team looks into it.

                  I will say depending on the email, if it came from an external source, we also try and scan the links to see if they're malicious as well. If you were to click on that link, it may actually block you at this point after enough of them go through, just like Google or whoever else. The system learns that it's malicious and then tries to prevent anybody from giving up their username and password.

                  But if you ever click on them, don't worry about telling us. There's no repercussions. We just want to help you and protect your account. If you click on them, just let us know. Then we'll work with you. No report gets generated, nothing like that. We really just want to protect your account and your data.

Speaker 1:   So Rachel. Bob, you had a question also?

Rachel Croson: I'm Rachel Croson. I'm the Dean of the College of Social Science. I want to follow up on Rob's question about hiring new faculty. I understand the benefits of having, for example, a standardized laptop or desktop package that you can offer to faculty. You can buy it in bulk and the parts are interchangeable and it's easy enough to repair.

                  But as we know, faculty have unique research needs, and often those standard packages are not going to work for a particular faculty's research. Do you have a process in place by which we request an exception? Who does that request? What are the conditions under which it's accepted? Tell me a little about your plans along those lines.

Rob McCurdy: Sure. Thank you. We are working where we can standardize because there's great cost-savings in that. For example, without any standardization right now, the large majority of laptops and workstations on campus are already Dell. But for the most part, we're buying them individually. If we just created a university-wide contract, everybody would have the same machines, but they'd be at a lower cost.

                  We're looking at doing that and also different tiers, so silver, gold, platinum, or however you want to term them, as the standards. If you look at the data, the majority of people are using those standards, but we have all those other people that aren't. We don't want to be so rigid that we can't support the other needs, but we also want to be ... If somebody comes aboard and they just need the silver, gold, or platinum, they can just order it and go. It's already in stock and it's ready to go. Whereas if they need the exception, they can do that, but it probably won't be as cheap. Then also it could incur an extra week to deliver, something along those lines.

                  We want to offer those standards for the majority that use those, but we don't want to be so rigid that we can't adapt, because, again, a corporation is completely different, but it's so easy there because you can do that because everybody's use cases follows. But even within a college, let alone from college to college, the compute needs are so vastly different.

Rachel Croson: Who's making that decision and how do they ...

Rob McCurdy: We're working on the proposal right now. We're doing the research to see all the different tiers of Dells we have right now and then, within the department, the exceptions that would come from the department when they're ordering. Just your standard ordering process, just eventually what we want to have is you can just click silver, gold, or platinum and get that and know what that is, but if you need a different one, there's still that process like you would today.

Deborah M.:   Deborah Moriarty, College of Music. When something like the VPN comes online or the sitemap things to telling people what's out there, how will you let us know

that?

Rob McCurdy: Good question. I'm always looking for ways to better communicate. I'm open to ideas. I would be very open to coming back here occasionally as a regular item, but I know that you have many other agenda items. If that works for you, I do send out ... The weekly emails I was sending about the integration, we're shifting to monthly now. Long term, maybe it makes sense to still do a quarterly IT update newsletter. But we're trying to figure out what that engagement path is because I know if I just constantly send emails, it becomes noise, and then nobody listens or reads them either.

Deborah M.: Oh, so if it's in a newsletter and it's something significant like the VPN, I think people would not want to probably not read the entire newsletter and get to what would be relevant to them.

Rob McCurdy: Yeah. Part of what we're doing as well when we're integrating units is we have a relationship management that we're establishing. We're trying to set up, for those that will accept us, regular recurring meetings, at least quarterly, but in some cases monthly. We'd be giving those updates individually. We'd push those out so every unit would get that. But, of course, I can't meet with all of the faculty from a unit as well, so we know there's still that gap there. I'm always looking for ideas how to fill that effectively because I know just shooting out emails isn't great.

Deborah M.: I mean maybe something like just putting it on the agenda for university council as a short item, that information, I mean just to say this is online, so that we can then let our constituency know.

Rob McCurdy: Yeah, I can do that.

Deborah M.: Thank you.

Rob McCurdy: Thank you.

Speaker 1: Any other questions for Mr. McCurdy? All right, thank you.

Rob McCurdy: Thank you.

Speaker 1: Next on the agenda, we have a presidential search committee update, and it's from three distinct individuals: Mary Finn, who's the Director of Criminal Justice. She is the faculty senate representative the presidential search committee. We have graciously attending Trustees Melanie Foster and Dianne Byrum with us. If you all come on up and come up to the front. I guess Gary will move off so you have three mics here. They can fill us in on the status of the presidential search process.

Male: Yeah, so Mary.

Speaker 1: Oops! Sorry. We'll have Mary Finn deliver ... She spoke last week, but there may

have been new stuff. Also, there are new people here as well.

Mary Finn: Good afternoon. As I was introduced as the faculty representative to the search committee, I just want to start by saying that I was very honored to be selected for that role. I was one of six faculty that were nominated, elected by the faculty here on campus. I think each of those individuals was equally qualified and committed to this institution. In my role as representing the faculty as a whole, I also want to make certain that my actions pay honor to those five other individuals that were also nominated, but did not get the opportunity to serve.

