

Deborah M.: I'd like to call the meeting to order. Is there a motion to approve the agenda for February 19. Second. Any additions to the agenda? All in favor say aye.

Female: Aye.

Deborah M.: Opposed? Motion carries. Is there a motion to approve the draft minutes from January 15th, 2019? Motion, second? And take a look at the minutes any additions or deletions? Any changes all in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries. The president's remarks. Acting president Satish Udpa.

Satish Udpa: Let me begin by mentioning two pieces of information that I suspect you already know through the newspapers. The first piece of information was that a week and a half ago we decided to terminate Bob young our general counsel. You're all aware of that. And we have a new General Counsel now Brian Quinn. I must say that I like working with Brian Quinn. His style is very akin to my own style, and I think there is chemistry and that's important. The second thing I did was at the board meeting I offered an apology to all the survivors. Some of the survivors at least came back and told me they liked that. Now I don't know if every survivor would respond in the same spirit, but I'd like everyone to look at the institution in a different light relative to say a week ago.

I continue to be in the information soaking mode. There are so many things that are new to me and I'm absorbing a lot of facts. But let me give you some things that I've been doing. One is that I met a small group of survivors about two weeks in a very private session, got some feedback from them. There's a lot of pain, there's a lot of pain. And I wish we had gone to them a year ago, a year and a half ago we didn't do that. I want to everything to minimize their pain and suffering, so that's one thing. I also have been meeting with various student groups including [inaudible]. Their issues are important to us and we need to address them over a period of time, so I'm committed to doing that. I continue to listen to various groups.

Some other things, we submitted a request to the Department of Education for an extension to the ... we had to put a response together for the Clery report, the interim Clery report. And I'm pleased to let that we received a 90 day extension. We have an outside counsel helping us and we are going to contest many things in that report, because some of them are not true. There are many things that are in the report that I think we should address. We are going to look at those in the next few days. Changes that we are looking at are, do we need a designated Clary officer? This thing has been biting us, and every time there's a mistake we pay up to \$55,000 a mistake. I would suggest that if we have someone who did nothing but this thing there would be fewer mistakes, and we'll probably end up spending a lot less money on the Department of Education.

The other thing that we need to do is, if we decide to have a Clary officer, who does that person report to? Right now that is being done out of the General

Counsel's office, I'm uncomfortable with that. I would like that person to report to someone else may be the compliance officer, maybe the police department. I don't know we haven't thought about it yet. But I don't want that person to report to the General Counsel's Office, and we are thinking about it. The other thing that was mentioned in the interim Clary report was we need some consolidation of our HR records. Let's say that a person commits something in College A, when College B decides to hire this person, they don't have access to many of the records. We need some consolidation of records. And so that's something that they recommend. I'm having conversations with the HR to see how we can accomplish that. More to come on that.

The trustees are figuring out what to do with the healing fund. We made an announcement at the board meeting that it's going to be reinstated. We are going to impose a few additional constraints. We don't want fraud for sure. We are going to impose some ... We're going to stick to the main parameters that we announced a year ago, but we are going to make sure that whatever we do, we have checks and balances in there to make sure that fraud doesn't occur.

Lastly, in all of these things, it's easy for us to get immersed in this thing. I don't want to lose sight of the fact that we are a university and I want to restore that sense of being a university again. There are a number of things that are going on here that we should not lose sight of. We need to make sure that [EFREB] becomes operational in a year or year and a half. If we don't, shame on us, we cannot lose sight of that. we cannot lose sight of the initiatives that we are pushing forward in Africa that is dear to us. I want to make sure that we make the right kinds of investments in those kinds of things. One of the things that we are pushing forward is an initiative called the Ice Cube Project. This is a project in the Antarctica, and if you guys want to go to Antarctica, this is a great opportunity.

I want to push that. We want to be players in that NSF initiative. There are a number of exciting things that are going on the health colleges. There is a complex that is Coming up near the whole Clinical Center. Again, I want to make sure that we have adequate resources invested in that to make sure that we have major players in that effort. There is an initiative that's going on relating to the autonomous initiative where a number of colleges are coming together besides engineering and science. Social science, law, Business School. A whole bunch of colleges are engaged in that effort. This is a great way to bring colleges together. And if we don't do this, again, shame on us. We cannot let all the things that we're doing for the survivors suck up all the oxygen. We want to make sure that the energy that we are investing in all of these things continue and go on. That's all that I had to say, and I'm looking forward to listening to what else goes on in these meetings. Thank you.

Deborah M.: Thank you very much. Remarks from me. I would like to start off by thanking the secretary for Academic Governance office. Gary Hoppenstand and Sherry Lott very much for sending out the email ballot to the steering committee, and then

enabling us to put the ... to send it out to faculty senate for the African Studies program. It was something that the provost and the president very much wanted to have on the board of trustees agenda for Black History Month, and we were able to accomplish that. I also want to thank everyone for the very fast email responses that we received. Sometimes you wonder if you send out an email and it just goes into a black hole and this one was lots of people right away, we had a ... within 24 hours we had, it was already approved. So that has now been approved. The Board of Trustees approved it and thank you for your quick responses.

On your desk, on the table in front of you is a response from Reclaim MSU to the Board of Trustees response to the reclaim MSC proposal. This is not from faculty senate, this is from Reclaim MSU and Dr. Borcila will be talking about that in the comments from the floor. But I just wanted you to be aware that it was there in the event that we don't have time so that you can read it. And then the work session that we had with John Beck, the minutes from that, not the minutes but the comments from that, the asks and actions, comments, and the comments that everyone wrote will be available at University Council as an attachment. So, you'll get those next week.

New business. University Committee on Curriculum, Marci Mechtel.

Marci Mechtel: Marci Mechtel College of Nursing. UCC met at the end of January and approved the following programs. There are for new programs highlighted by an accounting analytics graduate certificate effective summer 2019. Agricultural Food and Natural Resources Education, Master of Arts effective fall 2019, Film Studies Graduate Certificate effective fall 2019, and Race and Ethnicity in the United States minor, effective fall 2019. There were 18 program changes and no program deletions. For courses there was approval for 41 new courses, 99 course changes and five course deletions, and there are no moratoriums or discontinuations to report thank you.

Deborah M.: Thank you. Would you like to make a motion to accept that report?

Marci Mechtel: I move that we accept the UCC report as given.

Male: Seconded.

Deborah M.: All in favor?

Female: Aye.

Deborah M.: Opposed? Motion carries. Thank you. From the last faculty senate meeting as promised we've put him first on the agenda, Dr. Steve Hansen, high risk travel process.

Steve Hansen: (silence)

Thank you. Is it working okay? Okay. I really appreciate you giving me a few minutes here today. I wanted to share with you for your information and for your input, a process that we've been working on in collaboration with the Provost to provide support for our faculty and staff who travel to high risk countries and regions. And let me start by saying right off the top what this is and what it isn't. And what it is, is really an effort to ensure that our faculty and staff are safe when they're doing their work around the world to help change lives. What it's not is an effort to have any attempt to tell faculty where they should work or how they should do their work. There's three things that have gotten us to this point right now.

One is that our faculty are literally around the world working to solve problems. And a lot of these problems are in risky places. When you put that together with what might be characterized as a just a general rise in risk around the world, we're at a point where there's been an increased demand for this kind of support from our faculty. The second piece is we're now in a better shape to assess, monitor and manage travel risk than we were in the past. The big thing that's happened here is three years ago, the Provost put into place an Office of International Health and Safety. And that's given us access to some specialized expertise and networks that position us much better to deal with travel risk. And then the third thing is a year and a half ago, we began to implement and launched a global travel registry. Now we actually know where our faculty are going to travel to and when they are traveling, we know every day where they're at. We have a real time database that we can locate our faculty.

We've gotten in a spot where there's an increased demand to provide support for risky travel, and now we have the capacity in place to help address some of those needs. Let me say a couple things about what it means to be a risky country or where does this come from. We actually have two categories that we have established, an extreme risk category and an elevated risk category. At the heart of this are the Department of State Travel Advisories and they revised this a year or two ago, but they rank from one which is normal travel all the way up to four which is a recommendation to not travel. And an important thing, even within countries now they will designate areas. So you might have a travel to country that says use increased caution, that has an area of that country that's actually a number for that recommends do not travel.

