

Deborah M.: I'd like to call the meeting to order. We have a quorum. Is there a motion to approve the agenda for January? Thank you. Is there a second? All in favor, say I.

Speaker 1: I.

Deborah M.: Opposed? Motion carries. Approval of the draft minutes for November 13th. Is there a motion to approve? Second? Take a look at the draft minutes and just to let you know that if and when these are approved they will be on the website. On the academic governance website as will the un-edited transcript of the meeting. Ready for me to call the question? All in favor say I.

Speaker 1: I.

Deborah M.: Opposed? Motion carries. Interim President Angler is not here today. And we will go directly to the Provost remarks.

Provost: Thank you just a couple of things. Welcome back. This is officially Spring semester. We call it Spring semester instead of Winter just to keep your hopes up. So welcome back. I think most of you know that the day it began with a pretty, a very significant tragedy. We had an automobile accident this morning that took the life of a young woman here on campus. In a moped accident. The details haven't been widely shared. Not with me, not with others. But her family has asked that her name not be shared until the rest of the family is informed. But I know that you share the same sorrow that I do. That we have lost a young student. A family has lost a daughter. Unfortunately we lost three students over Winter break. None were here on campus. Each was back home. And each case an accident. A tragic accident, but here on our own campus is particularly poignant. So in the days ahead as that information is shared I know that you will ... She will be in someone's class. A friend to someone that you know. And I know that you will do all you can to support her students, her colleagues, and others. So thank you.

Two things I wanted to call to your attention. I announced one yesterday at a briefing that we do at each semester for academic leaders. Last semester we began a group and some of you, I don't know if anybody in this room was on that group. But we had a small steering committee that actually helped coordinate a study around the future outreach and engagement on our campus. We've been leaders in community engaged resource. National leaders for many, many years. We have an office in Outreach and Engagement, as many of you know. But the question really was, "What does this office do? And what do our faculty intend to do over the next decade or two? And do we have the infrastructure now that supports the work that family ... Faculty and staff want to do in the community and with partnerships?"

And so this group, many of you I hope, completed the survey that went out to all faculty. There were also some focus groups. The results of that review are on my

website. And I would encourage you if you have interest at all to pull that up. To comment on it. It lists what I asked this group to do. Is after speaking with various groups of faculty and academic staff and also at the conclusion of the survey to pose what they saw as opportunities going forward. And so there are not recommendations per say. They're really a set of opportunities. And the next step is really to look at that and then to determine what the implications are for the ways that we go forward. How we organize services and the office and the infrastructure. So your input is sincerely needed. We're trying to take comments for the next couple of weeks before we take a next step. So thank you.

Related to that there are about 50 leaders. Detroit leaders. And about 50 campus leaders who are meeting on Thursday afternoon to talk about the role of Michigan State University and Detroit. And this is related also to Outreach and Engagement. So again if that scenario in which your professional work takes you. I would very much appreciate your input.

Finally, last announcement. Tonight at MSU's museum kicks off the speaker series, "Finding our Voice." And tonight the speaker will or the series will be kicked off by a welcome and some remarks by Judge [inaudible 00:05:28]. So if you have an opportunity this evening, you may want to look at the time. Again it's at the MSU museum and that information is online. But this is the first of I think six or eight speakers over the course of this semester. Before an exhibit that will open in April that really honors the survivors and also deals with the broader issue of sexual assault in our ... Not just our campus, but our culture. So, thank you.

Deborah M.: You were also going to talk about the budgetary one.

Provost: Oh, okay. Oh, yes. Okay. Change gears totally. So thank you. There was a question that came up in steering committee that needed probably to be addressed. It was a comment that someone suggested should be passed along as we continue with the presidential search. And when we talked to candidates about procedures and policies on campus. And it was around budget reduction and the ways in which budget reductions are imposed on departments. I know that there isn't anyone in a department that hasn't felt the stress of the perf and the perf is the one percent reduction in the general fund budget. It's just in the general fund budget that is returned each year centrally and then redistributed to colleges based on their spring planning documents. The assumption in this letter was that it is directly imposed on individual departments. Which is not the case. Colleges may have chosen to do that. Colleges have to return one percent of their general fund budget. Not their auxiliary budget or other kinds of things. Not [inaudible 00:07:29] earnings or other income streams. But of the general fund budget. And there are certainly colleges who have chosen to distribute that to each individual department. But that's not the University mandate. That is an individual decision within colleges.

So the reduction is very much real. And that is the way in which there is some accumulated, some accumulated dollars centrally that is re-distributed again based on the planning that Deans do and present each Spring. So if in the last five years your colleges have new dollars for positions, or programming, or new initiatives it's a result of that re-distributed one percent. It is not without pain or anxiety, but as I explained to the steering committee about five or six years ago. The Deans had a conversation about other ways in which they could generate some flexible recurring dollars. And that's the key to this, right? These are recurring dollars. So this is really how you get your new positions. The Deans took on the challenge of thinking about how to generate additional, flexible, recurring dollars. And at the end of a couple of our discussion acknowledged that as much as they didn't like this. They couldn't come up with another thing at that point in time that they recommended.

So it doesn't mean that there won't be a better idea. There's always better ideas. And we may come up with one in the next couple of years, but that's an explanation of the current per funding. And the ways in which it is both collected and then re-distributed.

Deborah M.:

Thank you. Any questions for Provost Hewitt? Okay. Onto my comments. You may have noticed, or you will notice certainly when I say it, and you probably already have the Dr. Gary Hopins down at the Secretary for Academic Governances is not here today. Unfortunately his wife was taken to the hospital maybe two or three hours ago and he's there with her. They think it may be a heart attack so our best wishes are with Gary and we will try to not make to many academic governances mistakes in his absence. I would like to, she's not here, but I would like to thank Laura McCabe for taking on the role of an at large member of the Steering Committee. And she has also been voted to be the Vice-Chair of the Steering Committee. She is presently on her way back from Chicago where she was presenting her research at the University of Chicago. Clearly she didn't know that she was going to be an 'At Large Member' when she accepted this engagement. So we wish her well in her ... And we're glad to have her back. And hope that her train ride back is wonderful.

The At Large Members, or two of the At Large Members, we only had two of us who were available for this luncheon meeting met yesterday with two new members of the Board of Trustees. Kelly Tebay and Breon Scott. We had a very good meeting. It was very productive, I think. And they were very interested in academic governance. They were interested in hearing what we had to say. They seemed to be very immunable to working with the faculty. It was actually a very nice meeting. So it was, I think, we'll look forward to seeing where this goes. But I think it's a wonderful step forward. And that's the end of my comments for today.

New business. The University Committee and Curriculum. Marcy McTill.

Marcy: Marcy McTill, College of Nursing. UCC met at the end of November 2018 and approved the following program request. New programs five. The highlights include an art photography minor effective Summer 2019. Food safety graduate certificate effective Summer 2019. Social Science Data Analytics effective Fall 2019. And a sustainable Bio-product Science and Technology Minor effective Summer 2019. Additionally there were 10 program changes and one program deletion. For courses we approved 30 new courses. 40 course changes and no deletions. The program discontinuation was an Earth Science Interdepartmental Bachelor of Science Degree effective Spring of 2021. The short report is located in the appendix and you can click on it if you want to read the full report.

Deborah M.: Is there a motion to approve the curriculum committee report? Is there a second? Is there discussion? And with no discussion is all in favor say I.

Speaker 1: I.

Deborah M.: Opposed? Motion carries. 7.2, "How the Office of Institutional Equity Operates." There's been a fair amount of questions coming to I think many of us. And many of us have questions also. With recent newspaper articles about things happening with the ... With OIE. And we thought it would be a good idea to ask Dr. Curry to give us some insight into what the process is. And here he is to do that. Thank you.

Dr. Curry.: Okay. Wrong presentation. He said he just loaded it. Where would I find it? In the corner somewhere. [crosstalk 00:13:43]. It's not that one. Not that one. Better be that one. Should be that one. Got it. Thank you.

Speaker 2: Do you know how to get a presentation ...?

Dr. Curry.: Yeah, we're good. Thank you. I gave an overview to the Steering Committee after one of the it seems all too frequent newspaper stories about OIE complaints. And discipline. There are a lot of misunderstandings. And some issues arise simply because there's limited information that can be shared. So what I wanted to do is to provide just a brief overview. The relationship in particular between OIE and what happens after they do what they do. So with our Office with the Colleges and with the Department. But I also wanted to give you an update on something else. Because this is an environment that continues to undergo rapid change. Last week a memo was sent from the Provost and the Vice-President for Research about new NSF reporting guidelines. So NSF guidelines, and I'll say if you are a PI or a co-PI and there is a chargeable violation of in our case a relationship violence or sexual misconduct policy or our anti-discrimination policy. Then the University has an obligation to report that to NSF. Anything that has occurred after October 21 last year, 2018.

And then if as a result of that investigation there is action taken. So if there is a disciplinary action taken then we also have to notify NSF of that. So that's new. We are going to talk first with the University Committee and Faculty Affairs

about what we're doing with regards to implementing those guidelines. Again NSF said "We're doing it and you guys can get on the moving train." They started doing it and in a sense retro-actively. And so we've had to implement some procedures immediately, but we do want to walk with Academic Governance through what we are doing and any suggested changes they might have.