My report basically is a bit to describe how I ended up on the search committee, that process, because I think there's a little lack of clarity about how that happened. I did receive a call from Trustee [Bynum] asking if I would serve and also told that there was going to be a press conference within a few days that would announce the entire search committee, which actually consists of 19 individuals. That press conference was held in August 22nd, and there's a broad cross-section of representatives across the university on that committee.

We had a meeting of the search committee first week of September. At that meeting, there was, I would say, the values moving forward that are critical to any search. One has to do with the importance of confidentiality of individuals who are applying or being nominated for the position, as well as bringing up and continuing to hold in the forefront of our minds the importance of inclusivity, diversity in the approach that we take to both recruiting and identifying qualified candidates as well as we move forward to review those individuals.

We had a training, or presentation I would say, from the Office of Diversity and Cultural Initiatives. In addition, we had training session from the Relationship Violence and Sexual Misconduct Workgroup, who is a group of experts on campus who have been impaneled by the president to help address the ... I guess in some ways to help heal the community as we have members among us who have experienced relationship violence and sexual misconduct on campus.

They came in with their expertise and, I guess, in cooperation with the administration, has laid out a network of support for those individuals. We had an excellent training session from them to keep in mind the importance of compassion for the survivors of sexual abuse and, again, to make sure that we keep that in mind as we are moving forward through the search, that they are forever in our thoughts.

Each member of the presidential search committee was requested and required to sign an agreement of confidentiality and, again, the importance of this to maintain confidentiality of the candidates. That copy of that statement is available on the presidential search website, as well as a number of other bits of information about the steps that have been taken thus far and the steps that we're planning to take into the future.

One of the key aspects and contributions of this and expectations of the search committee is that we attend input sessions that are being held throughout the campus. That gives the opportunity for different colleges and different constituencies to provide input to us as members of the search committee around three key questions. Those questions have been posted on the website. They have been shared with the individuals who have been helping the co-chairs coordinate the input sessions. We actually held our first one last night.

I think at this point I'll probably turn it over to the co-chairs who joined me today. They can provide you with additional information that they may have.

Melanie Foster: Hi. Melanie Foster, member of the board of trustees and co-chair of the search, with my colleague Dianne Byrum. There are four trustees that are on the search committee. It was basically volunteer basis for the four that raised their hands to be on the committee, so to speak. The chairman of the board, Brian Breslin, as Dianne and I just serve as co-chairs, we both are in our second term here at Michigan State University. We're both College of Agriculture and Natural Resources alumni. I'm a Republican and Dianne a Democrat, as we are elected on a partisan ballot, so we feel that we're bringing balance to this.

In selecting and asking the 19 members to serve on the committee, we wanted a very diverse representation of Michigan State University. We have three alumni that are on the committee. We have several colleges represented. I might miss one, but we have Comm Arts, ANR, FRIB, Engineering, Broad College of Business, Social Science, James Madison College, and College of Human Medicine. We really worked very hard to make that as broad as we could with the number of members we selected.

We have three alumni that are on the search committee, one being a woman named Linda Hubbard, who is the President of Carhartt of Michigan. She's also very active in the alumni group at the Broad College of Business. We have Mark Murray, who is the former president of Grand Valley State University and currently on the board of the Meijer Company, who is also an alumni of Michigan State and actually worked one year here as the treasurer of Michigan State University. He has a very diverse background, which is very significant in higher education.

We have David Porteous, who is a trustee emeriti of Michigan State University. He also continues to serve on the College of Law Board here at Michigan State. We have a staff representative in Deb Bittner. We have two deans and I think-

Dianne Byrum: Right. Undergraduate and a graduate student.

Melanie Foster: Right. Undergraduate and a graduate student. The graduate student was chosen much in the same process as the faculty senate representative in that we received five or six names and interviewed and selected that individual. The listening sessions, we're very excited to continue with that input.

We have scheduled approximately 20 listening sessions, which is probably somewhat unprecedented in presidential searches. The typical number is probably four to six. But we feel at this time in Michigan State's history it's very, very important that people want to be heard, that we want to listen, and they're called presidential search input sessions, not listening sessions. But we want to hear from many constituencies. Some of those will be ...

Dianne Byrum: Closed.

Melanie Foster: Yeah, some will be closed, some will be by invitation only, some we're not even invited to. Terry Sullivan, who is the former president of the University of Virginia and also a James Madison graduate of Michigan State University, will be hosting several of the input sessions that are directed to specific audiences.

Some are community-based. I actually held a small one last week, which was with the MSU Foundation Board. Some are very small with groups like that and some will be for the entire community. They'll be very broad in scope. We have interviewed consulting firms, and we do plan to announce a national consulting firm before the end of this month that will be involved in the search process with us.

Dianne Byrum: I think that covers that. We did have our first input session last night. It was with the student athletes. I found it very refreshing. It was very constructive. We had a good dialogue for a little over an hour, and lots of input, lots of comments. You saw some common themes. It was very refreshing. It was a very positive experience.

I'm looking forward to tonight. It's our first college-based. We really turned it over to the deans when it comes to organizing the colleges and their input sessions. Tonight is going to be Education and Communication Arts. We're off. We're off to a great start.

