

Speaker 1: I'd like to call the meeting to order since we have a quorum. Is there a motion to approve the agenda for April 16th second? All in favor say Aye. Opposed? Motion carries. Is there a motion to approve the draft minutes for March 19th? Is there a second? And you take a look at the draft minutes and see if there are any corrections, additions, deletions... Hearing none. All in favor say Aye. Opposed? Motion carries. Acting President City shoe is out of town. Doctor Jane Yeward is not available at the moment, she will get here as it is possible for her to get here. So we'll go to my comments, which I don't have a lot, but I want to start off by introducing the at large, this is the final faculty senate meeting of this semester.

And so the final one of this academic year and I want to start off by introducing the at large members who are retiring at the end of, actually it won't be until August that they are retiring. They're on duty until August 15th. But seeing Greg Swain. Could you stand up Greg? Yes. You have to. Greg Swain, Laura McCabe who is the vice chair of the steering committee and Michael Capital Woods, is he here? You know there he is, he's looking for his chair. So, I just want to, I want to thank them for a huge amount of hard work. I think we are all aware of how much work there has been for the past couple of years. It's been a very busy time for academic governance and particularly for the at large members.

And I also just want to reinforce the philosophy of the at large members, which is that we represent the faculty. We do not represent ourselves. We don't represent our college. We don't represent, I don't want everybody to play the piano, although it would be nice, maybe not. But we do work very hard to try and be as representative of the faculty as we possibly can. And we meet on a very regular basis. We make decisions in terms of what is going to be sent out together. We have lots and lots of emails and I will very much miss working with these people. So thank you very much. I wanted to ask if there are people who are on the faculty senate who are non returning members, could I ask you to stand just so we can say thank you to you also. Let's give a round of applause. Thank you.

Again, it's a lot of work coming to the meetings and being on top of things. And one of the challenges of our particular brand of academic governance is that we have constant turnover and so we have new people coming in all the time. That's I think one of the strengths, but it also is a challenge. So very happy to say thank you to the people who are not going to be on faculty Senate next year and very happy to say thank you to the ones who were coming back. New business, the university on curriculum, professor Mercy Mcdowell. Okay.

Mercy Macdowell: Marcy Mcdowell, College of nursing you see met on April 4th and approve the following, six new programs including food processing, technology and safety, agricultural technology certificate effective for 2019 global health master of science effective for 2019 global health graduate certificate effective for 2019 indigenous studies graduate certificate effective summer 2019 and special education leadership multi tiered systems of support, master of arts effective

for 2019 and special education leadership multi tiered systems of support graduate certificate effective for 2019 there were an additional 17 program changes and no deletions. UCC also approve the following course requests. 33 new courses, five course changes and no deletions. The following are approved by the provost and our effective spring 2020 through spring 2023 they include pre dental pre-medical and pre optometry programs. As always the short report is as an appendix B with a link to the full report. Questions?

Speaker 1: Is there a motion?

Mercy Macdowell: Can I have a motion to approve the UCC report as given?

Speaker 1: Is there a second? Any discussion? All in favor say Aye.

Mercy Macdowell: Aye.

Speaker 1: Opposed? Motion carries. Thank you very much. Next we have the UCFA recommendation for the faculty merit and market pool increase. Dr Mark Weddell is at home not feeling well with a very bad cold and so we do not have any other person on this committee who was also on UCFA. So I have asked doctor Laura McCabe, who is the vice chair of the steering committee to present this and make the motion.

Laura McCabe: All right. So I'd like to motion to approve the letter for the recommendation of the long term faculty merit and market pool increase. We got a second?

Speaker 1: Yep.

Laura McCabe: Okay. So I wanted to note that in the letter that on page two, while the market increases are set for this year but there's a statement about giving our goal of reaching the middle of the big 10 in faculty salary, salary re recommend a 4.5 increase in annual faculty salary increments over the long term. Inclusive of a 4% increase in the general merit pool and a 0.5% increase in the market adjustment pool. Again, the swollen impact the 2019 2020 academic year but it's hoped that by stating this that the university can in-plan for its inclusion in the 21/22 budget period. And also have key noting and this letter is the paragraph where we note that we appreciate interim president and provost you its commitment to recommend support in the 20/21 budget to provide MSU standard retirement contribution to qualify an academic year of faculty appointed on summer budgets funded through either research or general funds and other accounts.