At this point in time NIH has said they intend to do something similar, but no other federal agency as of yet has done the same thing. Again we anticipate that that will happen, but for now it is NSF. So those guidelines there and all of these things will be made available.

Now probably difficult for you to see. Let me give you a few principles and then I want to walk through that just a bit. So some background issues as you think about the Office of Institutional Equity as you think about academic human resources. Your colleges and your departments. How do these interact and inter-relate. So first of all, and I'm going to simplify and probably over-simplify things. The Office of Institutional Equity has a narrow mandate. Their mandate is to investigate charges of violations of the relationship violence and sexual misconduct policy. And the anti-discrimination policy. To investigate those policies and issue findings with regards to those policies. They don't investigate if the allegation is you misuse travel funds. That's not in their portfolio. If you violated some other University policy that's not their portfolio. It is simply relationship violence, sexual misconduct, and the anti-discrimination policies.

They investigate. And after they investigate they work with, or actually while they are investigating, they work with departments and they work with my office in Academic Human Resources in the Office of the Provost to move these along. And to see what needs to happen. So we continue to work as we have with regards to any other policy violation with department chairs, chair person, school directors, and deans.

Let's see, couple just other things. Early on in the process and again this will be a little more clearer when I show you the flow chart. Early on in the process there's a decision made. Someone alleges a violation. OIE notifies the Dean's office, the department chair person's office, and academic human resources and there's a determination made as to whether or not there is some interim employment action that needs to happen. Is there something that needs to be done right away to protect individuals? To protect students, etc. So there's a determination even before. There's a full investigation, there's a finding. Is there something that needs to happen?

We work with the departments. With the colleges in making those decisions. Sometimes OIE might decide that they're not going to conduct an investigation because the allegation that was made doesn't pertain to the two policies that they are charged with investigating. But there may be other things that were determined that are of concern. That perhaps violate other policies or that warrant some kind of action. Yeah, all of those issues get referred to Academic

Human Resources. The colleges, to the appropriate offices. So just because it's outside the mandate of OIE doesn't mean those issues aren't addressed.

And in many cases OIE might decide that there is no finding. We do an investigation, but there's not a violation that we find of the policy. That doesn't mean that something inappropriate didn't occur. That doesn't mean that appropriate corrective action should not be taken. So even if there is no violation, it maybe that there are actions that are warranted. Maybe there was a violation of something else. And again I'll add a few examples to this. And in case ... You would have no reason, most of us would have no reason to know any of this, but last ... Two years ago, three years ago when we substantially revised the discipline and dismissal policy and it worked its way through the faculty senate, there were a number of additional protections put in for faculty. So anytime a faculty member ...

Anytime there is contemplation about disciplining a faculty member, tenure faculty member, tenure system faculty member. The chair has to meet with the faculty member, the faculty member has a right to meet with the faculty advisory committee and the department. If he or she chooses to do so. They have a right to meet with the personal sub-committee chair of UCFA, if they choose to do so. And if major discipline is contemplated they have a right to have a hearing before a disciplinary review panel of the University Committee Faculty Affairs. Again this is all advisory. This is all before any decision, final decision is made about discipline. So there are protections that the faculty put in a few years ago to try to prevent inappropriate disciplinary actions occurring.

I'll say one other thing. As we look at many of these cases. I said OIE has a narrow threshold and they also have precise guidelines that they have to follow in determining whether or not the relationship violence and sexual misconduct policy was in fact violated. So they ask questions, "Was the behavior severe? Was it pervasive? Was it persistent?" It may be that someone did something in appropriate one time and that might not get to the threshold of severe, pervasive, and persistent. And OIE might find no violation of the policy. That doesn't mean that's not behavior that needs to be stopped. That does not mean that that's not behavior that might warrant some kind of corrective action. So again OIE narrow threshold and clear guidelines on what does it take to get to the level of violating those particular policies that they're charged with.

So graphically a complaint is received by OIE. So someone files a complaint. OIE makes a decision as to whether or not they're going to investigate or not investigate. Not investigating might be because it's outside their jurisdiction. It's not the relationship violence sexual misconduct-conduct policy. It's not the ADP policy. Then it's not theirs to investigate. And if there is behavior that warrants investigation that would go somewhere else. Or on occasion there is a problem, but participants will not come forward. Will not speak with them. Will not participate in the investigation such that they can not do the kind of investigation they would like to do.

Now there are occasions in which the behavior is such that the University decides it's going to take on that role anyway because there is enough there that we believe we need to act. But again generally if the complainants won't come forward then there's not much that OIE can do.

Even in the case where there's no investigation we learn about that and Academic Human Resources and the Office of the Provost and the College and Department are going to know about that. And so we will make decisions. So we had a case in which no violation, no investigation with regards to relationships violence sexual misconduct. But there were some issues about how funds were being used. Misuse of some travel funds. Well that warranted action even though it wasn't violation of the policies that OIE is charged with dealing with.

If they conduct an investigation, they consult with the administrative unit. So the college, the departments and schools, and with Academic Human Resources. And a decision eventually is made. Is there going to be a finding that there was a violation or no finding that there was a violation. There is an appeal process after that in which either party can appeal. So both a claimant, the person bringing the charge. And the respondent, the person against whom the charges are made. Either could appeal. And after that appeal process ends, then my office sits down with the relevant administrators. The dean's office, the school, and our department chair person's school director and talk about what do we do.

Now it may be that there is a violation and it warrants disciplinary action. And that could range from sometimes it's simply, "We need to talk to someone." The chair needs to have a conversation that says, "This was an inadvertent issue and you need not do it again." It could be there there's a reprimand letter that's written that goes into the file of that individual. It could be, we've had cases in which we said, "You will not get ... You will not be eligible for merit pay increase next year." We've had cases in which someone was in an administrative role and because of this behavior it was deemed that it's inappropriate for you to be in that administrative role and so you are losing that administrative appointment.

And there are occasions in which people are suspended without pay for a period of time. We have not had any cases to date of tenure system faculty members for whom we have gone into the dismissal for cause process. We have had cases involving non-tenure system, so fixed term faculty members and we started down that process and I think of the case I can think of they resigned before we got there. But in a worst case scenario dismissal would be a possible penalty.

And again sometimes what we find, OIE says, "No finding." But it's not unusual for us to find that, "Okay you didn't violate the relationship violence and sexual misconduct policy because this was a consensual relationship." Well we have a policy that says, "You're supposed to notify your chairperson or school director about a consensual relationship so you have violated that policy." So again there

still might be discipline that occurs as a result even though there was no finding of violating the policies that OIE is charged with.

And I guess final thing I'll say with regards to all of this. And something that is going to change for us a bit. In HR, in the Human Resources world generally, when you take corrective actions against an employee the intent is always to correct behavior and not to punish so you don't send out a press release to the world saying, "We just discipline this person for violating whatever the policy is." You try to inform people on a need to know basis. Guidelines from the Office of Civil Rights of the Department of Education say, "We are not going to have to expand that a bit. And we're going to have to notify the complainant if there is a finding and discipline is the result." So there will be notification that goes to the person who brought the charge if discipline is finally imposed. That that discipline did occur. But it has been our practice not to give detailed information about any disciplinary actions that have been imposed.

Deborah M.: Thank you. Are there any questions for Dr. Curry? Thank you very much. Next is discuss the upcoming All Climate All University Climate Survey with Rebecca Campbell and Carrie Moylin. I don't think it matter.s

Section 1 of 4 [00:00:00 - 00:28:04]

Section 2 of 4 [00:28:00 - 00:56:04]

Carrie Moylan: I don't think it matters.

Rebecca C.: Given Dr. Curry's illness, we're going to use this mic. Good afternoon everyone. I am Rebecca Campbell. I'm a Professor in the Department of Psychology, College of Social Sciences, and I'm the chair of the University Wide Relationship Violence and Sexual Misconduct work group. I was here last semester, saw many of you then, see some new faces now.

We were asked to give you an update today on an all campus climate survey. I'm here with my colleague Dr. Carrie Moylan, from the School of Social Work, also in the College of Social Science, who is leading our effort on the work group for this climate survey.

So very briefly, a bit of context. Our work group was tasked with doing a review of where this campus is at with regards to relationship violence and sexual misconduct. Where are we at with services, programs, policies and how can we move forward in a data-informed, best practice way. That was one of the first things we tripped over, data-informed. We don't have good campus-wide climate data. Our students have been surveyed, our faculty and staff have been surveyed. They have not been surveyed on the same things, so that is step one, is to bring us all together to do a campus-wide ... meaning students, faculty and staff, climate survey on relationship violence and sexual misconduct. So, that's a need that we identified. We have proposed that. We have gotten approval from the Provost, and a whole bunch of other people along the way.



This is going to happen. It is going to happen this semester. It's going to launch after spring break, and we're in the process right now of being in touch with groups like you, lots of other groups to let you know this is coming. This is why we're doing this. The goal is to be able to gather information about the current state of our campus, to give to the next administration regarding where we're at with climate on relationship violence and sexual misconduct, to start moving forward in the coming academic year, to improve programs, policies and services and the like. So, that is why we are doing this.