One thing I want to expand on a little bit is the RVSM training. This lasted about two hours, and it was extremely helpful. It exposed the committee and myself particularly to a sensitivity to the survivors that we had not had that kind of training before. We've incorporated a lot of their input into how we structured the input sessions, including they helped us with the script. The script that we are using tonight and that we used last night is something that they developed for us.

We're also having safe places at these input sessions. If someone is triggered and they would like to talk to a counselor, we have trained counselors on site. We're being very sensitive to people and we want input. You can also go to the presidential website. There is an input forum there. Anyone can fill out. It's all anonymous. We really want the input. The input we get from those three questions will help us develop the position description for the president. It will also be used as part of our evaluation of the applications.

Melanie Foster: If you add a comment on the website, it is anonymous, but we are asking what

	college you're in and if you're an undergraduate student, graduate student, faculty, postdocs.
Dianne Byrum:	Postdoc or adviser. That came out of the faculty senate in the meeting last week.
Melanie Foster:	Right. Just so we have an idea of who's seeing what, but we do want it to be anonymous. Also, during describing, it's all anonymous, too.
Speaker 1:	Do we have any questions from the floor for either Dr. Finn or Trustee Byrum or Trustee Foster?
Male:	[inaudible].
Speaker 1:	I think you got beaten.
Male:	[crosstalk].
Speaker 1:	Yeah. Just please identify yourself.
Katherine R.:	[inaudible]. Hi, everyone. Katherine Rifiotis, ASMSU President. This is tall. Just wanted to let most of you know I'm also part of the presidential search committee. But most importantly, I've been working with the deans of the colleges to have just student forums that's by students for students with students, of course, with the logistical help of the deans. The ASMSU representatives of the respective colleges are also going to be there.
	It's a little bit broader than just to help me be the best undergraduate representative that I can be, but it's also to help us create a platform of advocacy for the coming years and for once the new president is here, for him to have an idea or her have an idea of what we are expecting and we're fighting for. I just wanted to put that on your guys' radar. Thank you.
Roberto Folley:	My name is Roberto [Folley], Engineering. I brought up the question last time that I saw the set up of the committee as representing a significant conflict of interest, because the board of trustees have the constitutional right to pick the president. But I was shocked that half of the board of trustees are also in the search committee.
	I brought it up last time, and maybe I misunderstood you, Trustee Byrum, but I thought what you said was essentially that it was your fiduciary duty to serve on a committee. I went back and I looked at your bylaws, and there's no place in the bylaws where it describes one of the processes of searching for a president is the board of trustees serving on the search committee.
	My problem, MSU got into some of these problems because we could not stay away from conflicts of interest, people who should not be doing things being in situations where they were doing those things. I've become really, really sensitive

to the idea that we should avoid conflict of interest in all cases. When half the trustees are going to select the final group of candidate and then the trustees are going to determine which of those candidates are endorsed as president, I think it's a conflict of interest and it's also a little bit like you guys are serving as both judge and jury. I don't think that's right.

Dianne Byrum: To clarify what I said last week, and I want to preface it by saying I do respect your opinion, but I respectfully disagree with your opinion.

Roberto Folley: [inaudible].

Dianne Byrum: But I do that in a respectful way. I hear what you're saying to me, I've taken it in, but I can have a difference of opinion, and that is truly what I happen in this instance. I do respect your ability to come to the microphone and state your opinion. It is your opinion.

The conflict of interest does not apply here because the board of trustees does not have a conflict of interest inherently. Our power is given to us through the state constitution. The bylaws are silent. I would expect they would be silent on the process by which to select a president. This university hasn't selected a president in a competitive search in 25 years. There's no file on a presidential search available for Melanie and I to follow. This is a learn as you go. We've tried to make sure that we put best practices around us.

That was the primary reason of hiring Dr. Teresa Sullivan, who has a great deal of experience at all levels on searches, including numerous presidential searches and also seeking a professional national search firm that has experience in presidential searches at AAU and Big 10 Universities.

It's not a conflict of interest. You could argue that it is an undue influence, but conflict of interest it is not. I have no financial conflict in my role as a trustee. I don't receive any compensation from the university and I can have no contracts with the university to have compensation from. It's not a conflict of interest, but the authority does rest in the board on the selection of a president. The board has chosen to have this search committee to not only develop the position description and assist in the interviews and determine the qualifications of the applicants, and then forward a group or a pool to the board for selection.

That is the process. It is being more open and transparent than our history in the past would have indicated. We are trying to be very transparent, which is why we are doing some 20-plus input sessions, we have the forums on the website. Melanie and I have had three or four press conferences, we've had a couple of communications to the MSU community, and we are appearing in forums like this well and beyond the input sessions. I think we've met with the deans three times, and we're scheduled to meet with ASMSU in early October at their next meeting. We are trying to be very open and inclusive and more transparent than it's been the history of the university.

Speaker 1:   Just one follow up, please, because we [crosstalk].

Roberto Folley: I just want to make a ... This thing is gone. Okay. I just want to follow up. I think your definition of conflict of interest only in terms of financial terms is very, very narrow. I'm not talking about you making money or anything outside of these ... In terms of selecting our president. What I'm pointing out is that if the deans of our colleges serve on the search committees and then they also became the people who made the final decision on which candidate should be selected, that is what I think is a conflict of ... I'm not talking about a financial conflict of interest. I'm saying you guys are giving yourselves too much weight in selecting who the next president should be.