Speaker 1: Is there a discussion questions? [inaudible 00:07:22] I think you'd have to come up to the microphone and state your name. No, I think you have to come up to the microphone and state your name. Otherwise, Gary Haplestan will get me. So he will come looking for me.

- Jennifer: All right. Jennifer Johnson College of human medicine. I was just trying to understand if it's that percent that one year or for suggesting that they do this indefinitely.
- Speaker 1: Well I think that maybe Terry Curry could answer that.
- Jennifer: I just, the wording wasn't quite clear.
- Speaker 1: And I think in the way that it's stated, it's, we're recommending this over the longer terms with the idea that it would be, you know, it's a suggestion and of course we could modify it later. I mean, Terry did you want to make any...? We are trying to set a goal but of course we can do it for this year. So...
- Terry Curry: I'll just add as those of you who have been on UCFA know or I've been on the faculty senate for a while now every year UCFA makes a budget recommendation. So when the next opportunity arises next year, they may reconfirm the recommendation has been made. They may decide to make a different recommendation with regard to the 2021 year, but then in subsequent years UCFA will continue to do that.
- Speaker 1: Thank you. Other discussion or questions? Yes. And I see someone's hand.
- Steven: Steven Gastar College of social science. I don't have an objection but I do have a question. So we, the goal is to meet the middle of the big 10 range of salaries. Right? That's what I heard. Do we have a sense of where we fit in terms of cost of living, visa via the other big 10 institutions? So I think the question would be on what basis are we trying to hit the middle, right? Why hit the middle? It makes more sense to think about where we stand in terms of how much does it cost to live here. I can tell you that, you know, speaking personally, my salary right now and the average increases, I get work great here in East Lansing where even if I were in the middle of Pennsylvania, it would probably not be enough because the cost of living cost of housing, costs of a whole range of other things is significantly higher there. So I think thinking about this going forward in terms of what it actually costs to live here and how that impacts quality of life would make some sense and then could be included in our, in discussion of our packages.
- Speaker 1: Thank you very much. I don't think that ever has been brought up and that's a very good point. Yes, please.
- Laura: Hi, this is Laura [inaudible 00:10:43] College of Ed. I appreciate that. We do have a very low cost of living here in East Lansing, but I do think one of the reasons we're able to attract great faculty is that there are several universities in major urban areas that are drivable from here. And I know a lot of faculty in the college and in the department live in Ann Arbor for example, or in Detroit or in Grand Rapids or other places where the cost of living is not nearly as low as it is here. I live here. My husband's on the school board. Like we love it here, but I'm

not sure that that's the only, I feel like we live in a lot of different places and we'd want to consider that as well.

Speaker 1: Thank you. Other comments? You are ready to vote? All in favor of approval of the letters say Aye. Opposed? Motion carries. Thank you. Next we have discipline and dismissal of tenured faculty for cause policy. This is Dr. Len Fleck University Committee on faculty tenure.

Len Fleck: Len Fleck, College of Human Medicine, chair of the University Committee on faculty tenure. Let me begin by introducing the policy revisions were recommending by giving you some history and context behind it. And many of you have your computers there but I'm going to just read a couple of new paragraph starting with the policy from 2015. Okay. So this was the policy that was in some sense originally in place and I am reading from section seven Roman numeral seven B initiation of formal proceedings. That would be about the fifth page of that policy. And it reads as follows, "If the provost determines that the matter is serious enough to warrant initiation of dismissal for cause proceedings, the provost shall provide written notice of determination to the president along with a recommendation as to whether the faculty members should be relieved from some or all of his or her duties during the dismissal for cause proceedings. The parties should receive a copy of this notice if the president and then the relevant sentence. If the president decides to relieve the Faculty member from all of his or her duties, the faculty members shall be placed on a leave of absence with pay during the pendency of the dismissal for cause proceedings." Now... With pay that's the relevant...