Couple quick context things about the survey, and we're happy to answer questions and Carrie can address some specifics too. We are working with an outside firm to do this survey. We're working with RTI International, which is a non-profit research institute in North Carolina. Many of you may know of their work. They have done a lot of campus climate surveys for The Department of Education, The Department of Justice. They are well equipped to do this kind of work. To be blunt, we felt that it was important in the current context that we work with an outside vendor for a survey of this nature, to ensure that it is handled with clarity, transparency and that the data will be shared. So, that is why we decided to go with an outside vendor and that's why we picked that particular vendor, because of their long history of doing this work, and of having a transparent process.

The survey itself is designed to be relatively short. This was hard for us as Social Scientists, and all my colleagues ... yes, I can tell who of you are in the Social Sciences because you just wept with me, thank you. Thank you for your pain and shared suffering. We managed to get this down to something that is going to be 15ish minutes. That's tricky to have something that short that's also reliable and valid and that's what we have been sweating, day in and day out all last semester, and are continuing to iron the details out now. So, we're very happy with the survey. It draws on existing measures of these key constructs, with good reliability and good validity. I should also poke a little fun at our beloved Provost here, that in meeting with her she put us through another round of comprehensive exams on these issues regarding reliability and validity, to make sure that we weren't just creating our own survey, that we were working from established measures.

My understanding is that the steering committee at a meeting also said, "Hey, there's a survey that my colleagues have found regarding bullying, and is that something we could do?" We have some measures of bullying already in that survey. It is not as developed as what the steering committee brought to our attention, but again, we're trying to work with that constraint of a short survey that can go campus-wide, but it does have some measures of bullying, workplace and civility things that are related to relationship violence, and sexual misconduct. So, I hope that gives you a bit of an overview. Do you want to add a couple of odds and ends?

Carrie Moylan: No, that's good for now.

Rebecca C.: No? Okay. We are happy to take any questions that you have about this project.

Steven G.: How will-

Speaker 3: Could you come up and talk through ... at the microphone? Can you state your name?

Steven G.: Hi, I'm Steven Gasteyer, from the Department of Sociology, College of Social Science. My question is, how do you envision the results of the survey being used. I actually have a second question too. I think that one of the problems with surveys right now is we are deluged with surveys from all sorts of entities. Some of whom are not trustworthy, many of whom are not worth our time. It concerns me a little about how this is going to be identified when it pops into our inboxes. So, really two questions. That first one and then secondly, how are we planning to use that data that comes out of this?

Rebecca C.: Do you want to do this?

Carrie Moylan: [inaudible 00:33:48] Sure. Those are both excellent questions, thank you. First I'll address, how do we get people to see this survey, know that it's important and take the survey. It's part of the reason why we're here today to talk to you about the survey. So, we're working to create a marketing plan, which is getting me to step out of my comfort zone as a Social Scientist, and learn a little bit about how do you get an effective message across. So, we're working on a marketing plan. We're working on various ways to have, for example, the Provost and other administrators share with their groups and [inaudible 00:34:28] this survey is coming. Please take this survey, it's important, and it's trustworthy ... everything like that. So, we've got a plan. If you have ideas about ways that we can get the messaging out, we're always open to hearing those ideas. We're taking a lot of meetings, but we're also looking for the most effective ways of getting that message out.

So, the extent to which you can share that with your colleagues, and your colleges and your networks that this survey is coming, please take this survey it's really important ... that will help us to get a good response, and of course a good response rate gives you more reliable data that we can then have trust that this data is giving us a good picture of what's happening on our campus. So, it's one of the most important things, is getting people to actually click on that survey and take it.

Rebecca C.: I want to add something real quick and then we'll come to the other questions. The marketing campaign is really trying to go sort of two directions. The top down approach with letters of support from Provost Youatt, from Satish, hopefully from ASMSU COGS, and the grad student unions, as well as the other unions. So from the top down places, but also the bottom up approach. Us here, us at union meetings, us at a lot of different places in the next month so people

can see us, they can see who we are, they can ask these kinds of questions. So, we're hoping that the marketing plan of going in both directions will do that. There is an incentive for the students, financially. They get some money if they participate. Every Social Scientist worth his/her/their salt knows you got to do that, we're doing that. Faculty and staff, we do not. We will do this as part of our commitment to the university.

Right, so it's short, but your point is very well taken. We've been trying to address survey fatigue. That's why we've been coordinating with the Provost Office and a lot of other places to say "Spring semester shhh. No other surveys will be launching at the time this goes out." So, that's one way we hope to cut through the noise. Now, in terms of the use, I'll again let Carrie start and then I can chime in if needed.

Carrie Moylan: So, in terms of the use of the data, we anticipate that the data will give us information about the extent to which students, staff and faculty are experiencing various forms of relationship violence and sexual misconduct. As well as many broader climate measures about how people think the university is doing handling these issues. School connectedness, and the workplace sensibility. Things that the research has shown are risk factors for these things happening, right? What makes it a riskier culture? So, that's the kind of information that will be in the survey, and then that gives us a number of different ways that we can target new or expanded prevention programs. We can use that data to inform prevention programs that are already happening, or develop new prevention programs. It gives us information about what services might be needed. Are there unmet needs, or places where we haven't devoted enough resources and we could add some resources?

We will be looking to various groups around campus to help think about, with this data what does that mean? How do we think about what to do with this data? It should coincide with a new Presidential administration as a result of the search happening now. I think that's an excellent opportunity for our new President to say, "We need to take this data and do something with it." That's a role that we think the whole campus can play, in speaking to that. Do you want to add?

Rebecca C.: Good. Other questions?

Deborah M.: Thank you very much. Please let us know if there's anything we can do from the Faculty Senate, University Council and to help the ... Oh, I'm sorry.

Analuna Borcila: [inaudible 00:38:32] James Madison College, hi everyone. Happy new year. I don't know if this question is appropriate ... Who it is appropriate to address this question to. I'm just trying to figure out ... So, RVSM work group is getting at issues of culture on our campus, which have been signaled to us, but to get a better sense of what these issues of culture are on our campus. In addition to what we've already heard anecdotally, in addition to what we've already seen as

proof that there are problems with culture on our campus. Serious problems with culture on campus. Do we have a group that's responsible for looking at how the policies that we have on campus to address relationship violence, and sexual misconduct are working?

Carrie Moylan: I can say a few things. I do believe there is an RVSM policy review work group that works on the specific RVSM policy and changes that may need to happen to that. Certainly the RVSM work group that we are a part of have been talking about those issues and we're certainly a place where you, or anyone else could come with concerns about those policies and how they're working, to the extent to which our committee remains active. Which, we hope is for awhile. We'll see. Becky might not.

Rebecca C.: So, the RVSM work group, we are an ad hoc. We were formed by interim President Engler. So, we don't know. So, I think that's an important thing to track and to pay attention to. We have the sexual violence advisory committee, which has a much more traditional structure than what we have. As a work group they have designated representation from faculty tenure line, faculty non-tenure line, student A, student B, staff A ... much more traditional structure than what we have on our work group. So, that is one entity to look to.

We also have the Violence-Free Communities Group, which is a group of practitioners on campus and folks who pay attention to policy as well. I think that we're at a good opportunity as we come down through this semester, and as we move into next year, to really think about what should be the entity that does that. We have a couple of different options out there. What is the best way to do this? Right now, I can't answer that question, but I would encourage this body and any body to really be thinking about, what is our long term strategy for review on this? Right now, it's kind of shared across multiple groups who care very deeply about this issue.

Analuna Borcila: Thank you.

Deborah M.: I have a ... sorry. I was going to say, I have a quick question. This is probably obvious, but will the results of the survey be able to target where on campus things are happening?

Carrie Moylan: We are collecting some information about, for example, college, or unit that people are part of. There may be some limitations in terms of how much information RTI wants to share back to us, so as to not violate the confidentiality in small units, or small departments where it may make it obvious who that person was. We do hope that there will be some more specific targeted information, so that additional units or colleges could think about, "This is what we know is happening in our domain. What can we do about it?"

Deborah M.: Thank you.

Carrie Moylan: Yeah, places we feel safe. That kind of information.

Deborah M.: I was Deborah Moriarty from the steering committee.

Dan Gould: Dan Gould, I had a very similar question. In terms of the demographics. I would think ... especially faculty, may not want their college to look bad. So, social desirability, obviously it's a topic we all care about, but there's this other side and how are you going to handle that in the directions, if I think it might come back to my college, or my unit or whatever it might be there?

Speaker 3: Can you state your name?

Dan Gould: Dan Gould, Education.

Speaker 3: Thanks.

Carrie Moylan: There are multiple points during the survey ... Everything from the initial survey invitation to reminders throughout the survey about the anonymity and confidentiality of the data. It is one of those places where having an external vendor really helps to provide that sense of, "This isn't going to get back to me, specifically." RTI will very strictly be careful about sharing information that might come down to this could only be one person, if you combine all these sources of data. So, I think that those protections are there and at various points, people are sort of informed of those protections. I would be surprised if we have any data that would be at the department level. Colleges is probably the smallest unit at which we'd be addressing that.