Benjamin Horne: Hi. Benjamin Horne, ASMSU in Lyman Briggs College. I just wanted to give you a little bit of the student perspective. When you spoke to ASMSU in the spring, you left us with a copy of a book called A Complete Guide to Presidential Searches for Colleges and Universities. I wanted to know how much you used that book in determining the best practices for the search. As you mentioned, you left us with that book stating that you were going to use it to help give you some ideas of best practices for the search. I wanted to gauge how much did you use that.

Dianne Byrum: It's a basis of the best practices. I won't say we're following every single one, but we are listening to Dr. Sullivan and consulting with her on not quite a daily basis but clearly more than once a week to guide us as we move forward in what we're doing. One of the things is the input sessions. We wanted to make sure they were extremely robust.

Benjamin Horne: Then another follow up question. Regarding the placement of individuals on the search committee, you mentioned the COGS and faculty senate representatives were chosen by their own constituencies, ASMU's was not. Then also with the amount, we have one representative for our 40,000 student population whereas the board of trustees has four for their population of eight.

                  That way, being co-chairs, I assume you are nonvoting members in the discussions. Even then, having two members that are voting members that also go back to the board of trustees and have that double voting role, that creates an extreme imbalance and discussion.

                  Say there's a debate between two candidates on which is going to be a part of the pool that is going to be sent to the board of trustees, if Trustees Kelly or Ferguson say, "Well, we're not going to vote for this person in the final," that creates an extreme imbalance in discussion because we effectively have two members that have double or more of the say of everybody else in the committee. When we have 40,000 students with one representative, no matter the amount of listening sessions, if we only have one person in the room, that is not fair representation.

Dianne Byrum: I guess I would respectfully disagree with you. We have a search committee. We

attempted to the best of our abilities to make it inclusive and representative of the MSU community. It needed to be small in number. Our hope was 15, we ended up with 19. It can become unwieldy if it gets too large.

Now I understand that undergraduates want more representation. Faculty would like certain types of representation. We heard from postdocs that they would like representation. At some point, this is what the search committee is, and the search committee has been established. We are going above and beyond to get student input. That input will be reflected in the description of the position as well as assisting in the evaluation of the candidates.

That's how I can answer for you. It is not perfect and it is not to your liking, I understand that, but it is a process. We have been very transparent with what the process is, who the search committee is, their qualifications and backgrounds around the website, and we are moving forward. At some point, we had to make decisions and move forward, and that's what Melanie and I did.

Benjamin Horne: All right.

Melanie Foster: Our goal was to have a search committee of 15, and we just couldn't figure out how to get to that matrix. I'd also like to remind you that we are statewide elected officials. We run for this position on statewide ballot. You'll be making choices again this November for two new trustees because the two incumbents are not running for reelection. We're elected by approximately two million constituents in the State of Michigan. Our duty is to hire the president of the university and oversee that person's guidance of the institution.

Benjamin Horne: I understand. Can I have a follow up? Is that ...

Speaker 1:   One follow up.

Benjamin Horne: Yeah. I mean I understand. I have been in every board of trustees meeting this entire year. Just saying one of those things in terms of the amount of input, I understand the listening sessions and the goal of the listening sessions. I agree with the necessity of non-disclosure agreements. I read the entire book that you said, and basically they had an entire section on how necessary nondisclosure agreements were. But the amount and quality of input that are going to be gained from those sessions is incredibly limited when we only have one student in the room who is not able to be advised or communicate with any other students because the information they have and need to discuss, they're not able to because of a nondisclosure agreement.

When we have one student only, the amount of quality input that we can get is incredibly minimal. Normally, at board of trustees meetings, there are no less than four student representatives. I don't see how it can be relevant to have only a quarter of that representation at a time as critical is this.

Dianne Byrum: There's one undergraduate and one graduate student.

Andaluna B.:   Hello. Andaluna Borcila, James Madison College. I'm going to say some things here, just a few, that were also said at faculty senate. I don't want to occupy too much time, but I think that they have to be said again because we as a faculty have a responsibility to ask for an open, transparent, and legitimate process, because selecting the president of this university will impact our lives and the lives of our students, our lives for a very long time if we're still here. Hopefully, we will be.

But I know that this is a forum in which students can talk, and I'm grateful they're talking. I'm hoping that this will be a forum in which actually deans can talk and signal the many problems with the process and this search. I'll try to keep my comments really contained so that I can leave students and perhaps deans as well as other faculty a chance to talk.

No matter which presidential search guidelines one follows, whether it's the AAU or the AAUP, I have a preference for the AAUP, it is quite clear that in order to have a successful search, the community needs to have trust in the process. We as a faculty have a responsibility as a faculty to ask for an open and transparent and inclusive search process like the ones that over a thousand people signed on with the petition and faculty senate endorsed, because many members of our community do not trust the board, but also because of the way in which this search has unfolded, which has exacerbated the lack of trust.