Speaker 1: This is the original to be original 2015?

Len Fleck: Yeah, this was the original 2015 policy as opposed to the policy that the board put in place in 2018 and that we reacted to last fall. Okay. And the most relevant parts of that last sentence that I read would be the fact that pay is not denied an individual under the 2015 policy. And as we discovered, as we debated this issue in the University Council on faculty tenure in general, that has been the policy of big 10 universities. There's one or two sort of minor exceptions, but that has been the policy. Okay. Then we move forward. And of course, what precipitated the board's action to modify this policy had to do with the Larry Nassar and deemed Strample issues. And so again, I'm going to read from the very same paragraph as I read before. So under Roman numeral seven B of the 2018 policy where the relevant sentences read, about halfway into the policy, "If the president decides to relieve the Faculty member from all of his or her duties, the faculty members shall be placed on a leave of absence with or without pay at the discretion of the president during the pendency of the dismissal for cause proceedings."

Now the issue, part of what raise the ire of the faculty in this regard was that there was a question about due process and the fact that the president could make this decision unilaterally and if this became the policy of the university in

the future, this could become problematic for all kinds of reasons. If we want to be as fair minded, I guess I'll say as possible about the action of the board, because at least when I think about it in the context of what was going on, the biggest problem the board was faced with is that they had the dean of a medical college who had engaged in apparently the egregious behavior that was more than a little embarrassing to the university. And if the university were to continue to pay that individual for a long drawn out process for dismissal, this was seen as something that would not reflect well on the university, especially from the point of view of taxpayers who would say, why in the world are we paying somebody to do nothing after they have engaged in some truly egregious behavior or alleged behavior.

And then there's a second part to that 2018 policy, which again I have to read, it's another two paragraphs down. It reads as follows. "Once written charges have been filed with the president and chair of UCFT, a faculty member may not obtain official retiree status from the university during the pendency of the dismissal for cause proceedings. A faculty member who was dismissed for cause at the conclusion of this process is not eligible for official retiree status or marital status." So that's the second part that was problematic. And in contrast to the 2015 policy, because under the 2015 policy, if an individual were to choose to go forward with the dismissal process all the way up to the moment that the board of trustees was going to make a decision and say, in effect, you're dismissed, that individual could say, I want to retire. I realize in effect I'm going to lose this. I don't want to lose my retirement benefits. And so I just want to quit now.

Under the 2018 policy approved in June of 2018 by the board, without the consent of any faculty, in fact against the wishes of the relevant faculty committees, from the point of view of the board or at that point in time, they were in effect saying, once the dismissal process begins, once you decide to go forward, you no longer have the option to retire. If you are found guilty of the charges and in dismissed in accordance with those charges, then you will lose those retirement benefits that are at risk. Namely, your health insurance, America's status parking and library privileges. Okay. So that was where we were when the university committee on...

And then we wrote collectively as the Senate, we wrote a letter to the board saying we were very disheartened and disapproved of their action. The board was responsive and listen to us, we have a new board which is listening even more and is quite open to the policy revisions that we, the university committee on faculty tenure in UCFA are proposing. And so the next document that I want to call to your attention are those revisions, which we discussed very thoroughly over the course of many meetings. And so let me just kind of walk through what our particular recommendations will be to the board of trustees and for which we're asking your approval. First of all, we agreed that what we should have is a three person review panel randomly chosen, made up, up dismissal for cause review officers not including of course somebody from the colleges, the accused

and that panel in consultation with the president would decide whether the accused individual will be denied pay during the dismissal hearing process.

So part of the idea is that just takes care of the problem of somebody who is not a faculty member named the President of the university making a decision unilaterally. We, we wanted to restore faculty governance and we feel that this is accomplished by having a three person review panel that will actually make the decision as to whether or not an individual who is up for potential dismissal will or will not get paid during that period of time. Secondly, we agreed that the judgment of the panel must be unanimous and now that's going to be related to our third point. The conduct of the accused faculty member must be egregious to justify denial of pay. And to where we did the word egregious was not something that was chosen at random that were, the word egregious is actually under Roman numeral four of our current policy.