Rebecca C.: Other questions, or comments? Yeah.

Michael K.: Michael Kaplowitz, at large member College of Ag. and Natural Resources. I didn't hear, is this going out to every faculty member and every student, or is this going out to a sample of faculty and students?

Carrie Moylan: Great question. So, it will go out to every faculty member and every staff member. We are starting with a random sample of undergraduate students, who will receive an incentive, but we will then open it up to all undergraduate students. So, that nobody feels like they didn't have a chance to share their experiences. Given the particular climate, we wanted to make sure everyone had a chance to share their voice. All graduate students will receive it, so the only confusing part is the undergraduates. It will go out otherwise, to the entire campus, yeah.

Rebecca C.: The incentive structure that we had to use where the undergrads had to create the two-tiered structure, the budget for incentivizing every undergrad was not something in good conscience I could put before anybody. So, there will be a robust sample actually, that is drawn to make sure that we have representation of some under sampled groups which tend to be males, on this particular topic ...

and tend to be racial, ethnic, cultural minorities. So, those groups will be sufficiently sampled ... definitely sufficiently sampled, in the group that is incentivized. Then, as Carrie said, we open up beyond that because we want people to have a chance to let their perspectives be known on this issue. It's so critical.

Deborah M.: Any other questions or comments? Yes.

Juliet G.: Juliet Guzzetta, College of Arts and Letters. Excuse me if I'm asking you to repeat. I just wanted to double check, the results will be made completely public, to whom and when approximately?

Carrie Moylan: The survey will be open in the spring. RTI will work on the analysis over the summer and we anticipate the report will be available sometime in early fall. The idea of having the external vendor and working with RTI was in part to ensure that results are in fact made available and are trustworthy in the sense that it was an external source who put together the report. So, RTI is actually preparing the report and releasing the report. So, we would expect that, that report would be available sometime in early to mid fall, depending on how long the analysis takes.

Juliet G.: [inaudible 00:46:33] by email-

Carrie Moylan: Yeah, I'm sure there will be a big marketing push for when those results come out. We are also working in part of the marketing plan to create a survey website home. The report will be made available there as well. So, we'll make sure that that information gets out to the Faculty Senate and other bodies like this, so you know where to look for that report.

Deborah M.: Thank you. Other questions or comments? Thank you very much and we look forward to completing the survey and to getting the results. Next we have discussion regarding the healing fund from Provost Youatt.

Provost: Not sure how I get nominated to do this one, but I will share what I know. I think all of you now are aware that the board unanimously voted to reinstate a fund to be accessed by Nassar survivors. They did not, on Wednesday, announce the parameters of that fund, and so I have limited information, but I will share what I know. I believe that they ... contrary to what you might have read, are looking very broadly at eligibility to the fund. I believe they've taken the advice of the task force very seriously, and understand the importance of ongoing counseling, understand the ways in which the reasons why there are sometimes delays in seeking support. All of that has been, I think considered ... is being considered in their thinking.

The only other thing that I would share is that I believe that they're going to reach out and seek advice from a number of groups, and don't ask me what groups because I don't know, or when. I think they're proceeding very

thoughtfully in this, and my sense is that there's a strong commitment while there were perhaps half of the committee who strongly advocated for this. In fact, there was no arm twisting. At least in my presence, and I was not present for most of the discussion, but there was no arm twisting among the group. There was a strong sense that there was a moral obligation to do this. That it had been an error to suggest that it ... No matter what their original intention was, that that was not the conversation. The conversation was what in this time was the right thing to do. That's at least in the part of the conversation I heard, That was the discussion.

Again, I think they're thinking broadly about it. There was a conversation at steering committee last week where steering committee, very ably presented the faculty perspective on this, and that was last Tuesday. I think probably pretty soon, the board will announce ... because they're having the discussion ... the board will talk about eligibility. They have to seek a new administrator for the fund. There has to be an external administrator for whom people can apply to the fund. Again, at least in the initial conversation, there's an understanding that it isn't just the individual survivor, but it is those who are connected to that individual who've also been affected by the trauma. That's the direction of the conversation. If I knew more, I would be glad to share more, I don't. I'm telling you what I believe is the direction based on the conversation, and again, I know all of you saw the report that there was unanimous support for it, and you've also seen the board speak out on their disagreement with some other statements that were made. They feel extremely strongly about that.

Deborah M.: I should also add that when we met with the two new Board of Trustees members, we stated that the Faculty was concerned about exactly how the new fund was going to operate. That it was a fairly broad statement that they endorsed, and we suggested that the faculty would very much want them to follow the suggestions from the task force, from the RVSM task force. They said, "Yes," that was absolutely their intent. So, I think that's where things are, at least for right now, where things are headed.

Any other questions or comments?

Speaker 3: Rebecca has one.

Deborah M.: Oh yes, Rebecca please.

Rebecca C.: Rebecca Campbell, College of Social Science. Yes, I can confirm that the Trustees have reached out to the work group. We are in the process of scheduling a meeting to discuss eligibility to go through current best practices and treatment, treatment duration, the scope of who's impacted ... Family, friends, significant others. So, the Trustees are asking for very clear suggestions from us that are evidence based regarding mental health treatment for trauma.

Deborah M.: Great, super. Thank you very much. Next we have mental health update from the Counseling, and Psychiatric Services, Dr. Mark Patishnock.

Mark P.: Okay. You pronounced that really well. You're one of the few people that have done that recently. Freaks me out a little bit when someone pronounces my last name correctly. Catches me off guard, but yes, Mark Patishnock. I'm the Director of Counseling and Psychiatric Services here. Thanks for having me, looking forward to providing a little update about what's been going on. So, just start with an overview.

As many of you likely know, CAPS is really the result of the integration between two distinctive departments that previously existed in different ways. First, a counseling center which existed in Student Affairs. Then, the Psychiatric Clinic, which was a sub-unit within Student Health Services previously. So, both of those have been combined in one larger unit, mostly located in Olin Health Center on the third floor.

We also not only restructured mental health services to exist together, but that is also kind of exists within another reimagine, or restructure in student health and wellness at large, that also includes Student Health as a department, the sexual assault program, safe place domestic violence and stalking shelter services, and health promotion which really does a lot of our advocacy and education around substance abuse and overall wellbeing.

CAPS is the primary mental health resource for enrolled students. So, there is a psychological clinic, there is a psychiatric clinic, but CAPS is widely known as the place where students come to get started on their mental health journey and also to receive a lot of services within our department. But, our main goal is to meet with each student that requests services, and to really figure out first and foremost, what do they need? What type of services are most appropriate. Then, number two to connect them and plug them into those services knowing that some of those will be available at CAPS and others will be available throughout campus, and off campus.

So with that, we're really intentional about offering a spectrum of resources that start with our 24/7, 365 options, includes a lot of psycho-education things available online, but also most recently the MySSP tele mental health services. I kind of sell it as the embedded counselor in every student's phone, so to speak, where students download this app. They can select they're from Michigan State, that they're a student and at three in the morning, if they're home on break or on campus, they can text or talk with a counselor in over 100 different languages. So it really significantly expands our ability to capture students who might not otherwise walk into a clinical facility. So, that's what we're seeing.

We're also accredited by two different organizations. The first is IACS, which stands for, International Association of Counseling Services. It's the gold standard nationally, that accredits university counseling centers. We've been accredited



for awhile and we're up for re-accreditation soon. Then, also the American Psychological Association. We have four pre-doctoral interns in health service psychology, essentially kind of the residency, or right before graduation. So, in addition to my role of making sure that we're operating within the standards of collegiate mental health and laws, and other things, we have these two external audits that happen.

We're located on the third floor of Olin Health Center. We're also located in the union. So, one of the great opportunities I got when I got here was there's a place over at the union, and we're going to put some more counselors and Psychiatrists over there. So, my initial day was walking through the drywall and the construction over there. Now, since October we're operational. So, one of the good things for that is that not only we have more space, but we also know that some students might feel more comfortable walking into the union than a clinical environment. So, hopefully we're capturing more students in that way.

Section 2 of 4 [00:28:00 - 00:56:04]

Section 3 of 4 [00:56:00 - 01:24:04]

Mark P.:

... right then a clinical environment, so hopefully we're capturing more students in that way. And then we're also embedded. So we have 2 clinicians we just recently hired in North Hubbard and Wilson Hall. So the idea is that students where they live and where they interact and spend time, that if we can connect with them there, that might be a way to reach more students as well. So that's kind of an overview in a nutshell of some of what CAPS is on campus.

We have currently funding for 28 full-time counselors. I referred to a counselor pretty arbitrary in that way as a wide-ranging definition, including to be any person with a Master's degree in counseling, clinical social work, or Doctoral degree in Psychology, like myself. Right now, with our 28 FTEs, we have 1 counselor per about every 1800 students. 24 of those have been hired. This past semester, we were operating more around 19 or 20 with about 3 or 4 recent hires and 4 active searches that we're working on right now.