Our extreme risk countries are all of the level four countries from the Department of State, plus some other ones that we have elevated to extreme risk based on information and working with our different private security firms that we engage with. And so if you look here, here's a list of the 20 categories that we characterize as extreme risk. And these things change, so countries can come and go. The list today is actually ... This is out of date already. The list today is actually the same 20 countries, but some of them that are in white here now have actually moved to yellow. The Department of State has recognized some of

these countries we had already elevated to high risk, and is categorizing them as level four countries.

These are the countries that would be categorized as extreme risk. And I'll run you real quickly through the process that's being proposed. I will say this process has been piloted for the last few years in a project we have in Afghanistan. So you can see we've had 12 trips to Afghanistan that have run through this process. In the extreme risk countries, you can see there's been 45 total trips to these countries. So they would have run through this process, if it was in place all 45 of those would have ... with 38 different travelers. It looks something like this then. When you go and plug your trip into the global travel registry, if you're going to one of these extreme risk countries, it would flag it and it would send it back to the traveler and say, "We need some more information." And the traveler would fill out that information.

It goes to the Office of International Health and Safety. They do a security assessment. They send that security assessment to the traveler, to the college dean, and to a committee called FASTR, and that's Faculty And Staff Travel Review Committee. FASTR reviews the security assessment. It looks at mitigation strategy and makes recommendations to the dean of the college, and sends that information to the traveler as well. The dean looks at that information, gathers any other information he or she wants or needs, perhaps engages in a conversation with the traveler themselves, and makes a decision whether to support travel or not. There's one more step then if the decision is to support travel, then the travelers asked to sign an acknowledgement of risk. I'll come back to that in a minute. And once that's signed then the travel authorization is signed, and the traveler's good to go.

There's that other category I mentioned, the elevated risk ones. These are countries that are probably two or three, but there's a pocket or something in that country that's extreme risk. And so what happens if you enter one of those countries, then it would flag it, it would ask for more information about where you're traveling. That would go to OIHS, they would review it, and they would decide if the traveler's not traveling to the extreme risk area, goes through the normal system. If they are going to plan to travel to the extreme risk area, then it kicks into that process I just described before, and it goes to the FASTR Committee.

The last thing I'll mention here is this acknowledgement of risk, and My eyes are bad I can't even read under my screen here and I know it's terrible for you, but you should have that in the materials. And let me try to summarize what it acknowledges anyway. The traveler agrees to register in the global travel registry and keep that information up to date so we know where they're at, why they're in country. It's the traveler's responsibility to review the security assessment, and implement and develop a mitigation strategy. It's a recognition that the university can't guarantee the traveler's safety. It's also a recognition that the traveler is not required to take this trip as a condition of employment, and it also

recognizes that MSU will provide international health insurance, medical and security assistant if it's available for that country.

And I say if it's available, because we've had instances where things become so dire in a particular country that it's not available for the traveler. So that's what they would be asked to sign as an acknowledgement of risk. That's it. I welcome any comments or suggestions. And you can ... you may have some today or if you want to email those to myself or to [inaudible] Beck who's played a major role in helping pilot the initial phase of this. Thank you.

Deborah M.: Any questions for Dr. Hansen? I actually have one. If you are traveling in the summer when you are not actually being employed by the university, because we're on nine month appointments. Are you also supposed to register on the global registry?

Steve Hansen: Are we registering ... If it's not on university business, if it's not on university business, you wouldn't register in there. If it is university business then you'd register-

Deborah M.: Then you'd [crosstalk]. Okay thank. Any questions?

Robert Ofoli: What happens if-

Deborah M.: Yes.

Robert Ofoli: So during the summer ... Robert Ofoli, engineering. During the summer, some of us travel on behalf of professional societies. But that professional society basically is asking MSU to say, let me go to country a to do a programming for them. And in that case, even though I don't do the usual travel request, I still go through the international registry. In that case-

Steve Hansen: In that case you're still on [crosstalk] university business so you would register then.

Robert Ofoli: Okay, thank you.

Andaluna Borcila: I'm Andaluna Borcila James Madison College. Thank you for your presentation. Just to clarify, are you asking input from faculty or is this already done, and we just need to inform our people about it?

Steve Hansen: No, we're still looking for input. We're ready to launch but we wanted to bring it to Faculty Senate to gather any more information in case you have some ideas to modify this and make it more effective.

Andaluna Borcila: Can you give us a timeframe for like how long we have to get more input? I've solicited some but just to that. And I know from my colleagues, a lot of my colleagues, we travel internationally to do research.

Steve Hansen: I think we'd like it as quick as possible. We've been trying for several months to have this conversation. We can wait a week or so if that would be fine.

Andaluna Borcila: Okay. Thank you.

Steve Hansen: Yeah.

Deborah M.: [inaudible] question?

Male: No.

Deborah M.: Okay. Anyone else?

Steve Hansen: Thank you.

Deborah M.: Thank you very much. The at large slate of nominees and the athletic council slate of nominees Amanda Tickner, University Committee on Academic Governance. There she is.

Amanda Tickner: At our last UCAG we reviewed the slate of at large nominees for the steering committee and approved them all. There was none that we rejected. I guess I'm not quite sure what-

Deborah M.: This is an action item, so we need to approve it. We should do them separately. So-

Amanda Tickner: Yeah.

Deborah M.: Would you like to make a motion to approve the at large slate of nominees?

Amanda Tickner: Okay, yes. I make amotion to approve the at large slate of nominees.

Deborah M.: Would you have ... everyone has that as an attachment, is there any discussion? Yes, please.

Filomena Nunes: Yeah I'd like to-

Male: Could you come up to the microphone please.

Filomena Nunes: Filomena NunesLet, FRIB. I'd like to understand the process better. When you say you had a list of nominees and you accepted them all. what criteria did you use? Why do you accept them all? What's the thinking behind this?

Amanda Tickner: Right. Which is why we didn't reject any honestly. Because they're ... If somebody nominates themselves then they want to do the job, so there's not great criteria for rejecting them. So if we saw something problematic, if they

were not qualified by their position to be in that position, then perhaps by the bylaws, it says that you have to be a certain faculty status or whatnot. If that was problematic, then we might reject them. But otherwise it's sort of proforma.

Deborah M.: And this slate of nominees goes out to the entire faculty by email ballot for a vote. Any other discussion? All in favor of approval, say aye.

All: Aye.

Deborah M.: Opposed? Motion carries. The slate of nominees for the athletic council.

Amanda Tickner: Okay, Athletic Council. As part of our UCAG duties, we go through nominees for many university committees, including the Athletic Council. And so we reviewed all of the people who had self nominated and an indicated interest in this committee. When people do that they write short statements, so that is our primary criteria for reviewing who is going to be on this committee, is reviewing those statements. If they didn't write anything, which remarkable number of people ... If you ever want to be on one of these committees, please write something so we have something to evaluate. If you didn't write anything, you were eliminated from contention. And so after reviewing these, and the other considerations are we try and with these, all of the committees put up a slate of nominees that are somewhat diverse in there academic affiliation. So their schools and departments.

In this case, it was deemed that the statements were more important than keeping that diversity, so there is some duplication. There are two people from Human Medicine and two people from Osteopathic Medicine for that reason that we were prioritizing the statements rather than their departmental affiliation. But in general that is a consideration just to be transparent about our thinking process there. This is the slate of nominees, motion to approve the Athletic Council slate of nominees.

Deborah M.: Is there a second?

Male: Seconded.

Deborah M.: Discussion. How many nominees did you have?

Amanda Tickner: Off the top of my head I do not recollect the exact number, I would say that there were at least 40 people that put themselves up for this.

Deborah M.: And then this was brought down to the amount that we have now?

Amanda Tickner: Right. And there was some ... It was not as if everyone who wrote something got on the slate, we did discuss the qualities of their statements and so forth. And then also kind of knowledge of the committee of the different candidates as well was considered.



Male: It was [inaudible].