Okay. And under the 2015 policy. And so, the other word that's used to describe a misbehavior is there's minor misbehavior, there's major misbehavior, there's serious major misbehavior and there's egregious major misbehavior. We wanted, we felt that a judgment of that three panel to uh, to be unanimous because if the behavior is truly egregious than it ought to be something that would be obvious to any reasonable person making an assessment of the circumstances for that particular faculty member. And saying that the behaviors should be judged to be egregious. We noted that there were several levels of judgment regarding the accused behavior that would have occurred before this issue ever came before the University Committee for faculty tenure or came up to the provost, to the president. So there's all kinds of safeguards for individuals who are accused of very kind of misbehavior and efforts to correct that behavior before we get to this sort of very final step that has to do with dismissal from the faculty.

We had to figure out how we were gonna define egregious and we came to the conclusion there is no way to define egregious. It's not something that is written in some gold standard dictionary anywhere is an Oxford dictionary and so on. And so we came up with what we felt were guidelines that this three person panel could use for purposes of judging that behavior was egregious and the four guidelines we came up with are as follows, the behavior represents substantial damage to the reputation of the university. The word substantial is a judgment term. And again, we have to trust that three members of the faculty can make a judgment about what would count as substantial damage to the reputation of the university.

You can ask yourself because this is obviously public knowledge. In the case of Dean Strample this is a behavior that he's accused of the kind of behavior that would represent substantial damage to the reputation at the university. To my mind that would satisfy that criteria to that guideline. Secondly, the behavior or else interrupted intent to commit the behavior represents violence against any member of the university community. Thirdly, the behavior or interrupted

intent to commit the behavior represents substantial damage to the university property, either physical or intellectual. Fourthly, the behavior or interrupted intend to commit the behavior represents substantial violations of fiscal norms, fraud or actual theft. And again, numbers make a difference here. \$100 versus \$1 million. Or a substantial violation of scholarly norms. For example, fabrication or falsifications of research data. We're all capable of making mistakes and submitting articles and failing to check a reference there. All kinds of minor mistakes that we can make in research, but things like falsification and fabrication, these are serious violations of academic integrity. I think we all understand that quite clearly.

And then, our fourth large point, we agreed that if the panel judges that the accused faculty member's behavior to be egregious and they are denied pay, then they may still choose to retire before the hearing process begins. So they continue to have that option. But if they do not retire at that point, then their retirement benefits are at risk. And those are the benefits that I specified before that is they do not have the option of retiring later in the hearing or dismissal process. Now I call attention on the handout here that concerns were expressed in our full committee meeting that this individual might be denied due process since they, since they don't actually, it would not appear for this three person panel making this particular judgment, unlike in earlier stages of the process and again, in later stages of the process, they can appear, they can have legal representation and so on.

But we noted that such an individual would have had several opportunities to plead their case early in earlier stages of the disciplinary process. And a record of their pleadings would be part of the thick packet of very thick packet of information that would be reviewed by that three person panel. And so in that respect, it seems to process is adequately protected in our judgment. And then fifth and lastly, we agreed that if a faculty member is being considered for dismissal but their behavior is not judged to be egregious, then they may stay on, they may stand duty and be paid. This is a judgment that would be made by the department chair dean of the college. And that would actually be in conversation with the provost in university as well. That faculty member may then go through the hearing process as far as they wish with again, the option to retire at any point if they wish.

Right up to the time when the board of trustees is ready to make a decision, they can retire, which means they protect their retirement benefits in that way, they would have the right to do that. On the other hand, if the board of trustees renders its judgment and in fact finds him guilty of the behavior that they've been accused of, then they are dismissed from the university so then they cannot retire. And so then they have lost the benefits that I've mentioned before. I think that's probably all that I need to say by way of introducing this topic. I imagine there might be some robust discussion at this point.