We also have about 5 full-time equivalent psychiatrists, which leads to about 7 or 8 different providers working full-time, both here and at the Union. And then a host of clinical-care managers, medical assistants, other nursing professionals, and about a dozen trainees in addition to administrative support professionals. So all in all, we have about 60 or so - 65 - folks that operate on CAPS in some way, shape, or form.

So in a nutshell, this is what we do and the services that we provide. So first, we provide same-day screening services. So we really wanna remove barriers to care. So any student can walk into our third floor and to be seen in the same day. Most students can be seen within 15-20 minutes, sometimes it might be an hour or a little bit more if they come over lunch. But the idea is that we want to see students the moment that they're ready and willing to ask for help.

We also provide crisis-stabilization services. We provide hospitalization services. We've changed things recently so that when if we send a student to the hospital, we actually accompany them. We meet them at the hospital. We meet their family. We talk with the attending physicians. We coordinate with the police. And we really make sure that that vulnerable moment for students is occurring in a way that the student feels like we're part of that process. And then we're also involved in post-hospitalization discharge, 'cause we know one of the most vulnerable moments is when they get out of the hospital.

Of course, we're CAPS, we do counseling. So we have individual, couples, group counseling. We've expanded our groups to about 25 active groups at the moment. We have the ICSU unit, which stands for our Intensive Clinical Services Unit. So when I got here, I asked a question of, "What do we do for the students who aren't necessarily in crisis today, but they might be in crisis in a week from now and might need hospitalized. What do we do to help these most vulnerable students?" And so what was really apparent is that we needed to develop this unit that really, at any given time, can accept about 15-20 students where they get weekly therapy, individual therapy, weekly group therapy, psychiatric services, care management in which then conversations happen in collaborative environments. So this has been a huge success so far, CAPS. I just met with our Interim Director for this unit, and we've had some really good treatment results and helping some students who might otherwise go to the hospital or have things happen.

So we're also involved in consultation with students, faculty, staff. And also suicide prevention. We're doing a lot of things in those areas and hoping to renew our training. Critical incident response. So a good example of this is as the Provost shared today with the tragic accident, we have a critical incident response coordinator at CAPS. A guy named Ed Thomas, and he's working with folks as we speak right now to coordinate a response to help everyone involved - directly and indirectly - to help provide them with unique, tailored services this evening and the rest of the week.

We also offer a host of training programs, as we have residents in psychiatry, psychology, counseling. Tons of outreach. Multicultural initiatives. We have a student mental health coalition, where we've brought all of the mental health groups on campus that have passion in this area to talk about what they're doing so we can coalesce voices and to make sure they're all working on the same page as much as possible. We play a role in the behavioral threat assessment team, the behavioral intervention team, the medical withdrawal and return, and so we're doing all those things in addition to just the primary care services. Our scope is pretty wide-reaching, and part of that's because I think CAPS role is to help shift and change the culture of making sure all students are getting what they need, and I think that's what's happening nationally.

So one of the things that I wanted to share was although we're doing a lot of CAPS, we have partners who are also really helping us in our extension of what

we do. So, for example, primary care services - below us on the second floor - where a student would go if they need a flu shot or have an ankle sprain ... I'll just share with you about 30% of all of their appointments are mental health related. And so we know that some students that might present with somatic concerns and they might present at the health center, because there's less stigma. And so we know that what they're doing is an extension of serving us. And they see tens of thousands of appointments a year.

Health promotion, we also know, is doing a lot of substance-use treatment, eating and body sort of treatment, so they're also engaging in mental health services outside of CAPS.

So in a nutshell, our updates include many of the things we talked about. We've had an expansion of staffing, so when I came here, there was about 12 or 13 counselors on staff. We have 28 that we can hire, so we have more than doubled our counseling staff in a matter of 6-7 months. We have multiple locations. We're offering embedded counselors in the residence halls and students' phones. We've doubled our group program utilization. And the thing that I really don't talk about often, which is just the clinical and cultural integration of taking 2 departments with 2 different scopes of practice, 2 different histories, and really getting them to work together. And we're operating on 2 different electronic medical record systems right now. So that's the back-end thing that I don't share a lot, but really part of our day-to-day life.

The student mental health coalition, they talked about bringing students together. And then really redesigning our clinical system. I really charged the staff when I came here of rethinking every single step from how the student would know we exist to how would they walk in, how would we greet them, what forms, who do they meet with, what's the follow up care. To really think about every step in the process. How can we reduce wait times and how can we improve the student experience? And so we've offered now 3 different types of screen appointments. We have urgent screen appointments, regular screen appointments. And then we have appointments for students that if they just come in and say, "You know, I don't even know if I wanna be a client. I just wanna talk to someone for 10 minutes. Can I just do that?" Now they can. And there's very limited paperwork they need to fill out, and we offer them a consultation. If it's more serious, then we do connect them to our durational system.

We have continuity of follow-up care expectations now. So we have a system in which when students come in and tell their story, ideally they just meet with that one person. And they continue to meet with them. And so we know how hard it is for students to tell their stories multiple times. So the idea is that if someone comes in and meets with a student, screens them, you keep them. And you provide the treatment, if possible.

And then community referral coordination. So because of needing to refer students into the community, we're engaging in more efforts to really expand our relationships to tracking those students and to really making sure that when they get referred out, it's actually a successful referral. So we're engaged in some of that this semester.

So some counseling data. As a snapshot, so we've had about 21% increase in unique student utilization just in 1 year, which is a lot. That's actually a good thing. I think, historically, my understanding is that counseling center utilization was around 5 or 6%. Nationally, our Big 10 peers have about 10% on average, so we're needing to capture some more students. So that 21% increase is actually a very positive thing. It shows that more students are coming in and getting help. And our total screening appointments, we had a 44% increase. So the number of students that walk in the first time, 50% increase in our individual counseling appointments, and about 100% increase or doubling of our group therapy, just relative to what the services were 1 semester ago.

So, as you can see, there's been significant investment and changes and really serving our students. The number of unique students, I just put an asterisk, because that 21% doesn't take into consideration the consultations that we don't capture through our clinical record system. So I guess it might be closer more to 25 or 30% increase, if we included that.

So a brief write-down about academic status utilization. So we have about 88% or so of our clientele at CAPS are undergraduate students. 78% or so of the student body is undergrad, so what that says is that more undergraduate students than what we would expect are coming in. And so, in some ways, that is actually fairly consistent nationally. We know that undergraduate students can utilize services more. Graduate students have different things going on, different resources. But it does raise the question of why is that? What's going on here? Is this appropriate? How do we reach out to different graduate schools and to make sure that we're connecting those students to services? Very consistent nationally.

Top 3% of concerns: stress, anxiety are usually conflated. Very similar things students tend to think about in a similar way. And depression. And that's really what's happening nationally. If I went down the road, other concerns are academic concerns, relationship concerns are the next common things. And so we're very consistent with national trends in terms of what students are sharing their concerns are.

I'll share a few words about the presence of suicidality during non-urgent screen appointments. So when our students come in for screening, we ask them a host of questions. The one is: have you had thoughts of suicide? And so for students who come in and say, "Actually we're not in crisis." We're not in crisis, I don't need to be seen today, necessarily, but I just want an appointment. 44% of them are suicidal. And these are students who say, "We're not in crisis", but that we

offer a paper form, and we know it's hard to put some things on a paper form. And so the ones that say, "We're not in crisis", when we actually meet with them individually, there is some degree of suicidal thoughts. It doesn't mean it's severe, or that it's actionable, or that we need to engage in hospitalization, but about 1 in 2 students not in crisis have that going on. Which is why we offer a same-day screening system, which is why we don't want for students to wait a week or two to get in initially. We want them to come in right now. A student could walk in right now, if that was going on.

Hospitalizations, we average about 2 a week. Had about 30 or so last semester. And, unfortunately, that's very consistent with what's happening nationally, as well. I've worked at some other Division I schools, and that's pretty par for the course. So we're seeing here what other schools are seeing. And with regard to MySSP, I still think it's very early to know what the trends are in terms of where we're at. But it's been a soft roll-out this fall. We're starting to do some more promotion. I think each month there's been a few hundred students have downloaded the app. A few hundred students that are utilizing the app, and I think that's continued to grow and grow. And so we're having an upward trend. And our hope is to get that into the thousands and for students to really feel like that's a way to connect for services outside of CAPS, especially when we're not open.

So that's all I have. Thank you for your time, and I'll let you get back.

Deborah M.: Any questions for Dr. Patishnock? Yes? Yep. You wanna go up?

Juliet G.: Hi. Juliet Guzzetta. College of Arts and Letters. So I really appreciate this. I found it really helpful and interesting. And it sounds great. But anecdotally, I've had really a number of students, particularly undergrad - but also grads - say they've gone to CAPS. Right, they come to us, then in class or after class about issues. And that the wait time was months. Which doesn't seem consistent with the presentation. So I'm just wondering what your thoughts are on that.