The board says it's following AAU guidelines, but some might argue that you have violated these guidelines and some might say, if they were more generous, that you follow them at a bare minimum. For instance, we as a faculty elected five, six representatives. We have one. That would be a bare minimum. A bare minimum. Students, 40,000 undergraduates, one student. They didn't even get to elect their student. They obviously know the guidelines very well from AAU. Graduate students, one student.

Majority of faculty on this search committee are, in fact, administrators. Let me quote the President Engler from a senate meeting. But deans were once faculty. By that logic, faculty were once students. Students, you can rejoice because you have some people on this.

Now this logic either basically illustrates a lack of understanding of different positionalities within MSU and the perspective one can give as a stakeholder, different stakeholders in this institution, or it is a very, very cynical response to our faculty and students' demands for shared governance. I'm going to let you pick which one of these things you think it illustrates.

We as a faculty have an obligation to signal this, but our deans have been saying in many interviews, including in a letter that they signed, which I very much appreciate, about the need for this top-down structure at MSU to end and the need for a paradigm shift. How? At this juncture, can we have a committee for the

president that inspires no trust? I don't know. Will administrators also push back against the problems with this process and this committee and ask for a transparent and inclusive process that we can trust so we can have our president? Thank you.

Speaker 1: Does anyone wish to respond? [inaudible].

Colin Wiebrecht: Can I remove this? [inaudible] keep that. Okay. Hi. My name is ... One moment, sorry. I'll just-

Male: [inaudible].

Colin Wiebrecht: Oh, that works.

Male: It's my job. [inaudible]. There we go.

Colin Wiebrecht: Thank you.

Male: [inaudible].

Colin Wiebrecht: Thanks. Hello. My name is Colin Wiebrecht. I am an ASMSU representative, and I represent the Alliance of Queer and Ally Students. I represent all the LGBTQ undergraduate students on campus or ASMSU the best I can. I wanted to ask specifically about the selection of Trustee Joel Ferguson to be on the committee. Given many of his comments, I personally don't understand it, I'm sure many others in the room don't understand it, if we're trying to have a transparent and respectful process, how you're going to select someone that referred to the awful incidents of the last couple of decades as this Nasser thing, who referred to some of the lawyers representing survivors as ambulance chasers, who said that MSU, after all this investigation, is going to look great, who expressed confidence in President Simon because of all the money she had raised for different sports arenas here.

I guess I'm just wondering what was the rationale behind selecting someone that's made that many comments, who is clearly very tone-deaf. How does that give us any confidence moving forward?

Dianne Byrum: Do you want me to ...

Female: Go ahead.

Dianne Byrum: My first comment to you is I am not going to sit here and defend anything that Joel Ferguson has said or done. Having said that, he is an elected trustee just like I am, and I have no authority to remove him. Under the constitution, he has equal weight to Melanie and myself. As Melanie indicated, the two trustees, the two additional trustees, volunteered and wanted to be on the search committee.

As equal weight, I have no authority to remove him from that position, but I'm not going to justify or sit here and acknowledge that anything he said was appropriate. I think he was tone-deaf, I think he continues to be tone-deaf. I can control my own actions, I cannot control Joel Ferguson. That's the answer to your question. It rests with the constitution and the fact that he is voted in by the people of Michigan, and he can only be removed by the people of Michigan.

Colin Wiebrecht: All right, thank you.

Speaker 1:   Do we have any others that would like to speak or ask questions?

Dianne Byrum: Yeah, somebody over there.

Speaker 1:   Yes?

Dan Gould: A lot of the discussions seems to have been both-

Speaker 1:   Please introduce yourself.

Dan Gould: Oh, Dean Gould, Education. Seems to be both the composition of the committee. I could be wrong, but my hunch is it's done. That isn't going to change. It's been in the media.

Dianne Byrum: That's correct.

Dan Gould: We can be as upset as we want to, but that's not going to change. I guess I'd like to fit here a little bit more. Have you strategized as a committee how, on one hand, when we bring candidates in, we show them the hurt and the lack of trust and the vulnerability? On the other hand, how do we recruit somebody ... If I'm a top candidate and I'd go in and I heard this meeting, I'd go, "This is a hornet's nest. I want to be really successful."

If you know anything about leadership a year in, you're going to make tough decisions, and half the people aren't going to like it and the other half will. I mean just like making a search committee. My college is not on. Okay, tough. They had a pick. It's just the way it is.

I guess from a strategic point of view, have you really talked about how do we put the best foot forward? We have to recruit really good people. On one hand, we have to be transparent and show the hurt and the lack of trust that still exists on some parties. On the other hand, how do we recruit a top candidate so she or he will come in and be effective?

I guess my last point is create realistic expectations, because I hear people saying the new president's going to come in, everything's going to be solved. It's going to be a mess for a while until the new board members get on, other kind of things. Have you talked much about that?

Dianne Byrum: We started to talk about that as a committee. The committee has met once, and we met for an entire evening. It was almost five hours. Melanie and I have talked about it with some members of the search committee, particularly those that are housed here on campus, and a great deal with Dr. Sullivan.