Speaker 1: Would you like to make a motion for acceptance of the proposal?

- Len Fleck: I would make a motion for acceptance of this proposal having to do with revisions for the dismissal of tenured faculty.
- Speaker 1: Is there a second? Second, discussion?
- Rufus Isaac: Rufus Isaac a college of Agriculture and natural resources. Two questions that came up as I listened to this today and I want to thank the committee for their work, but one was why is it only violence towards people on campus that were concerned about why isn't there part of that that's relevant to people off campus? And then the other part was, how is this committee put together? It wasn't clear to me how we'd get these three people together, how are they elected selected, etc. Thank you.
- Speaker 1: I think that violence... And Terry Curry obviously can answer this, but I believe that is covered under other university policies and that would go through academic human resources. Is that correct?
- Terry Curry: Yes. So the dismissal for cause review panel is a group of 10 faculty members. They are appointed by the president, but based upon the recommendation of UCFA and UCFT. They typically don't do very much. Their role is when a recommendation is made to dismiss a tenured faculty member. One of those members is identified. It's selected. She or he who can't be from the same college as a faculty member in question, talks to the faculty member, talks to the relevant administrators and deans and provides a confidential recommendation to the provost to see if there's any other ops and more appropriate than dismissal. So should it not be any discipline should a suspension be used instead of a recommending dismissal. So that's the role of that panel. And since we very rarely had dismissal for cause hearings, they aren't asked very often to provide any service when they do. It's very important service but that group of 10 individuals would be the group from which the three would be chosen with the caveat in the recommendation that you would not choose someone from the same college as a faculty member in question.
- Len Fleck: Then the other thing I just remind everybody of the university committee of faculty tenure has 17 members representative from each and every college. So it is broadly representative of the entire university.
- Donna: I'm Donna Sheila James Madison College. First of all, I really want to thank Dr. Flakwood and UCFT I have a broken toe so I'm trying to work this. So I want to thank them for the initial letter that they sent that they worked on, that we endorsed. I want to thank them for really taking this really seriously. And for trying to build in controls over the process. There are a couple of points of concern to me. One is not actually with what is written here. I will make that first. And the second one is specifically to the wording of one point here. So the first point of concern is the narrative that's been in place that the reason why we need policy change is to get rid of Dean Strample. The thing is we could have gotten rid of Dean Strample as a dean a long time ago.



If the complaints made against him would have been listened to, he wouldn't have been dean. So we've got a failure there that's being kind of masked by this whole narrative about how faculty have all this power and they can't be dismissed. So I just want to make that point cause we got to take control of that narrative and really, you know, work with that. That's what happened there, right? People complained about him, didn't they? And there was a failure to actually take him down from the position of responsibility that then enabled other things. I'm not going to go into that more, but you know. So the second point specifically has to do with the wording here. So the wording that gives me pause and concern is the one that defines egregious behavior first as behavior that brings substantial damage to the public image of the university.

There's no way to quantify that. That can be politicized, that can be weaponized, that can be used against people in various ways. So I really think that when we need to do something about that wording, that wording, you know, is very uncomfortable wording. It can be used for purposes we don't intend it to be used. Now what does substantial damage to the reputation of the university mean? You know, some people sitting in this room might think Lana Simon has done substantial damage to the reputation of the university. Some people sitting in this room a few months ago, like ex-president Angler thought that reclaim MSU is doing substantial damage to the reputation of the university. And he said that in the press. So I don't want to make too much of a deal of that or how scary that was. No, but the fact is it can be weaponized and used that way. So I think it cannot be part of our policy. We need to do something about that specific language. These are just the two points I wanted to bring up. Thank you.

Speaker 1: Other discussion?

Creme: I'm Creme College of Engineering. Maybe more of a clarification if we pass this today or some other time. Okay... If we pass this today, I'm trying to understand what is the procedures for this to come into place and what is the political likelihood of that happening. And do you have a sense of that?