Mark P.: Yeah, no I really appreciate that. I think a lot of times it's hard to ... When I talk about wait times, initially, what I'm talking about same-day access. So the wait time is nothing up front, generally. Other than just sitting in a waiting room. I think what you're referring to is the students that come in and they're saying how long they're having to wait. And so generally, anecdotally, throughout ... If you look across the spectrum of students, they're generally waiting, being scheduled for out-patient therapy generally every 2-3 weeks. On average, when they get accepted into our system.

If you look at that, though, that was probably about midway, 2/3, midway through the semester that had changed. Because when I had come, there was a waitlist from last semester. There was a waitlist from the summer. And so we actually changed our clinical system to get rid of the waitlist in that way. If we're gonna keep students, we need to be able to see them within a reasonable period

of time. If not, try to connect them elsewhere. And so, absolutely, that's a concern that I think is still there. Especially during peak times. And so they goal is to really not have them being seen any more than 2-3 weeks in general.

But I'll also say is that it can be really difficult. Each student, when I learn how long they're waiting, I never necessarily know what that means on the surface. I don't want them waiting at all, right? I want them to be seen as soon as they need to be seen. But sometimes students are requesting to see a certain counselor that has a certain demographic background. Sometimes counselors are requesting to get a certain trauma-type of treatment, and we might have 1 or 2 therapists that have that specific training and that area. So sometimes it's a reflection of a match. It's a reflection of the severity in the [inaudible 01:08:44], the type of treatment protocol, the recommendations, and how they're working with psychiatry in other ways. And so, in some ways, it's hard to know, but I absolutely agree with what you're saying. And I hear that, too. And I think we're working to reduce the wait times and to figure out at what point do we then just need to refer them in the community so that when they do get connected, they get seen regularly enough. Absolutely, yeah.

Juliet G.: Yep.

Speaker 4: [Salina Nunez-Ethrop 01:09:09]. So I have a couple of questions, and let me just start by saying I appreciate your presentation, and I appreciate all the increase of effort that has gone into this and all the thought of putting these 2 departments together.

My first question has to do with the fact that 5 psychiatrists, to me, for a body of so many students seems really low. And it seems like the numbers of students that are struggling doesn't stop to increase. And we should, perhaps, be thinking much more than this. So I'd like to hear your comments on that.

Well, perhaps, I'll let you answer to that, and then move on to the other one.

Mark P.: Okay. Sure, yeah. And so, when I look at the numbers, I really don't know what they mean. What I care about is can we serve our students? How many folks do we need relative to the resources in our community and getting them connected. I think, yeah, with our psychiatric staff, it's actually fairly large, believe it or not, for a university counseling center. Sometimes it's hard to even hire one. But what you'll know is that our psychiatrist will tend to schedule out months in advance.

There are times where a student will come in, they'll be identified needing psychiatric services, and it'll be 2 or 3 months to get connected. Once they get connected, they typically are followed for multiple years, but I think getting in, yes, there's a shortage of psychiatrists, and I think - as you can see - the wait time for initial appointments. And that's part of why we really rely on primary

care to also provide scripts. But you're right. I think the demand is there, and I think students are waiting a while, yeah.

Speaker 4: But is there a plan to try to increase this number? To try and attract more psychiatrists to the area? I mean, I understand the problem is not just in student support, right? Outside student support, there's a real shortage.

Mark P.: Right. So we're at, I think of our 5 FTE, I think we're about ... We're mostly funded. We've mostly filled all of our positions. I think there's a part-time here or there. So we're mostly staffed at where we're funded at the moment.

Speaker 4: Okay. So the other question had to do with those that do not get to your [inaudible 01:11:23] center or wherever. So there are many students that are walking around that, perhaps, some faculty understand something is going on. And, perhaps, they even have a conversation with a student, but the student either is in denial or just really doesn't want to do anything about it. So does your center have any plan on how to encourage the student to come in and reduce the stigma that is still there?

Mark P.: Yeah, absolutely. There's a couple things we're trying to work on. The first is, I'm trying to bring ... There's a model called "Let's Talk" that I'm working right now to review and to bring. And so Let's Talk essentially is this model to capture students who otherwise wouldn't come into CAPS. And, honestly, that's probably the area that I'm most passionate about. I'm generally not worried about the students at CAPS, because there's reassurance that they've been reviewed and connected. I'm worried about the students that don't walk in.

So Let's Talk is a model that's been developed out of the University of Cornell. There's a lot of research and a lot of institutions have implemented this. Essentially, what we do is we stick someone like me in one of the residential or academic colleges or student support areas - let's say half a day a week, 4 hours a week - and then that's the point person. They're the liaison. They're consulting informally. They're talking with you all. They're talking with other staff members, and a student can just drop in and just talk with them there. And so right now, I'm working on about a 6 month plan to actually implement this for the fall, if possible, knowing that we have to run this through various constituencies and my staff. But the goal is to implement this 13 or 15 counselors out there this fall, and including all of your respective colleges.

We're also trying to revamp our QPR suicide prevention efforts this upcoming fall. My understanding is about 7 years or so, a bunch of us here at MSU were trained to do this training, and that's really what it is. You go out and you train people how to have these conversations. How to make these successful referrals, and to really engage people to activate themselves to get involved and help students.

So we're really hoping to get outside of the physical building of CAPS, integrate ourselves more into the community and have mental health professionals more immersed throughout campus. So there's a couple plans for that, yes.

Deborah M.: Thank you. Other questions? I would like to let you know that Dr. Patishnock gave a presentation today at the College of Music. And he is, I'm gonna say this - I haven't asked him about this - but I believe he is available to come to various colleges and give a talk to that college. And at the College of Music, he was able to give us statistics on how many people from the College of Music were utilizing CAPS. And it was very helpful and he answered lots of questions, and he was there for about an hour, and it was a very useful thing. So I would encourage other colleges to look into this.

Mark P.: Thank you. I'd be happy to come to any college. And I'm a certified QPR instructor, so happy to come do that and meet with any of your respective colleges anytime. Thank you.

Deborah M.: Thank you very much. Next, we have the Board of Trustees response to the Reclaim MSU proposal. Dr. Jennifer Johnson is not here today, so Dr. Michael Kaplowitz will be ...

Speaker 5: [crosstalk 01:14:35]

Deborah M.: ... giving the report.

Dr. Kaplowitz: Deb, you'll have to help me.

Deborah M.: Yeah.

Dr. Kaplowitz: OK. So the update is that, as you know, last spring there was a motion that found support that was sponsored by faculty that we are all calling the Reclaim MSU proposal. There was some radio silence and never a response from the Board of Trustees after that motion was passed along. So the steering committee put together a written memo earlier in the ... during the fall semester. And we resubmitted it to the Board of Trustees, and we asked for a written response to that ballot and that set of recommendations.

We received a written response from the Board of Trustees that basically said, "We don't really understand what you're proposing for the first point in the Reclaim proposal. And the other points all seem to us to be unconstitutional, so we're not going to further reply to that." That written response was shared as an attachment, I believe, to the agenda. It was discussed or shared with Reclaim MSU as well, and the steering committee has sent those issues to appropriate governance committees for further review, response, recommendations, so that we can then respond as a faculty to the Board of Trustees.



Deborah M.: Yes. I think that is very accurate. We sent the proposal to the Board of Trustees initially. We received no response. Then we resent it and asked for a written response. And this has been our ... the new policy of the steering committee is things that we send to the Board of Trustees or that we send to the Presidential Search Committee, we are asking for written responses. So that we get something back so that we can have something to report back to you.

And the Reclaim MSU, what we're calling the Reclaim MSU proposal, which was passed by faculty senate and then sent to the Board of Trustees. They responded and, because the steering committee basically steers things to committee, we have steered it to University Committee on Faculty Affairs and the University Committee on Student Affairs, because those are the 2 committees that would be looking into this for a response to the Board of Trustees Response.

Yes.

Analuna Borcila: Hi everyone. Hi again. I'm Andaluna Borcila from James Madison College. I'm also one of the two people who put forward the Reclaim MSU policy proposal to faculty senate. So I have some questions, and then some things that I'm going to urge you to do. And I know you know already what they are, because at least I spoke with Professor Moriarty about this briefly. But before I do that, I should say that this policy proposal, work on it started immediately after the failure of the upper administration or after ... the fielder of the upper administration was revealed. And then after the ways in which they failed to respond to the impact statement by Nassar survivors, President Lou Anna Simon left, resigned. The Board of Trustees appointed John Engler, and John Engler needs to go. He needs to go. We didn't want him here. And then, we started working on this policy proposal. We started working on the policy proposal. Because we believe there's a problem with culture, policy, and leadership at MSU, and they are linked.

This faculty body, this body, has been one of the most progressive bodies on campus in the last years - in the last year - in terms of people actually coming, speaking up, speaking their mind, and pushing for changes. And one of the accomplishments, in my view, of this body, is to draw attention to the ongoing and continuing problems that exist within our upper administration and within our culture.

Now, this Faculty Summit endures the Reclaim MSU proposal in April. And just 2 quick things. I'm really thankful that the steering committee pushed the proposal [inaudible 01:19:41] in April to the Board of Trustees for a written response in November. In November. I'm not grateful for the lag time, I understand that there was some response from the Board initially, but we never knew what it was. And now we have this response from the Board of Trustees.