Part of why, those three questions, it's way beyond the qualities and the characteristics, the criteria for the next president. It's what do we see as our challenges. Higher ed is undergoing massive challenges right now, way beyond what we see right here in front of us at Michigan State: the value of college education, the cost of college education, the competitiveness, the changing demographics of student body. These are major challenges a new president's going to have to face. What are the major challenges facing this university? On the flip side of that, what are our strengths? What are the real opportunities?

Because part of it, you are absolutely right, we have to sell the next president of Michigan State University, and this is a great place with a lot of potential. We've had conversations a couple of times with the deans on this very subject. There's a lot to be excited about here. We have strong alumni, we have outstanding programs that are nationally ranked, quality faculty, outstanding students with a thirst for knowledge, our research, we collaborate, and there's a spirit that we know we need to embrace change here, and people will come together to embrace that change.

These are the kinds of things that we have to be selling for the next president here, because that president is employed some place. We're going to have to tug them away, pry them away, and that's not going to be an easy task.

Yes, we've talked about that. It's going to take all hands on deck. We will be reaching back into the MSU community if there are relationships there with some of our finalists. But at this point in time, we haven't even developed the position description and we have not solicited applications. We're just a little bit ahead of that, but, yes, we've started to think very clearly about that.

This is where Dr. Sullivan is really going to be an asset for us, as are some of our key faculty and deans across this university will be real allies and assets as we start to hone in on who are those applicants. Do we want to go out there and recruit somebody? Is there somebody out there that one of you may know that we need to recruit and to apply?

Melanie Foster: Well, and we also, when we were putting together the search committee, we realized that part of their responsibility is putting Michigan State University's best foot forward. That's why we chose distinguished scholars, but people of prominence in academia, that when they are meeting with potential candidates that they can exemplify the quality of our faculty and, hopefully, entice the right person to be here.

Deborah M.:   Deborah Moriarty, College of Music. Last week at faculty senate, I brought up the voting, how the search committee would be voting, and realizing, as people have mentioned, that the search committee is and this is what it's going to be. The at-large members sent an email suggesting that perhaps a solution to what seems to be a perceived conflict of interest with the board of trustees being on the search committee is to have the voting members of the search committee put forward ... Not including the four members of the board of trustees, to have the rest of the search committee be the voting members who would then put forward a list to the board of trustees. I wondered if that was being considered. This was a suggestion from Jennifer Johnson, who is one of the at-large members.

Dianne Byrum: We've had conversations on the search committee on that very topic. I would say at this point in time we've not set forth the voting rules for the search committee. We've had conversations. We have not settled on those rules. We do hear your input. I'm not saying that we necessarily agree with it. I think the jury's out. I still have an open question. But that has not been determined at this point in time.

Deborah M.:   Would it be helpful if there was something that came from the faculty senator from the university council as a general agreement that this is what they would like to see happen?

Dianne Byrum: I'm not going to instruct you one way or the other on how the-

Deborah M.:   I'm just saying would you like to hear ... Rather than hearing from individuals, to hear from the body?

Dianne Byrum: I think we're hearing that on multiple fronts. If you would like to forward something, I'm not going to say don't do it. I hear what you're saying. I'm not sure how I feel about it right now.

Deborah M.:   Okay, thank you very much.

Juliet Guzzetta: Juliet Guzzetta, College of Arts and Letters. I wanted to follow up on the Joe Ferguson question and then I also have a separate question.

Melanie Foster: I'm just going to say we have to leave in about five minutes.

Dianne Byrum: Oh, because we have a listening session.

Juliet Guzzetta: [crosstalk].

Melanie Foster: We have a listening session.

Dianne Byrum: Input session.

Male: Input session.

Juliet Guzzetta: Essentially, I heard the question was why was he elected to the search committee, and the response that I understood was because he volunteered. I'm wondering a little bit about how maybe we decided on four trustees. Why not six? Why not two? How did we arrive at four, so that anybody who volunteered might be on it?

Second question, unrelated but following up on something that you said, Trustee Byrum, in the faculty senate meeting, was that you're looking for a healer and someone with emotional intelligence. I was wondering what the criteria is for that position and how you'll be able to judge that type of intelligence.

Dianne Byrum: We don't have the criteria yet because it's being put together through the input session, so we don't want to prejudge if. That was me speaking as an individual. One of the things we have talked about, though, as part of the vetting of the candidates when we get to the final pool, is doing a personality test to really dive deep into leadership qualities. These are becoming more prevalent in presidential searches, so we have talked about that and made sure that as we select a search firm that is still an option to do. It's an extra layer of vetting and really looking at background. That's one way.

In terms of the composition of the trustees, it started out with Brian Breslin, Melanie, and myself being the nucleus of we spent over 30 hours identifying the consultant, Dr. Terry Sullivan, interviewing phone calls and then in-person meetings to identify her. It was the three of us. Then when Brian pulled back, when he wasn't going to be seeking reelection, it didn't feel it was appropriate for him to stay that involved in the search since he wouldn't be here come January 1.

Then it was someone we sought to replace him. At that point, we wanted to balance it two Democrats, two Republicans, and Ferguson was the volunteer on the Democratic side. That's how it happened.