Amanda Tickner: Yeah, it was pretty extensive discussion actually for this one, because we recognize the importance of this particular council at this particular time, so we spent a lot of time deliberating on this.

Deborah M.: I'm just curious as to why everyone was put forward from at large, but you have a different process for the Athletic Council.

Amanda Tickner: Well, the at large committee we did not have anything to go on beyond the statements and yeah, I mean, we could have perhaps rejected some of those, but given the fact that we can all vote on them, it did not seem like it was reasonable to reject someone because we don't ... Yeah.

Deborah M.: Where as the Athletic Council is chosen by the president.

Amanda Tickner: It's chosen by the president. And so the vetting process there ... Essentially we were voting on the slate of people to present to the president to select from, whereas the steering committee at large nominee is for vote from everyone, and so the input is much broader. And so it was felt that rather than restrict the options for people to choose from that we leave that to be broader than our slate of Athletic Council nominees.

Deborah M.: Any other discussion? Yes.

Robert Ofoli: Robert Ofoli, engineering. On the senate ... No, on the steering committee you indicated who self nominated and who was nominated by whom. I see that information missing on the Athletic Council, so how were those people nominated? Yes.

Amanda Tickner: The Athletic Council, all of the council's that we select nominees for to give to the president or the Provost are self nominated.

Deborah M.: Any other discussion? All in favor say aye?

All: Aye.

Deborah M.: Opposed? Motion carries. Thank you. We now have Renee Rivard with the Teladoc utilization process.

Renee Rivard: (silence)

[inaudible] take me just a second here. I wanted talk to you this afternoon about ... It's just a couple of things. Many of you may be aware of a couple programs that we rolled out this past spring and again in the fall. The fall program that we rolled ... Thank you very much. The Fall program that we rolled out was a

telemedicine service called Teladoc. How many are familiar with Teladoc? A few hands. Okay, well, it's good that I'm here then. We'll talk a little bit about that. Teladoc is just that. It's a telemedicine service. It provides you access 24/7 to board certified physicians as well as pediatricians. It's basically a virtual consult or visit with a physician. There's also a level of behavioral health service physicians that are available as well. So you have access to social workers, psychologists and psychiatrists for those that might need some guidance or assistance with navigating, with a maybe a depression or some sort of stress situation, those services are available to you as well.

And so we launched this in October. If you were looking at or remember you opening enrollment materials at all, all those annoying emails that you get about open enrollment those are from me, so I'm sorry. We've had some success with rolling this out. This is one of those services that you don't really think about until you might need it. What I thought I would do today is give you a little bit of background and some statistics, but also walk you through how can you enroll and where do you go if you want to register for the program. This is one of those things that if you register in advance, when you do need to seek the service it's a lot easier than to connect with a physician through either the website or through your mobile app. However, you want to connect with a physician if you're pre registered.

It's not to say you can't register at the point you do need to connect with someone, but if you do that in advance, it makes a little quicker for you. I'm going to just give you a couple statistics here. We have about 75% of our visits are handled through a video chat with a physician. This is a very interesting new way to seek medical services. And obviously, this is not meant to take the place of your primary care physician. And it's also not meant to take the place of if you need to go to the emergency room because you have a very serious situation, then you go to the emergency room. If you need to go to urgent care because that's where you feel best seeking care, then you go to the urgent care that's closest to you to seek care.

This is really for what we're hearing from parents who have kids at home at two o'clock in the morning and they have an earache, they're running a fever, you're not sure what to do, so you connect with a physician who might give you some guidance on, "Yep, you need to go to urgent care." Or, "Nope, this is something that could probably wait till Morning." Or, "By the way, you need a prescription. Where's your pharmacy, and I'll call that in for you." It really is a nice service on a number of different levels. But what we're hearing is really from some parents who this has been helpful, particularly if they have more than one child at home and you're not carting all the kids out to the urgent care to be exposed to other sorts of things in urgent care.

Again, we have about 68% of our visits. We asked ... We didn't, but Teladoc will ask you, "Well, where would you have gone for this service had you not connected with Teladoc?" And most would have gone to the urgent care, and

that's fine. That still is an option. We're just trying to gauge where would people go. We have about 10% that wouldn't have sought services at all. I'm not sure if that's good or bad. But this again provides another avenue for families or individuals to connect with the physician in a way that's convenient for you as well. And we have a lot of people who are up in the UP. They're in various counties throughout the state, throughout the country. So no matter where you are, you have access to this service and it's proved quite helpful to them.

With that let me get to our HR. You can't type when everyone's watching, just saying. The first thing that you see when you go to our website is actually this is another program that we launched back in the spring. It's Livongo and this is for diabetes management. If you or one of your family members is dealing with a chronic condition of diabetes, this is a very nice program. It provides you with what's called a smart meter, so as you take your various levels of ... You have to check your blood every so often. It automatically captures those readings. It can send it to your physician for you. If you know of someone or you yourself are keeping logs of how your readings are turning out, this does it automatically for you and provides a nice report for your physician.

It also provides you with all the supplies that you need automatically sent to you or your family member on a monthly basis, so you don't have to run out and pick them up. And what we're finding is if those individuals ... it's just more anecdotally than anything. But those individuals who are using this program doesn't cost you anything to enroll in this program, are able to manage their diabetes a little better, because they have access to diabetes educators, dietitians and all through the phone. All of the resources that you might have available to you through your physician you still do, but also through the phone as well, and you can have a real time connection. So we're finding some success here with Livongo. To enroll for Livongo, the best thing to do is call them. Their number is on here, you can go to their website as well, but you can give them a call.

Join MSU. So here's Teladoc. You can find this by coming to our website, or you can come up in the search engine here and type Teladoc and it'll bring you to this as well. Let me go back. There we go. If you want to learn more, it gives you a little bit of information here. You can call them if you'd like at the 800 number, if you just want to talk to somebody about various services, or you can click on their website and it'll give you a couple of things that you can do. If you want to talk to a physician, you do need to set up an account. There's an eligibility check behind the scenes. So we send what we call eligibility files to Teladoc so that they know you're an employee of Michigan State University, and they know that your family is also a Michigan State University affiliate, if you will, so they're affiliated through you, so they can also enroll.

You can set up the account. I actually have set up an account. This is part of what you'll see when you when you get there. Okay. Whoops. Let me go back. I just wanted to show you ... I don't want to set up an account but I want to log in.

Whoops. I'm not used to the keyboard. I would also recommend that you don't have a very long password. Don't write it down in case there's any MSU IT folks in here, I don't have it written down, I promise. And this is what you'll see when you log in. Depending on what you want to do, what kind of services do you need? I want to request a visit. Most of the time what we're seeing is a call back to you within eight to nine minutes from when you request. If you are requesting a behavioral health visit, so you need to speak to a psychiatrist or a psychologist that can take a little longer.

But again, if that's something urgent, you need to speak to someone right away, then this is part of where you would go or you could certainly call. I have my husband enrolled. He's a dependent on here. If I want to set up an appointment for him, I can certainly do that. I would have my children on here if I had little kids at home. My kids are all gone and grown so they can set up their own accounts. So this is ... I don't have my medical history in here yet. There's a very short questionnaire that asks you certain medical information so that the physician that you talk to either on the phone or through video has some sense of what your medical information is. So what kind of medications I might be on, that would be something that I would have to ... I haven't done that yet, but I just wanted to get registered in case we do need the service later on we could certainly use it.

It's really that simple. Once you get in the website, there's lots of information here. You can also ... if you have ... Let's say you have a parent or you are caring for a family member they're not in MSU, an employee, or they're not an MSU dependent on your health plan. But let's say this individual they're staying with you or they're visiting you and you need care for them. You can connect with Teladoc as well. There is a charge for that. As an employee or a dependent of an employee, you are not charged any copay to use this service. We really encourage you to enroll or register, so that if you do need it down the road you're all ready to go. But the care recipient, I think is a very nice feature. Again, if you're taking care of someone at home, or you have someone who's visiting, again, you'd have to pay for the service, so they're going to ask you for a credit card. But it's something that you'd have access to a physician to handle their particular issue if they're staying with you. So with that ...

Deborah M.: Any questions? Yes.