This response, the second point, as far as I can see, does not mention unconstitutionality anywhere. So I just wanna make it clear, and you might remember this, that I have stood up here at this microphone since the beginning

of this semester quite a few times to ask the former chair, Dr. LaDuca, about our proposal. Because he brought up the fact that it was unconstitutional, I came to the microphone at least 3, if not 4, times to say, "Who called it unconstitutional? In what context was it called unconstitutional? What parts of it are unconstitutional?" And I urged him, as chair of Faculty Summit, to continue to push for this proposal, because we need a change in structure, and we need an open presidential search.

And what the answer that I was given was that it was unconstitutional. Over and over again. Okay, so now we got the Breslin BoT response, so this is signed by former Board of Trustees Breslin, as you saw. This is not the response we got from the new Board of Trustees, and as you know, if you were on University Council, when the nominees for the Board of Trustees come to talk to us, there was public support for an open presidential search from these trustees who got elected. And who, by the way, Reclaim MSU reached out to before they were the nominees of the democratic party to endorse this proposal.

So this is the Breslin BoT response. And what I have seen in it is 2 things. One is asking for clarification, and that clarification is easy to provide. I can provide it now, I can provide it at a later point. It's actually quite simple. We left some things open, because we didn't want to force the hand of the board to make all the changes we asked them. But we asked for University Board, and I can provide these clarifications. If I have the time or, if not, in writing later.

The second part is, they're not calling anything unconstitutional. They're talking about the presidential search. And they say, and I'm looking to quote, that "they believe that the concerns have subsequently been addressed, as reflected in the composition of the presidential search committee, and the inclusive and transparent process the committee has followed." I don't think that they have actually addressed our concerns at all, and in this body - as well as on University Council - people have stood up numerous times to talk about how these concerns have not been addressed.

Since the listening sessions, the search has been completely closed. Faculty Senate have raised numerous times issues about the presidential search process. So they don't mention unconstitutionality here. They just mention that they have subsequently addressed these issues.

So I understand that a proposal that has not gone through committee should go to committee. But this was an endorsed proposal. The letter finally went out to the Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees finally responded in writing. And they responded, frankly, much better in terms of first paragraph than I thought they would. Clarify this: is this supplementary or complementary to the board, or does it require the change in structure of the board?

My request would be that what needs to happen now - or my suggestion, stronger than a suggestion. I would like to request that what should happen now

is that the Faculty Senate leadership actually respond to what the board is asking in the first paragraph. Clarification: we can provide that clarification. We're the body that endures that. I'm one of the people worked on it and put it forward. I can provide it to you in one minute. And then, as to point 2, that Faculty Senate ...

Section 3 of 4 [00:56:00 - 01:24:04]

Section 4 of 4 [01:24:00 - 01:49:19]

Analuna Borcila: And then as to point two, that faculty senate leaderships say we don't believe you have addressed the concerns we brought up, and we strongly urge you to open the search. I think that it is really important for us to continue to press for transparent inclusive open search because, and I'm not going to get into legal issues now, because look at where our collective secrecy has brought us and look at what their decisions have brought us to. But, we should just push forward and say this is important. It's really important for us. And I'm happy to make other points, more specific ones.

I'm happy to explain, for instance, the point about the university board, if you wish, but I don't want to take all the time. So if I can drink some water, also, my lips are really dry because of the DayQuil I'm taking, that would be great. Thank you.

Deborah M.: I'm sorry, could you come to the microphone?

Analuna Borcila: They can't do anything about the constitutional amendment. They can't do anything about that. The most important point for us was that Senate endorsed this and that what we've basically asked them to do was to adopt by-laws. That would allow us to have a consistent voice in governance and to be able to have an inclusive search. Those are the things that are within the purview of our board of trustees. This faculty senate endorsed, or we've said we would like a constitutional amendment, but that is not an issue that needs to be what we're focusing on right now. What we're focusing on right now should be the search and the university board.

Deborah M.: Yes, please. If I could just maybe clarify a little bit what was happening at the steering committee. When the Reclaim MSU proposal was endorsed by faculty senate, the letter came from faculty senate, so it was initially sent to the board of trustees. They did not respond. Then we sent asking for a written response. At that point, they did respond. It has been sent twice. Now at this point in time, this is a faculty senate letter of endorsement of this proposal. In order to follow the process that we would normally follow, then we go into, it goes then to committee and it would go to USFA and USCA because they claim it's no longer the Reclaim MSU proposal, it is now something that is faculty senate.

So it is strongly recommended, and the steering committee would strongly recommend, I believe, that both USFA and USCA consult with Reclaim MSU before coming up with a response to this letter to the board of trustees. At any

point in time, Reclaim MSU is welcome to send whatever they would like to send to the board of trustees and nobody would ever stop that from happening. But if it comes from faculty senate, then it needs to go through the faculty senate process of going to committee and letting the committee talk to Reclaim MSU, clarify, and then come up with a response that would then go back to the steering committee and would then come to faculty senate again. It will eventually come back to faculty senate, it's just that as I said, the steering committee doesn't write letters.

Analuna Borcila: But just to clarify, this proposal has already done to steering committee before, but what we're asked to do now is to respond to the board's response.

Deborah M.: Right. Exactly.

Analuna Borcila: So it's not about taking the proposal back to get it vetted, it's about responding to the board. That's a step forward. Anything else would be a step back, right?

Deborah M.: It's a faculty senate clarification of the proposal. And the faculty senate clarification of the proposal needs to come from committees that are sub-committees of faculty senate. Standing committees.

Analuna Borcila: But this will really slow down ...

Philomena: Perhaps I can help you.

Analuna Borcila: Yes, go ahead.

Philomena: Perhaps I can help you here. I don't know how the others feel, but I am feeling extremely frustrated with this process. My level of frustration is beyond what I can contain. I think this is amazing that it took this long to come up with a letter like this as a response. I think it's really shameful, actually, that they were sitting on this and didn't respond, and I would urge the steering committee to not sit on this. I would like a 24 hour turnaround for this because it seems ridiculous that we take the same slow approach when there are really important things happening, like a presidential search, that could determine our fate for the next generation.

Deborah M.: Can you say your name?

Analuna Borcila: Could I add to this one more thing? We have two people on the committee that support it, or at least said they do.

Philomena: Philomena Nunez for [inaudible 01:29:24]

Deborah M.: Thank you.

Analuna Borcila: Thank you.

Deborah M.: We also spoke with the two members of the board of trustees when we met with them on Monday, and told them what we were doing and what the plan was, and they totally agreed that it was fine. We did bring up the Reclaim MSU proposal because we felt that it was an important thing to bring up at that particular meeting, knowing that they were most likely in favor of that proposal.

Analuna Borcila: Could I just say one quick thing? It really does matter how we put things forward, though. They were fine, of course, because why would they want to push back against faculty voice as new board of trustees members? But if you would have communicated to them, with all due respect, we think it's important that you look at this proposal now, they would've been fine with that, too, I'm assuming. You know? I don't know, but of course we need to proceed as a unified front on this. If we undermine ourselves, and I'm concerned that this is what might be happening now, if we, willfully or not, if we undermine ourselves, this will not be good for us moving forward in terms of actually being able to impact change. I really thank Professor Nunez for her words and I think that we really should proceed moving forward rather than backward or sidestepping on this. Thank you.

Deborah M.: Yes, thank you.

Robert: Robert O'Forley, from engineering. I guess I don't understand what are the procedures, but basically we are dealing with a different board of trustees at this point, and so for the members of the steering committee, I think it's an important thing that needs to be taken up fairly quickly, and so if we are looking ahead and looking at all the options that are available, is it possible to just say, ignore this letter that just came to us, and just send the original proposal to this new board. Is that a possibility?

Deborah M.: Yes. That is a possibility. That is a possibility that can be brought to the steering committee, or it could come back from UCFA or from UCSA is just to resubmit the proposal as it is and see whether or not the new board of trustees would be willing to do this. That is a possibility. But the reason we sent it to committee was because there is a new board of trustees, to find out exactly, because of the transition, would it be best to have a response to the letter from Trustee Breslin, or ex-trustee Breslin, or would it be better to simply resubmit the letter as it is, or would it be better to re-submit the letter with a clarification? There are lots of options, and then UCFA and UCSA will be able to look into that and then give us some advice, at which point, we will do something immediately.

Robert: Is that something that can be done in a fairly reasonable period of time?

Deborah M.: UCFA meets every other week, so we expect to hear from UCFA at the next steering committee meeting or as soon as they come up with a recommendation.

Robert: Okay. I think this is really important. That's our next president we're talking about. If we allow the same things that happened with Peter Macpherson, it's not going to be very good.

Deborah M.: I think that one of the things that we have now sent forward three requests. One is the Reclaim MSU proposal, another was the request to have the board of trustees who were members of the search committee have voice and not voice, and the other one was to allow us to submit questions that would go to the president. The Reclaim MSU proposal was narrowly passed by faculty senate, the other two proposals were very clearly passed by, first one was unanimously passed by university council, the second one was passed with only four people voting against it at university council, I'm sure you all remember this. We have not received positive responses to any of these. It will be interesting to see what happens with a new board of trustees and whether or not we should start resubmitting things and see what happens, but for right now, the new board of trustees essentially started on Wednesday. Yeah.