Jennifer J.:   Jennifer Johnson, College of Human Medicine. I just wanted to follow up on the suggestion. First of all, let me say I've seen a little bit of the process because I was one of the six selected, but from as far as I can tell, you guys are going way above and beyond to do everything you know how to deal on top of your day jobs. I just want to tell you, as somebody who's been here and plans to be here, I appreciate it. Are there things, whatever, if I was in charge, I might do different? Yeah, but I just want to say I see the effort. I see the effort, the dedication, and I don't understand how you're doing it on top of your day jobs, and I appreciate it. I just wanted to say thank you.

Dianne Byrum: Thank you.

Jennifer J.:   The context for the board being nonvoting members was in that light, and that the composition of the committee is what it is. It's the culture within the university. I don't know is the culture elsewhere, because I've never been outside the university. For example, I chair two searches, but my unit chief isn't on the search committee and, as a matter of fact, not supposed to be. The committee makes

recommendations and she decides. It's separated. I don't know if that's the culture outside of academia, but it is the culture in the university.

My suggestion about the board being nonvoting members, given that they're getting a vote once they ... You know what I mean? Once this six or whatever candidates go up was just ... I thought it was something that would make it look better to folks in the university that doesn't really cost you much at this point. You know I mean? That was really the context is trying to help find a solution that would help make it look better. The committee is what it is, but I think it would look better to folks. Just for what it's worth, that's the context. Thanks for trying to help us get a good president.

Female: Thank you.

Dianne Byrum: Thank you.

Speaker 1:   Is there any ... Oh, yes? Go ahead.

Isaiah Hawkins: I'm Isaiah Hawkins, College of Music and also ASMSU. The last thing she said is actually the point of my comments coming up. I know you have to go, so I'll make it brief. There are a lot of things that can be done to make this just look better and look like there is an effort at transparency and not just the words said, that there is an effort at transparency. A lot of those is beyond holding listening sessions and holding input sessions. It is showing that you are taking what is said into account, and not just saying that and then going your own direction but also responding to it.

I was at the faculty senate meeting back in the spring, when they endorsed the proposal to have people on this search committee. I was at two ASMSU meetings where we passed our own version of how we think student representation on the search committee should look. It seems that all of those, even though you say that you have looked for the best solution and have read up on best practices, everything that has been suggested to you has gone in one ear and out the other.

First off, I'm also of the mindset that appreciate the work you have been doing over the summer because this is a heavy load and the eyes of the world are on you, but also there are ways that this can look better. Even to the public, to my constituents that I represent through ASMSU, this looks like, at every turn, the wrong decision has been made. There are ways that this can just, from a public perspective, look better. That would inspire the trust that so many people that have spoken today have said is lacking.

Dianne Byrum: I know we have to go, but I want to answer that because I think you haven't necessarily recognized how we have taken the input and made adjustments. One of them was we were ready to fast forward the announcement of the search committee in very early August. We delayed that until after faculty came back and, in fact, made that announcement on the 22nd. That was a recommendation from

the deans, as well as sending out a community-wide email asking for input on the composition for the search committee. We gave an additional three weeks. We didn't finalize this search committee until just before on the 22nd. We did take that input.

Another one was with the RSVM Workgroup. We changed the listening sessions to input sessions. We followed up on their suggestion that we should have intensive training. We did that. We also had them assist us in writing the script to give structure to the input sessions. Those are two examples that specifically relate to the search where we have listened, we've taken the input, and we've made adjustments.

Melanie Foster: I would say we received probably close to 400 emails, which was this summer, when we were asking for input. We read every single one of them.

Speaker 1:   I do want to ask one quick question before you're off, because I think it's salient given what's transpiring at the national level. Whose responsibility is it to vet candidates extremely strongly for any skeletons in the closet that would compound issues if, say, someone was on the finalist committee and then something was unearthed about their past that they didn't divulge? Because that would just set everything back.

Dianne Byrum: [inaudible].

Speaker 1:   How are we going to deal with that elephant in the room?

Dianne Byrum: It's a great question.

Melanie Foster: Good question, yes. The search firm will be fundamentally responsible for doing the background checks. With the group that we're most serious about, they will probably contract out to private investigators to fully vet any candidate. That will be foremost on the search committee mind and agenda.

Speaker 1:   We cannot afford an error in that regard.

Melanie Foster: Absolutely.

Dianne Byrum: We agree with that. We've had conversations with Dr. Sullivan on this specific subject, that this search is going to require an extraordinary amount of background information. It's not going to be just a Google search. It's going to be an intensive look using professional services to do it. That's also why the psychological profile is probably very important in the search, too, as you could really get to the essence of leadership style and personality. Those are things that we're actively talking about because of the significance of this hire. Thank you. We do have an input session tonight.

Speaker 1:   Yeah.