Dan Gould: Dan Gould, Education, Kinesiology. Thank you first for this. It's very appreciated. One option I could see and I don't know if this is appropriate, if I was traveling internationally. I'm sick in a hotel room in Africa somewhere, does it work to call this number? And would they know like local resources, that type of thing?

Renee Rivard: They might. I would go ahead and set up your account particularly before you travel and call. Most of the physicians are going to be US based physicians, but depending on who you speak with they might be able to connect you with someone.

Dan Gould: Thank you.

Renee Rivard: Yep, you're welcome.

Ade Olomu: Ade Olomu with Department of Medicine. Who are the physician that take this call, and who does the triage of the patient?

Renee Rivard: Sure. Telemedicine or Teladoc is a company and they're actually associated now, actually most recently was the Best Doctors. Many of you may have heard me talk about Best Doctors, that's a second opinion service that we have. So those two companies are now combined. But Teladoc has a network of physicians that are all board certified physicians that they reach out to and "vet" if you will, to ensure that they're meeting the credentials required to provide service and then end up on their network if you will or in their network. It's really Teladoc who manages the physician network. Very similar to how Blue Cross Blue Shield manages our physician network. This is really Teladoc who's managing that network of physicians across the country.

Ade Olomu: Thank you.

Renee Rivard: Does that help?

Ade Olomu: Yes.

Renee Rivard: Yep.

Rhonda Conner-W: Rhonda Conner-Warren from the College of Nursing. One of my questions was partially answered in response to hers. But my question was, you indicated all physician providers and what about nurse practitioners?

Renee Rivard: I'd have to check on nurse practitioner. That is a question that we asked when we were first looking at Teladoc and honestly standing here right now I can't remember the answer. Let me get back with that answer because it was something that we researched before we move forward with Teladoc. But I can't remember what the answer is at the moment.

Rhonda Conner-W: Fine, thank you.

Renee Rivard: I will get back with you.

Rhonda Conner-W: Alright.

Renee Rivard: Yeah.

Deborah M.: Thank you. Yes. Dr. Borcila.

Andaluna Borcila: Thank you very much for this presentation. It seems like something useful. I can imagine myself using this. But I have two quick questions. One is, it seems like very few people actually have used these service, 69 people from what I could see. When can we assess or and how are we going to assess the investment and if it worked out well for us, and if it's filling the gap that it's supposed to fill? I don't quite know what that is, but ... Thank you.

Renee Rivard: Good question. The 69 visits were for the month of January. We're looking at utilization, and you're absolutely right. If no one uses the service, or we're not able to really determine a financial ROI, return on investment, then we'll have to look at is this something worth keeping on the books if you will or keeping access to. But this is one of those things and we found this with Best Doctors as well. It's one of those programs that you have to keep talking about, and ... Today, so when I asked the question, how many are aware of Teladoc? I only saw a few hands go up. It's upon us to make sure that we communicate and communicate often. And again, it's one of those things that you don't really think about it until you need to use the service.

The education and constant communication is really key. But we'll take a look at this program. We're looking at the utilization every month. What are we seeing? Where would people have gone to seek service? If they were going to the emergency room, that's very expensive to go the emergency room versus Urgent Care. All of those things have to be looked at and vetted as we go forward. And if at the end of the day it's not a value added service, then we have to take a look at that too, that's great question.

Stephen Gasteyer: Yes. Stephen Gasteyer College of Social Science. I have a couple of colleagues I know of off the top of my head who actually don't have ... while they have their general benefits through MSU, they're actually doing their health care through being the dependent on a spouse's health care. So for instance, even in some cases, for people who are on campus, for instance, in the College of Law, they have a different health program. If you're a dependent spouse of somebody who's at the College of Law, then you would not actually be on the current MSU health system. Would this system still be available to them?

Renee Rivard: That's a great question. And right now this is eligible, or benefits enrolled.

Stephen Gasteyer: Okay.

Renee Rivard: We have a little different ... Livongo, the program I talked about a moment ago, is benefit eligible. So that program would be available to the folks you're speaking of. This program is benefits enrolled. Meaning you'd have to be enrolled in an MSU health plan.

Stephen Gasteyer: Okay. Good to know.

Deborah M.: Thank you. Other questions? This came through the Faculty Healthcare Committee. And one of the reasons we wanted to bring it to faculty senate was to just increase awareness so that we could maybe get some more people who would sign up for it or register for it. So thank you very much Renee, I appreciate it very much. Next budget update, with Dave Byelich.

David Byelich: Thank you. Okay. I think it was probably about three weeks ago, Professor Moriarty asked if we could do this update, and Provost Youatt talked to me about it and said, "Well Dave, yeah there were a couple things that maybe are important that we get to." And so we thank Professor Moriarty for the invitation and would like to talk to you about a couple items. The charts that you see up on the wall right now is our normal chart that we show that conveys the understanding that we have a two year budget that is in place, that was approved by the trustees last June. That included 2018/19 and then 2019/20. And that second year was added on so that we could begin to work with things like the flat rate tuition, the freeze on rate increases on undergraduate tuition and so forth. Let me try to get into a little bit more of the spirit of Professor Moriarty's question and talk about this a little bit from underneath the hood.

Each year when we look at our overall institutional budget, we probably don't take time often enough to look at the full budget that includes all of the research activities, the dormitories and so forth. And this is about a \$3 billion operation on an annual basis. There are a number of things in here that we probably don't talk enough about, and I'd like to take just a second or two to talk about the big picture items that we have. First of all, each year in the AG bio and MSU extension, These are in total \$100 million program, and these are accounted for in what is referred to as the Expendable Restricted Fund, that's outside of the institution's general revenues, but they are extraordinarily important programming to the success of Michigan State.

Similarly, if you were to look inside our investment income, you would begin to see the application of that income into very significant university projects. For example, the interdisciplinary science building that is going up on the south end of the campus at this time. This is \$100 million building that is financed wholly from institutional revenues. The STEM building, another hundred million dollar activity. This building is, as I say, about \$100 million dollars. The state had contributed 30, we're contributing 70. Again from our internal revenue sources, predominantly investment income. If you were to look at the Grand Rapids Research Building. That building is about an \$80 million building. About half of it comes from our various investment income and so forth. The College of Music addition, the College of Business Pavilion, these are items that have a lesser contribution. Music at about \$10 million College of Businesses as you know was fully funded by donations. Although we are helping with the cash flow on that facility.

The bioengineering building, about a \$40 million activity, about half of it is institutional money. We have all along drawn upon that wider University

resource that \$3 billion resource including all of the investment income that we have available to us. In the most recent period, we have an additional item that we have included in our activity here. The settlement amount of about a half a billion dollars are bonded for, and we estimate that they'll require about \$30 million annually to retire that debt over about 30 years. You can see here the \$30 million, you can see some of our capital projects here, and then the total costs that we have. You can also see that if we have investment earnings about 6%, we have a very positive cash flow here. And it is this positive cash flow that we depend upon to do a number of these items.

Now also, it is possible that investment income can diminish. And here you see a 4% line. These materials by the way, are in [budget.msu.edu](http://budget.msu.edu) on your browser's info and information, and you'll find it there. You can see the 6% line here, a 4% line that goes red. And we ask what happens if that occurs? If this goes red, then we need to look at other university reserves, and also begin to look at the university's general fund for a way to offset this kind of a loss. Now also though, it is possible that the market could be higher. And you can see at 8%, we have a very positive circumstance and would allow us to look at additional programming.

I wanted to make sure that we had just a brief overview on how we are dealing with the very significant settlement activity, but also how we're financing other very important projects on the campus. Any questions on that? Okay. Yes.

Marilyn Johnson: Marilyn Johnson, Eli Broad College of Business. I wanted to take just a minute to commend you and MSUs other financial officers for your outstanding financial management. When Moody's downgraded our debt I read the report, and one of the things Moody cited was that things would have been much worse here were it not for the outstanding financial management and the outstanding treasury management at MSU. And the conservative stewardship allowed us to absorb that settlement, and without our outstanding financial officers, that wouldn't have been possible, and I just wanted to thank you for your stewardship.