Juliet G.: Hi again, Juliet Guisetta, college of arts and letters. I have a question, really, for all of us, which is that I can't figure out where we stand in terms of the level of seriousness of the finalists being an open search for the presidential committee. So we send up the requests, they have not been favorably looked upon. We will now send a response, and where are we going? Because the question that I keep hearing from us and from colleagues is, we need an open search for finalists. We need an open search for finalists. We need to be able to interact with them. We need to be able to see them and get a feel for them and we need to be able to voice our opinion.

So as representatives of those colleagues, I'm wondering what is the plan when we keep hearing, "Thanks, but no thanks," from the board of trustees and what measures are we willing to take to continue to feel, maybe not even continue, maybe just start to feel like we're really being taken seriously in terms of who the next president is going to be, because it's not just us. The whole country. Recently, the stuff with Angler and his newest comments about the survivors, and this is in the Washington Post, it's not just in the Detroit free press.

And as you yourself, Dr. Moriarty once responded to me with a related question, this search demands different procedures because there have been different circumstances. What are we willing to do? What are the next steps? Generally, I'm feeling time ticking in my life, but time is ticking on this search and I think it's well underway and we are not on top of it.

Dr. Kaplowitz: Michael Kaplowitz, Ag and Natural Resources. It occurs to me that some of us have heard the board of trustees or members of the board of trustees talk about what they will and won't do, what members of the search committee think is open or not open or what is recommended by their expert. But I think that it might be appropriate for us to invite the search committee chairs to come before this body or university council, maybe even next week, to share with the

university community what their plan going forward with the search is and hear directly from faculty and administrators about their concerns, their hopes or aspirations going forward. I don't know if that's the kind of thing we make a motion for here, if you would like some signal of support for that idea, but I think that especially since there is some time pressure, it might help us to be face to face with some of the characters in this play that we're all part of instead of sending letters back and forth, because as is well explained, our procedures are designed to take weeks and months, if not semesters to complete, if not years.

The hiring process is ongoing and it might be time for some face to face discussions, because perhaps in that context, we can make mutually beneficial progress, especially now that the new board has members who have different points of view. So, Deb, as our chair, or provost [inaudible 01:38:00] might you be able to help us think through how we can invite those people to be before our body.

Deborah M.: We can certainly invite them. Right now the new members of the board are not members of the presidential search committee. So the members of the presidential search committee are Diane Barrowman, Melanie Foster, our chairs, and I believe the other two members are Daniel Kelly and Joel Ferguson. They are both members of the old board. The three new members of the board are not members of the presidential search committee but as part of the board, they will make the final choice. In one sense, we're dealing with a new board, but we are also dealing with an old search committee. So the search committee has not changed.

Provost: But I think your point is well taken. The landscape has changed and the chairs of the search committee now are representing a different board than when they began. I think your notion of sitting face to face with folks and having a conversation has some merit. I don't know what the outcome would be, but I think that has real merit. That's just one person's opinion.

Deborah M.: I think it has merit, but I think if we were going to invite the chairs of the search committee, it would also be a good idea to invite a couple of the new members of the board at the same time, so that we have people who are representing the old search committee and the new board so that they all can hear what it is that we have to say. One of the things that I think is very important is for people to realize that the steering committee is not trying to put brakes on things. The steering committee wants things to move forward, the steering committee wants things to happen. We're doing as much as we possibly can within the parameters that we are given by the bylaws.

For instance, having a written response. We've never done that before. We've never asked for written responses to anything. We started to do that since there was the vote of no confidence and the board of trustees simply didn't respond and we had several things that they just simply did not respond to, they acted like we didn't exist. So now we are making sure that they know we exist. And

that's one of the reasons for sending letters, and that's one of the reasons for requiring a written response. Some things like that have to go through channels.

But there are other things like having people come here and talk that I think is not just reasonable, but what we would like to have happen. So, should we take a straw vote as to whether people would like us to invite? Next week we have John Beck coming to get, I think you all got that, initiatives again for the presidential search. It would actually tie in pretty well. I think he needs usually about an hour, so if we were to start off with people from the board of trustees and, could I see a show of hands for people who would like to see that happen?

Analuna Borcila: I'm sorry, are we doing this in lieu of responding to the Reclaim MSU policy proposal or the board of trustees response, which was the item on the agenda? I don't mean to interrupt, but we were deciding what to do about that, and then it became, should we invite the trustees here? I'm all right with that.

Deborah M.: I'm just interrupting the discussion slightly to do this, if that's okay.

Juliet G.: Can I comment about that?

Deborah M.: Yes.

Juliet G.: I like the idea, my only concern is that then we have trustee Byron here, and like last time, she says, "I hear you, and I respectfully disagree." My question is, what then is the plan? They disagree, so we're inviting them here to say they disagree, and then what is our response? I want to be unified on this.

Deborah M.: Essentially, go ahead. Yeah, sorry.

Analuna Borcila: May I suggest that we basically respond to the board of trustees letter invitation to clarify, and clarify and say that they haven't responded to our request as specified, and then invite them to come and talk to us. That's the issue, that's on the agenda. I don't understand why we need to go to UCFA in order to respond to the board of trustees response to our proposal when it took us seven months to get that proposal to them and get a written response from them and I just want to add to this that I made the request that the steering committee ask for a written response. I went to that meeting to ask for that in November at your encouragement, Professor Moriarty, so I think that there is no specific process that we're following here to take this to UCFA and UCSA. There is no process that's written in the bylaws for this. We've asked, they've written, they've sent us a response, we respond and then we talk to them. Thank you.

Marilyn: Marilyn Johnson, Eli Broad college of business. My views on this topic have changed after following the recent presidential search at my undergraduate alma mater, the University of Minnesota. Two of the three finalists withdrew from the search when they were informed that their names would be made public. In thinking about this and evaluating the trustees' response, I think it would be



helpful to know what current norms in presidential searches like the search at our university are, and then to ask ourselves, given the norms, what's reasonable given the issues here that may make this job less desirable than the presidential position at some other universities that are currently searching, and is what we're asking reasonable in light of current norms?

Deborah M.: Thank you. Other comments?

Juliet G.: Juliet Guisetta, arts and letters, regarding current norms, I absolutely understand that position, but again, I was really struck by your point, Dr. Moriarty, a few months ago about, we're not in a normal situation here. This isn't your typical search. Whatever we decide, one question, while we're still in the confidential phase of, "What would be your reaction if, for finalists, we make this public?" Is actually a really telling and interesting question. Still maintaining anonymity, what are your views, how are you reading the university here, our situation, and do you think it might be appropriate to have your name made public if you become a finalist, and would you like to engage with faculty and students?

Deborah M.: Other comments?

Philomena: I just want to reiterate.

Deborah M.: Say your name again, sorry.

Philomena: Philomena Nunez, [inaudible 01:45:47], I just want to reiterate we should not be wasting time with this. I support the previous proposal. Just respond, there's no reason why all these committees, and if the chair feels very strongly that you need to get input from these committees, that can be done over email in an overnight sort of circumstance and just provide a response that does not allow for this to continue. This is a waste of time. This letter is not a useful letter. If they had any doubt, any clarification, that could've been one email and that would've been solved. Six months or seven months to respond in this way, it's a waste of time and we should not participate in that wasting of time. We do not have time to waste.

Deborah M.: Anyone else? Thank you for your comments. This is not an action item. So therefore, we're not voting on it. However, if there is interest in bringing someone from the board of trustees, bringing what was suggested, which is the chairs of the search committee and the two other members of the board of trustees to our university council, we can certainly do that. I'm not quite sure how to proceed. Is there interest? Is there a show of hands of people who would be interested in having this happen? If you would like to have this happen, please raise your hand. If you would not like to have this happen, please raise your hand. Okay. We will work on having Melanie FASTER, Diane Byron, who are the two chairs of the committee, and Kelly Teabane and Brionne Scott, who are the two new board members who are in town, as I believe, those are the ones

that we spoke with and I think those are the ones that Reclaim MSU has been talking to and we will have them come the next time.

Provost: Dr. Moriarty, hearing the discussion today, is there any reason that the steering committee, it's not 'we,' I'm not on the steering committee, any reason that the steering committee cannot seek advice from the relevant committees via email for this response?

Deborah M.: No, we can certainly seek advice from the relevant committees via email. Absolutely. And get a response and see what, as I say, there are different options. There's the option of simply re-submitting the letter to the new board, there's the option of clarification, which would involve connecting with Reclaim MSU, and there's the option of coming up with a proposal that is something different that would come then back to faculty senate. Those are the options that I'm seeing right now, but those aren't necessarily the only options, and we will be in touch with the committees to find out.

And it's now five after 5:00 and Dr. Steve Hanson has been waiting for a very long time, and would you be willing to come back and wait again in a future faculty senate meeting and we will put you on first? Okay. All right. Is there a motion to adjourn? Second. All in favor? Opposed? Motion carries. Thank you very much.

Section 4 of 4 [01:24:00 - 01:49:19]