Dianne Byrum:	[inaudible].
Speaker 1:	Yes, because now we have item eight, which is comments from the floor.
Dianne Byrum:	Thank you for your time and for the invitation.
Melanie Foster:	Thank you.
Speaker 1:	Thank you, Mary.
Bree Holtz:	Hi. Bree Holtz. I'm from College of Communication Arts and Sciences. I want to thank all the students for getting up and voicing their opinion. What I would like to remind the students is that there are two open board positions. If you can have all of your student representatives vote in November, that would be great. That is one way that you will have your voices heard. Thank you.
Speaker 1:	To follow up on that, I'm working with the Democratic and Republican parties to have the four candidates that are standing for board election come to university council next month, and we can interface with them, because two of those four will be on the board. I'm trying my best. Also, I got an email. Due to the lateness of the hour, we'll have Mark Meadows come also next month to discuss the income tax issue. Are there any further comments from the floor before we close the meeting? Yes?
Jennifer J.:	Jennifer Johnson, College of Human Medicine. I am new to the faculty senate, university council, so I'm just going to say what I say with that caveat. But I am a licensed clinical psychologist and it does seem like ... There's a lot of frustration and pain in the university. It's legitimate. I feel it. A lot of you have been fighting to try to make the university processes better and more transparent for a lot longer than I have.
	I guess that is easy for somebody to say first coming in. But I guess I think we're more effective advocating with people making decisions when we can present solutions, in addition to the frustration, specific things they can do because sometimes it seems like ... I'm not talk about this meeting, I'm talking about a bunch of meetings together. Folks just don't always know what to do with it. If we can tell them what to do with it, they may or may not do it, I don't know. Like I said, maybe I'm naïve. I just came. But I think to the extent we can give them specific things we want to see, we might get more of it. That's all. Thank you.
Benjamin Horne:	Hi. Ben Horne, ASMSU, Lyman Briggs. With regards to that, I think from the student side, that's something that is said a lot and it's something that we try to focus on. When we have ASMSU meetings, we actually pass a specific makeup for that. We propose solutions a lot, but they're so often ignored that it gets tiresome, it gets old when we have all of this going on and we are so often ignored and overlooked.

Colin Wiebrecht: I'd just like to add to that. Hope this isn't off-topic, but I sat in this very room at a university council meeting. I believe it was four years ago when we were first under investigation by the Office of Civil Rights. I listened as President Simon brushed it off and dismissed it as just a realignment of MSU's policies with the new updated policies. That was also the same semester in which they selected George Will to be a graduation speaker. A lot of times we as the students just don't really get our voices heard, we just get a lot of tone-deaf responses.

In regards to the assurance that they're going to look for skeletons in the closet, we can find out the fact that they selected John Engler as interim president and his skeleton for right out in the open with mishandling sexual assault allegations in women's prisons in the State of Michigan that led to a huge settlement that the state had to pay out. If his comments over the past couple of months are any indication, I don't know if they're really going to look at skeletons in the closet. Hopefully they will with the permanent president, but if their actions on the interim president and the quick selection is any ... The students are really frustrated. It's enough is enough.

Speaker 1:   I mean this body shares your frustration. We did vote no confidence in the board, and we voted overwhelmingly for them to resign. Like you say, there's a frustration that students and faculty together don't necessarily make enough of an impact. I'm hearing some of the right things from the board, but my optimism is very tempered by, like you say, the selection of the interim president for other reasons.

Colin Wiebrecht: Yeah. Thank you.

Andaluna B.:   Thank you. I would like to just briefly thank you for your comment, but also to say that, at this institution, for a long time, from my perspective ... And maybe I haven't been here long enough. I've just been here for 15 years, I think. I forgot. But I think that very much of what used to be business as usual was to just politely suggest indirectly something that could be done, which was brushed off, that the practice of speaking up and speaking out are really crucial at this point as we move forward, and that having faculty and students have voice and continue to express and really call things out when they're just not right, that should be encouraged.

We can act on multiple fronts, but I think that amplifying actually the voice is not a wrong thing to do, it's actually a very right thing to do. We have a responsibility to do that because we failed our students. Strategically, there are many things one can do or can't do. We don't know if this board will respond to us. I don't think speaking nicer or not saying what we think is going to have the impact we want.

In the meantime, I do think that we have a responsibility to actually say what we think. If we ask and it's not done, I made this comment at one point before, those of us who, and I have been in marginalized situations, know we keep having to ask for the right thing. If we might not appear strategic, well, it might just we don't appear [inaudible]. But if we don't, who's going to ask? Even if they're not going to give us what we ask for, we have a responsibility to ask. Thank you. That's my

position.

Speaker 1:   Sure. Our time is running out so we have to get people to their families, et cetera.

Jennifer J.:   Jennifer Johnson, College of Human Medicine again. Yeah, thank you so much for that. I just wanted to be really clear on what I said. I'm not saying don't speak up, I'm not saying don't be mad, I'm not saying don't be direct, I'm not saying don't ... You know what I mean? There is a time for all of that. I'm just saying, at the end, when you're doing political advocacy or advertising, it's and what do you do about it?

I'm just saying at the end of all the, "I hate that you did this, this, this, this, this. This is wrong," et cetera, et cetera, et cetera, "Please do X." Just to make sure that that's always at the end. That's what I'm saying. I hear the students that they do that and it doesn't always get them somewhere and that ... Yeah, that was all, just to make it actionable, whatever we're trying to do.

Speaker 1:   Okay. Thanks, everybody, for their candor and comments. Do I have a motion to adjourn the meeting?

Quorum: [inaudible].

Speaker 1:   Second?

Quorum: Second.

Speaker 1:   All in favor?

Quorum: Aye.

Speaker 1:   No one's opposed.