David Byelich: That kind of activity or that kind of thanks really belongs to Mark Haas and our presidents as we go back in time. But Mark and his group have been very significantly involved in this. But let me tell you, this is sort of the spirit of Mark Twain's War Prayer. We're very appreciative of those comments, but I hope that you understand what this means. What this means is that over the years as investment income has appreciated, we at the institution have had a choice. We could have moved it into the general fund budget and used it for our annual activities. Those activities would mean in some instances that we would fund activities that are today funded through the 1% reduction that occurs each year in our annual operating budgets that go out to you. And it generates about \$6 million that the Provost and the President then can allocate back to units.

Over the years, this conservative financial management which is part of the brand that we've engaged in, has been to take and to hold on to this investment



income, and to begin to use it for big things. And you can see that as a trait across much of our decision making. Whether it be part of the investment income, or whether it be part of our royalties, or whether it be part of our indirect cost recovery. The same techniques have been employed. So we appreciate it, in this instance I think it turned out in the way that we would hope so thank you. Yes.

Stephen Gasteyer: Stephen Gasteyer College of Social Science. I'm actually interested in the large capital infrastructure projects that you listed at the beginning. And I will tell you the backstory is I have been involved with a small college that I happened to be the alma mater of, that has fallen into hard times in part because of unwise capital expenditures. And so I have to ... it leads me to reflect on six big capital projects. Do we have a sense ... how much have we calculated that those actually will pay off, and to what extent are you projecting that those are going to pay off for the university or are they going to be deficits on the university that for some other reason are worth the investment?

David Byelich: Thank you. If you look at three of the projects here on my side of the charts, each one of these is a project that would generate extraordinary amounts of indirect costs recoveries to the institution. The other thing that is a characteristic on these three, is that we have a lot of conversation about the hundred new faculty members that we have been hiring over the last several years. These hundred very significant researchers need places to work. And so as we go forward with hiring individuals, and hiring into specialties that will make this institution a very special place in the future, this kind of fundamental investment becomes a important to us.

We believe that based upon the indirect costs recoveries that are here, and we believe based upon the reserves and our analysis of the market that this is sustainable. If not, we would have walked away a long time ago. Okay. Yes.

James Dulebohn: I'm James Dulebohn College of Social Sciences. The FRIB's not up there. Everybody on campus is excited about it coming online and everything, so what is the status of the funding to the FRIB from the MSU side? I know that the Department of Energy's subsidizing it and the state has some. Could you speak about that a little bit?

David Byelich: Satish just went through a review just yesterday as a matter of fact on this. And our cash position on FRIB is positive at this point. The federal government is actually ahead of their payment schedule. Rather than force us to make investments they've provided us with about \$60 million for the coming year. There's just good things to say about the FRIB project. Okay?

Satish Udpa: The excitement is building because the FRIB facility will probably go on Stream in the next year or two, and that's when the research dollars start trickling into. And so that's going to have a huge impact on the bottom line.

David Byelich: Let me just talk to you about a couple of other of Professor Moriarty's interesting things that we need to work with. The most significant revenue source that we have for the institution is tuition. And for the first time in my tenure here, this tuition budget will exceed a billion dollars. Now this is something that has become a very important piece to us as we go forward here. Again, these materials are online, so if I skip ahead here. If you look here at the international enrollments for the institution, you can see the downturn that we have exhibited here, almost 300 students or more than 300 students as we look at this. Each one of these students represents about \$40,000, and each one of these students typically has pretty much a zero discount, so it's about 40 per person.

Now, when this began to go down, all that it did was it had underlined the institution's need to become very market research oriented, market sensitive in terms of the way that we go about our recruiting. You'll see in a slide here in a moment that over the next 10 years we expect Michigan enrollment to contract by 15%. That is the number of high school graduates annually would go down by about 15%. We need to become much more sophisticated in the way in which we try to attract students to Michigan State. What you see here on this side is largely a movement to the common investment ... excuse me, the common admissions application. You can see here pretty much a doubling of the number of applicants. What we have here now is the challenge to try to convert those applicants into deposits and into students at Michigan State. Again, our enrollment activities are extraordinarily intense this year, to try to increase the number of domestic nonresident students by about 300 students.

We have as an objective an increase over time of about 900 students, moving our total domestic non residents from 1200 up to about 2100 or 2200 students, so a very significant change in the process here as we look forward. This is the 15% reduction that I mentioned a minute ago. Again, another reason why this is a complicated process ... other states that we would typically have drawn from are also experiencing the same kind of decline. Similar issues in terms of international enrollment across the country. All of these factors suggest to us that we need to have a very comprehensive enrollment recruiting process that has a fair amount of market savvy that will allow us to attract and retain the kinds of students that are helpful to you and to our programs. This is a very aggressive chart. What it shows here, across this top line, is that this year we're hoping for ... not hoping for ... we're planning for 300 additional nonresident students.

In the next year, that increases up to 500, and then 650, and finally, over the period of time, up to about 900 additional students; that is to say, again, about 2100 domestic nonresident students. As we succeed in this, the additional revenue amounts are noted there, \$46 million. This is an extraordinarily aggressive program by the institution. It's one that we feel we can succeed at, but it is one that over time, I firmly believe, will ask for your help because that connection between the faculty and the students we're trying to recruit is very strong with the students that we're after here. Anything else on this? Again, a

couple of other things of Professor Moriarty's interesting points, as we have moved forward, these are thank you's really. An increase of about five 5% of credit hours per faculty member that we have.

We have also in our student success area, one of the biggest issues that we've been focusing on up front is to look at the relationship between those individual students who are on probation and their longevity at the university. If we can diminish this, we believe that we can retain at a better rate than even that we're doing here today. You can see, we're down to about 6%. We were previously around 9%. Again, in showing the success of the institution as we move forward. First year persistence at about 91%, six-year graduation rates at about 79, 80%. Understanding here that once you account for the students that graduate from other places, that graduation rate is, we believe about 90 and 90 plus percentage points.

The student outcomes here, again, as you look at the number of students that once they are either employed at about 65% or continuing their education here at 25%. About 90% of our students are either employed or continuing their education. We believe that this is a very positive statistic and a positive reflection on you. Couple of other things that we believe are very positive as we go forward here: the research activity within the institution at about \$700 million; we're now in the middle of the big 10. If you look at us, our lift over the three-year period is number one in the conference. We have increased more in this three-year period than any other institution in the big 10. Again, these are very significant changes that are important. They're important to acknowledge because you're the heart of them.

Faculty salaries are an item that we continue to work on. We're in the lower portion of the big 10, as you'd look at this. If you look at it in terms of compensation, we do a little bit better. We're about in the middle of the big 10, but again, because of the proportion of our faculty that will no longer have post-retirement healthcare is increasing; remember that was a change that was made in 2010. We need to focus on this and make sure that we can keep ourselves in that middle bar. One other component of our activities that is sensitive to us, we talked a lot about here, nonresident enrollment. If you can see here on the right hand side of the chart, we're about 12% more expensive than Wisconsin; we're about 25% more expensive than Ohio State. These are things that we're going to have to check or to change as we move forward in order to ensure that we are successful in recruiting nonresident students.

Largely, what you will begin to hear is that rather than increase the resident and the nonresident undergraduates at the same percentage, we will increase them at the same dollar amount, because of the math we're out of sync here, we need to change that around, a significant challenge. The last item that we have that is extraordinarily important to us is the amount of debt that our students incur as they move through Michigan State. About 30,000 here about the cost of one year's education. The proportion of students that incur that debt ... about 49%,

and you can see we're about in the middle here. Again, this is one of the challenges that we have before us. This process comes together in an annual budget process, which on the left side of the page is formula based in terms of allocating salary increments, operating support, 1% reduction.

In the lower triangle here differentially applied program allocations, any reductions, unit based program. This is the revenue based initiatives, the study abroad issues and so forth. Then on the right hand side, those items that are separately reviewed, the financial aid and so forth. We can't make a change in the middle of a year on a financial aid program. We can certainly make it over a period of time. That's why they're over on the right hand side. If we then just go back and review our overall activities coming up as we forecast them into the 1920 period, about a billion and a half in terms of our overall revenues; you can see the changes in other income. Again, the flat rate tuition and so forth is the highlight on the tuition and fee material.

This information, again, it is on the web. I would highlight one item that is important to us as we go forward. Renee touched upon it earlier in terms of health care. The 5% adjustment here is significant. It comes for two reasons: one is, of course, the cost to the program, the other issue is the increase in the number of particularly support staff employees within the institution. This is an item that we need to be looking at. Subsequent years, we do have that 5% parameter trending downward to about four and then 3% in order to try to relieve some pressure on the academic programs and our allocations there. Folks, this is a rundown on our budget materials. If any of you have questions, I'd be happy to help either now or offline. Thank you very, very much. Oh yes.

Filomena Nunes: Filomena Nunes, FRIB. First question, is this available widely? Is it okay to share with other faculty members?

David Byelich: Sure.

Filomena Nunes: Okay. Second question, concerning the settlement with the victims of Larry Nassar, where does that get reflected in everything you've shown?

David Byelich: Sure. Remember we talked about the all funds budget of the institution, and in particular, this triangle here that is the investment income. If you then focus in on that investment income, that investment income is what provides the revenues here or the resources to pay the annual debt service on a \$500 million bond. It is that interest income at the top that then pays for facilities, and in this instance, the annual debt service on 500 million of about \$30 million. Does that help? Is that okay? All right. Yes.

Andaluna Borcila: Andaluna Borcila, James Madison College. If we can have some clarification, I don't know who has it, about how much of this settlement is actually paid through by insurance? I know we're talking about that because we're insured for that. I understand that's a contentious process and that has something to do

with the statements about releasing or not releasing attorney general files to the attorney general's office. I know some of this is not you, but some of this maybe we can get some clarification on. Thank you.

David Byelich: Let me do the ... if there is an easier part of it. As one looks at the settlements and so forth, recall the Penn State incident was resulted in expenditures on the part of the institution of now, I think, on order about \$275 million. Of that \$275 million, Penn State has received about \$40 million in pay outs from their insurance carriers. I can't tell you what ours will be, but within the debt service that we have set up ... this \$500 million, \$30 million annually. What we have done is that has been put together in a way that is flexible such that any payment on the part of the insurers to us can be used to offset this total. We don't know what it would be, but this is designed so that when it does occur, if it does occur, this could be adjusted readily. Is there anything else? Satish, have I messed up anything?

Satish Udpa: No. I don't think so.

David Byelich: Alright, thank you so much. Again if there is any questions, please feel free to call or to email. The material is on the web and if there's any difficulty with it, please let me know. Thank you very much.

Deborah M.: Thank you. I do not know if trustee Byrum is here yet. There she is. She just absolutely walked in the door. I would like to introduce Trustee Byrum who is here as a representative of the Board of Trustees and as one of the chairs of the Presidential Search Committee, and she's here to answer questions and just to talk a little bit about what's going on.

Dianne Byrum: My favorite guy.

Good afternoon, everyone.

Male: Good afternoon.

Dianne Byrum: The sun's shining and it's not a wintry mix of freezing rain and snow, so I'm excited about that. It's been a busy few weeks on the Board of Trustees. I think I have chaired the board for about a month and it seems like six years. Seems like my term is up and I'm off to being a private citizen again, but it has been extremely busy. When I came in and I said my favorite person was Satish, what a difference that has made in the few short weeks that Satish has been the acting president. I want to personally thank him for accepting the challenge when I made the call, and I said, "Would you be willing to step into this very difficult position as we continue our search for a permanent president at Michigan State?" He graciously accepted that role. This is a brand new board with three new members. That's a significant change in the makeup and the group dynamics of a board of eight.

The board is still getting to know each other. We actually had our first board meeting of the year this past week. Think about everything that's happened and this was our first board meeting. We had an organizational meeting, which was the only business was to elect the board chair and the vice chair. Then we had a special meeting with the personnel action, the only agenda item; and then we had our official board meeting. It's been busy few weeks. You've seen the difference in the tone, in the action of the board right from the very beginning of Satish assuming the acting presidency and the new board members joining the board. I think that's a good sign. I'm very hopeful that you will see a much more engaged board and the tone will continue. Doesn't mean we're not going to have differences of opinion, disagreements, and that we won't have tough issues in front of us that we need to work through, but I think there's a greater sensitivity and more openness.

That's my hope. I can just say that the board, like I said a few minutes ago, we're still getting to know each other and work together. It's high energy. I really like that because there's lots to do, and we need lots of doers. I'm encouraged by that, too. I think we sent a communication out here probably 10 days ago, on the status of the search. I believe it's going well; I think that's the sense of everyone on the search committee. I can speak from my viewpoint on the search committee; this is a group of individuals that have really stepped up and taken the responsibility of being a member of that committee very seriously. Not only are they well prepared for the meetings; they attend, they participate, they're engaged, and there's no one on that committee that is afraid to give their voice and have their voice be heard. That should be encouraging for everyone because I think at the end of the day, we will have a better outcome because we have such an involved, engaged search committee. Deb, did I cover enough background for you?

Deborah M.: Are there questions for [inaudible]? Please.

Dianne Byrum: Hi.

Speaker 2: I'd really like to say that we appreciate the change of tone. I speak for myself, but I think others would feel the same. It's noticeable and I think we're happy about it. On this tone I'd like to acknowledge the fact that it's the second time you're here and I appreciate that, too. I think you're busy like probably lots of people are here, but it's really important that we're having a dialogue. The other thing, I think, that is also respected by the faculty here is that this is a really tough search. I mean a presidential search is no piece of cake in any case, but in this case it's particularly challenging. Even if we might seem like we don't always agree, we appreciate that this is not an easy task. Having said all this, I wanted to ask a few questions and see how much you can share with us, because not much has been shared on the details.

What I would like is just to ask some questions and if you think they're not appropriate, that you cannot answer, of course, feel free to just say that. At this

point I understand the names of the candidates are to be kept confidential, but perhaps how many are shortlisted in you're interviewing, perhaps you can share, and whether they've had ... Actually in your communication you shared that all the people had high level leadership experience, but you didn't mention whether they'd had experience with healing communities, dealing with sexual harassment situations and things like that. Also you didn't mention the demographics of this shortlist. As much as you can share with us, I'm sure we're all ears.

Dianne Byrum: Okay. I won't frame it in terms of a shortlist. I'll frame it in terms of candidates that are getting attention or are of the higher interest because the pool ... we said for best consideration, the end of January. Today's the 18th so it was a couple of weeks ago, but in general, those that are of the highest interest to the search committee would be in candidates that have deep experience. This came right out of the input sessions when folks said, "This is not somebody for on the job training." Literally, we heard, "No on the job training for our next president." They need to have deep experience at high levels in higher education. In our mind that means presidents, vice chancellors, vice presidents, provosts; and maybe at a system level or at an individual college level, being the chancellor at a college level. That kind of high level experience is what we're looking for. We also said that we would have a diverse pool and the candidates of the highest interest are very diverse in terms of gender and ethnic background.

We also said that we would consider a nontraditional; where the antenna's at least up for a nontraditional candidate. In terms of experience, we're also looking at have they gone through a crisis? What was that crisis like? How have they faced crisis? How have they handled it? Maybe what was done well, what wasn't done well; but we're looking and probing in those areas because that, too, was very important to the MSU community. If you spend some time on the website, and you go to the presidential prospectus; at the end of the prospectus, when we talk about opportunities and challenges in characteristics desired in the next president, that's the framework by which we are talking to candidates. That's the framework, and it comes right out of the input sessions. I think it's very reflective of what we heard. To the extent I can answer your question, I think I answered probably 85% of it or so.

Deborah M.: Yes, please.

Dianne Byrum: As you're coming up, the ... and then I left it in the car, but the communication that Deb forwarded over was shared from your session that you had just a week or so, maybe two weeks ago now; that was shared with the search committee. They all commented on it; they internalized it and it will be, to some degree, reflective, as we start talking to candidates, too. Some of it was more short term like black tuition in the data, the integration of the data center; those kinds of things. The qualities and characteristics, those were all internalized and will be part of the conversations.

Stephen Gasteyer: Stephen Gasteyer, College of Social Science. Third time I've been up here so most of you know me by now. Having started my career looking at leadership, I actually know that there are closed searches that are closed all the way through, and there are closed searches that are closed for the majority of candidates, but then open up at the end. One of the reasons to do that is actually to see how candidates interact with particular constituencies in a particular environment. I'm wondering if there's any possibility that while we understand that the search needed to be closed until you get a very short list at the end, if there's any possibility that a short list of candidates might/could be made open to see how they interact with the community.

Dianne Byrum: There won't be a shortlist of candidates in a public, open search. It will be a confidential search until a finalist. At a finalist stage, there is an opportunity to maybe do something additional. That is a conversation that has not been held because there is no finalist. It's very clear this has to be a confidential search. The number one question, when people are coming in and submitting an application is they must be guaranteed this is confidential or they will not apply. That is a daily touch base call with the search firm by multiple candidates. It is something that they are highly sensitive to. They will not stay in the pool or stay in the group of candidates. That is the reality we're dealing with. Yes, this is a very high stakes presidency. We get that. We understand that, but there's also a courting going on, too, between the candidates and the university. We want to keep those candidates interested in the university as robust, the most highly experienced candidates. That's the group that will be out in a second if we cannot guarantee them a confidential search.

Stephen Gasteyer: May I ask if you have strategies for how to vet the extent ... To be very frank, we have an experience of an interim president who did a terrible job of interacting with constituencies on campus. How, without somehow vetting a choice, are we able to make a choice among candidates based on their ability to interact with constituencies?

Dianne Byrum: Well, a couple of things. First, I would submit that bringing John Engler in as an interim president was an entirely different set of decisions and circumstances than a permanent president. You can't really compare the two. John Engler never would have been hired as a permanent president here. We were in literally crisis mode at that time. There were a series of dominoes that were getting ready to fall and a quick decision on an interim president was necessary. This has been a process that was thoughtfully laid out and communicated, and has gone through a step by step process. The search committee and the interactions have made it a totally ... This is a search. The Engler appointment was not of search. In terms of vetting, we have had conversations and we are fully aware that this candidate must be extremely vetted; extreme vetting, not just run of the mill search firm vetting. Those are conversations, and strategies are being considered. That is a point well taken and the search committee fully understands that.

Stephen Gasteyer: Okay.



Dianne Byrum: Thank you for that.

Speaker 2: Hello, Trustee Byrum.

Dianne Byrum: Hi.

Speaker 2: You've seen me talk about this before. I want to first thank you for coming here again. I'm not going to go over the same points I've made. There were people, senators at the Board of Trustees meeting. With a change of tone, we keep hoping that you can hear the concerns that we've expressed. With that in mind, not because we want to continuously hammer you with them, but because we think they're such important concerns and that we have the responsibility to voice them, we're voicing them. We're just going out of our way to do so. Respectfully, this is such a critical decision at this point, at this institution. We know you know this. Our concerns are that you can't really vet a candidate whose main role is to engage with the community and lead it out of the bad path it's been on towards something that the prospectus identifies as being very important: cooperation and building a different culture with a closed search. In other words, it is very important for our search to succeed.

We consider it, many of us, to be our search just like you do. For our search to succeed, we need to have trust from the community, but we also really need to be able to vet this person and make sure they're the right candidate for us. Again, according to the prospectus, one of the most important things signaled as well was somebody who can work, cooperate with the various stakeholders. Now they need to be able to see that they can do that by meeting with us and by 'they', I just mean the top candidates. We need to be able to see that they can do that by engaging with them. We think that it's really useful for you to see how this interaction can happen. It's good for them. It's good for us as a community to heal, to restore trust, and to have a voice. It's good for you to restore our trust in the process so we don't see anything more important than a viable search that brings us best candidate that can work with faculty, students and staff to step up to a different culture than what we've had here; one that can be vetted publicly and can realize if they're a good fit, because they might not realize if they're a good fit.

They might just think they're up to doing this, but really is somebody who thinks they're up to doing this and not willing to engage with this community at this point in time, a realistic choice. In my mind, I could think I'm up to doing lots of things, but deal with the MSU community under the public eye like they will be. These are real concerns and we continue to express them even though we know that we're repeating ourselves because we hope you can hear us and go beyond. We've heard you, but towards ... we understand. You need this and this is a good path forward with integrity for all of us. Thank you.

Dianne Byrum: Now I am listening. I do understand your point of view. I respectfully disagree, and I have to put the faith in the search committee; is highly representative of faculty. They're from your members. You get a sense for that interaction with the search committee. I do hear you. I do understand. I just respectfully disagree.

Robert Ofoli: Robert Ofoli, Engineering. I think I heard you say that there's been vetting beyond what a usual search company would do, because the search companies are in business to supply people and schools with people who are going to serve as president. I don't think they have the same degree of interest in vetting as the people who this person is actually going to be working with. I'm curious. When you say, the vetting that is taking place here goes beyond what a search committee would do, I'm wondering if you feel at liberty to tell us what it is.

Dianne Byrum: There has been no vetting of candidates at this point in time. There hasn't been this vetting at this point in time. My point was that the search committee has had conversations that we are not going to stop and only accept the vetting that the search firm would do as part of their services; that we will go above and beyond vetting a candidate because we, too, are very concerned that we understand this individuals background before an offer is made to them to be the President at Michigan State University. I can't go into details as to exactly what that might entail, but they haven't been totally decided either. That's another piece of it. There have been conversations and everybody on the search committee is fully aware that this needs to be a robust vetting and it cannot only be the responsibility of the search firm.

Robert Ofoli: Do we have the capability to do that kind of vetting?

Dianne Byrum: I have already answered that it'll be a confidential search.

Robert Ofoli: I'm not asking about telling me who is going to be president. What I'm asking is, do we at MSU have the capability to do the level of vetting that you are describing?

Dianne Byrum: You mean with some of our expertise on campus?

Robert Ofoli: Yeah.

Dianne Byrum: That's an open question. I'm not necessarily opposed to that. If you have ideas, bring them forward.

Robert Ofoli: Well, the problem that I'm having is we keep dealing with this. What my problem is, is that so many people have said things on this campus that are either not true or turn out not to be true. When you are sitting there telling me that you are going to do this vetting, but from what I'm hearing from you, you don't have a clue what that process is going to be or who is going to do it. How much trust am I supposed to put into that?

Dianne Byrum: I'm not able to share all of that.

Robert Ofoli: I don't think you know what you are going to do. I think that's the problem.

Dianne Byrum: That's your personal opinion.

Robert Ofoli: Yes. No. You don't have a clue.

Deborah Moriarty: Any questions or comments?

Juliet Guzzetta: Hi, I'm Juliet Guzzetta at the College of Arts and Letters. I want to keep the temperature cool here. I have a personal position which is a wish for an open search, but I understand we have different opinions. I'm wondering if there's some room to meet in the middle; for example, hearing that as we get near top choices, that they have a lot of concerns about being known to the greater community ... I don't understand that and I'm coming to you from the bottom here so I don't know what it's like when one gets up top in administration, but I would think it's fairly normal if you're a provost that you might look for a president position, or if you're a president at one university, you might look for step up or a different type of challenge. For whatever reason, it doesn't seem that unusual that one would make a different career move. I'm wondering why, if you're saying everybody daily is telling the search firm we need to remain confidential, that kind of gets the red flags going.

Could there be something like ... this is getting into brainstorm territory, but something like could the candidates release statements to the MSU community and maybe answer why confidentiality is important to them, amongst other things. Could we, choose five questions for the top candidates, the top five, or whomever, however many there are. Is there some way we can have some exchange, some interaction while preserving their anonymity?

Dianne Byrum: A couple of things; in terms of the confidential search, what we have to ensure is that the names are never released. Beyond that, if the Faculty Senate or the University Council would like to propose something like, "Here's three questions that we would like a written response to as you start to get more serious about a set of candidates," then that is that is something that could be considered. I don't want to make false promises, but it wouldn't be discounted out of hand. When I say we truly are interested in doing the best job that can be done on this search, that is coming from the heart. We have differences of opinion on how you get there. The confidentiality of the search literally is the big disagreement. We've tried to be transparent in how we've shared information along the way, which is why we published all of the input notes. We made it clear right up front, on the confidentiality statements and we put that statement on the website so that people could see what we were doing every step of the way. We won't discount your ideas out of hand.

Some we can accept and some we can't, but if you want to continue to send us your ideas and your best collective thoughts on how we might approach this with the vetting and answering questions so that there's more of a comfort level, then I would encourage you to do that. I would not discourage that kind of interaction. And then we can take it one item at a time and the search committee can discuss it. It's not going to just be the Board's decision on that.

Juliet Guzzetta: Before we get to Lapidus, is there a time frame in which we would need to get questions to you?

Dianne Byrum: Well, it's always better sooner rather than later. We're still on our June timeframe to have a new president identified, but there's going to be multiple steps as you back that out to today. I would say get it to us probably in the next four weeks.

Juliet Guzzetta: Thank you.

Lisa Lapidus: Lucy Lapidus, College of Natural Science. Deborah, didn't we send them a request for some questions?

Deborah M.: Yes, we did.

Lisa Lapidus: Did anybody respond?

Deborah M.: I believe the response was that we would not be able to submit questions.

Dianne Byrum: Well, submit questions.

Lisa Lapidus: Well, we're not asking you to submit. We want to see the questions and I don't see how that violates any confidentiality because it's just a question; it's not an answer.

Dianne Byrum: The answer would be the questions that are being asked to the candidates are in the prospectus, and they're in that bottom section where it says qualities and characteristics.

Lisa Lapidus: Those aren't questions. Those are qualities. I would like to know how you're actually going to ask the questions, because that gives us an idea of what the mandate that the President's going to take. I assume you have gone through a rigorous process where you ask the same questions to all the candidates. What are they? Why can't you tell us what they are?

Dianne Byrum: My answer to you is there embodied in the back of the prospectus; there will be questions formulated from those areas, but it is that topic. The particular question isn't really the issue. It's the dialogue and the discussion around that area of questions. The question is going to tell you less than what the back of the prospectus tells you on the issue areas we are probing. Because it's more of a

probing and a conversation that it is, "Answer this question. You have 60 seconds." You have that, in essence, in the prospectus.

Lisa Lapidus: I disagree because you could be changing what you guys decide to ask as you formulate your interviews. We would like to know what was actually asked in the interviews. You're not asking them to read the prospectus and write an essay. You're asking them questions. Those questions can be formulated into actual questions and it is best practices to ask the same questions to all the candidates at least at one level; maybe not the last visit. Why can't we see those questions? Your search firm hasn't probably made them.

Dianne Byrum: I've tried to answer you by those questions are all from what's identified in the back of the prospectus.

Greg Swain: Hi. Greg Swain, Steering Committee. As a steering committee member, I want to thank Kristi Byron for coming and speaking with us, and feeling the questions as a faculty member. I'm not speaking as an at large member. Now, I personally support a close search for a number of reasons, but also applaud the thoroughness with which I think the committee is undertaking the search from what I've learned as part of academic governance. I want to bring up a question that Satish has mentioned a couple of times. Now we are a university and so while it is very important to address the wrongdoings that have happened around here, it's a university and there are other issues that are equally as important for this place moving forward. My question is, is there a way that we, the faculty, the people here at MSU can find out where these individuals stand, what some of their priorities are moving forward.

If a person comes in and wants to build a bunch of new stadiums, that's probably not what we want. If the person comes in and has ideas about X or Y or Z, that they are going to prioritize, this information will be very valuable to disseminate to everybody. Is there a way that that info can be provided to us and shared with us from the committee, especially when you get down toward the end?

Dianne Byrum: We don't have that information yet.

Greg Swain: It'll probably come out of the interviews-

Dianne Byrum: Interviews-

Greg Swain: ... and discussions with these individuals. I'm quite certain.

Dianne Byrum: I can take it back to the to the search committee and we'll put that down as one of our discussion items.

Greg Swain: That kind of thing happens when people give an open presentation-

Dianne Byrum: [Crosstalk] Sure.

Greg Swain: ... we are not going to have that ability. Maybe the individual, without being identified, or individuals, that kind of information could be provided. I think everybody would value that greatly.

Dianne Byrum: Okay. Thanks Greg.

Deborah M.: If I understood you correctly, you were saying that if the Faculty Senate were to come up with three or four questions that could be answered, they would be answered anonymously by the candidates when you reach the final stage?

Dianne Byrum: We would entertain that.

Deborah M.: Okay. We can bring that to you.

Dianne Byrum: I couldn't promise you, but we would take that as a serious request.

Deborah M.: Okay. Thank you. Other questions? Comments? In the last meeting that we had with the Faculty Liaison Group had with the Board of Trustees, we gave the Board of Trustees the meeting dates for the next faculty senate and the University Council meetings, and we asked if they could try to plan to come to one semester so that they get a feel for the faculty, and so that we start to get to know them and they start to get to know us a little bit better than we have in the past. I want to thank Trustee Byrum for coming and for answering questions, and looking forward to having other trustees here. Thank you very much.

Dianne Byrum: This will not be my last time. Thank you.

Deborah M.: We have about two minutes for comments from the floor.

James Dulebohn: James Dulebohn, College of Social Sciences. Satish, I wanted to thank you. We had the University Council meeting on January 22. We had John Beck here facilitating. One of the questions was, what do we want to have happen before the new president comes, and a salient issue was concerned about the Forsyth report. There are accusations that MSU have been stonewalling the investigation. And just basically concerned about how legal counsel was being led. We shared some of those things to you later that evening at the University Governance reception. Those concerns reflect concerns of people that I've heard in my department and in the community around MSU. I just want to thank you, and others want to thank you for making some really difficult decisions and really trying to make an effort to raise the ethical situation here at MSU. I think it sends a really good signal to anybody that might be considering applying as president, to read the news that MSU has a culture of hindering the state attorney general from doing an investigation is just abhorrent.

We really appreciate it, and it was a really difficult decision for you. There was a contract involved and things like that, but we really want to applaud you for

standing up for what's right. That's part of this change in tone that we've recognized since you have stepped up in to fulfill this role. Thank you very much.

Andaluna Borcila: Andaluna Borcila, James Madison College. I know we're out of time, but I do want to just say two things. As you might remember, last meeting we had in our agenda the Breslin board response, the old board's response to the policy proposal that Faculty Senate endorsed last April. This is the reclaim MSU response to that response. That Breslin Board of Trustees response was asking for a clarification about what is the University Board. If you turn to this sheet you will see that's in the second paragraph, is a clarification for what that University Board is in the proposal Senate endorsed. Then there was a statement about how the search has been transparent and inclusive, which it's not. The other part of this is responding to the issues, but also really addressing the point that we've asked the Board of Trustees to adopt bylaws, to include language within their bylaws about presidential searches for now and in the future.

I just wanted to draw your attention to this without going through all the details. This is the response that I said that I could give you in a couple minutes last time. We wrote this response, we shared it with our Senate leadership, with the Board of Trustees. One last thing ... so as you look at this, please let me know if you have any questions now or later. Feel free to email me. One last thing: with this we also included a PDF with scholarly support for open searches. All that is, it's a letter that was written about the problems with close search by two experts in the field and directly addressing our closed search; then there are just a couple of articles. One of our colleagues gave you a couple of articles, but the PDF with this stuff ... so that was also submitted to the board with this letter. I can email it to you. You can also have access to it if you go to Reclaim MSU's website.

Somebody, not me, put it there on the website so that you can just pull it up and double click it, and get to it there. You have to forgive me as I adjust my ... Can you hear me or no? I'm trying. Here's the website that nobody has gone through here. I've gone through it. If you go to the Reclaim MSU website, which we might be able to or not right now, it's right on the front page. For those of you who would like to see those, right here, support for an open search. Well, you'd pull up that PDF. What you will see you in it is a letter; again, this letter we included to the Board of Trustees and you can feel free to please look at it, share it if you'd like, but also a couple of articles from the Chronicle of Higher Education. Thank you.

Deborah M.: Thank you very much. Is there a motion to adjourn? Second? All in favor?

All: Aye.

Deborah M.: Thank you very much.