Len Fleck: Len Fleck, human medicine. And the short answer to your question is we actually met with the board of trustees for lunch last week and presented this in sort of a preview mode to them. It seemed to me that they were quite receptive to the fact that at some point if you were to approve this policy today, there was this revised version of the policy today. Then we would be meeting with, there's a committee of the board that looks at the stuff and again explained to them what we had done, why we had done it and so on and they would in all likelihood be responsive and be willing to go approve it. One of the things that we were told was that, well, we were, the board said they were sympathetic to the concerns of the faculty last September but it would not have looked right to have made this policy in June. And then revoked it three months later and it could have had legal consequences with regard to what's going on with Dean Strampled and the legal system right now. So we have had to go through, we

have to go through a much longer process to into address what they're legitimate concerns where I think

Speaker 1: They had several... I was at the meeting also and just to add a little bit they had many of the same questions that have already been asked about what happens if it's violence off campus and they were also concerned about a timeline because that was one of the other concerns with dean Strample was that our particular method of dismissal for cause can take a very long time and we are going to I believe going to talk to general counsel to see if there is a need to put in a timeline.

Roberto Foley: Roberto Foley, collage of engineering. I guess, I would like to see things go a lot of fair and just looking at the reputation of the university. Because the reputation of the university comes into position where you are talking about things in the papers. And so on. And I feel that you could have a situation where considerable damage has been done to a student or a group of students who parents reported it, but it never got into the paper. And because it never got into the paper the question of the reputation of the university does not come into place. So I would like to say things actually spelled out a little bit more consistently to make sure that we protect our students, we protect our staff and we'll protect that our faculty.

Speaker 1: I believe was one of the points was something damaged to students and faculty? I believe that's already included in that. Please.

Steven: So I'm Steven Gastar again, College of social science. I too will rise and say that I would like to see the language specified a significantly. Because one of the problems is as long as we're talking about damage to the reputation of the university. Actually this could embroil for instance, somebody who has been working in the Middle East and is working on the Palestinian and Israeli conflict and starts talking about the need for justice for Palestinians. And we know we have right wing representatives in our legislature right now who would then use that as a way to label the university as antisemitic regardless of whether it is just as an example, right. It reclaim MSU is another example. As long as what we're talking about is damage to the reputation of the university, we open ourselves up to all sorts of problems that aren't about real offenses against real people. They are about politics. I think we do need to have in place mechanisms that remove people quickly when they are actually involved in harm to real people. So I think the language has to be clarified significantly so we can do what is important to do to protect people and we don't open ourselves up to politicized weaponized for rhetorical charges. So thank you.

Speaker 1: Thank you.

Len Fleck: I'd be prepared to speak to that. You have to keep in mind that when we're talking about the reputation of the university and who's making a judgment as to whether or not there is substantial damage to the reputation of the

university, these are members of the faculty, three members of the faculty. We don't care what right wing members of the state legislature may have to say or think about this. That's all irrelevant. Okay. And so this is a process that's occurring within the university, within the faculty. I don't have concerns that three members of the faculty are going to come up with some really wild idea of what... You're shaking your head. You're not quite, I'm being... It's unanimous. Yes, that's right. It's another thing gets a unanimous decision. So I just don't get concerned about that. Yes.

Jennifer: So Jennifer Johnson College of Human Medicine. Around that particular phrase, reputation of the university. My concern would be to clarify that it protects free speech. So, for example, did the person who leaked the original Spartan magazine to the Detroit Free Press damage the reputation of the university? Arguably yes. Was it the wrong thing to do? You know, to the person who leaked England's emails did I do that? No. Am I kind of glad somebody did? Yeah, maybe. So, you know, it really has to do with clarifying that it's not about criticizing the university and not about even very publicly criticizing the university that we're protecting free speech that way. And I've been trying to think, is there any way in which we wouldn't want to protect free speech of faculty? And I think if somebody goes on you know, racist, sexist, highly offensive tirade then, I don't think that should necessarily be protected. I'm not sure what our rules are around that, but, but the damage to the reputation of the university under some of our administrations was sometimes it felt like it was defined as anything critical of what they were doing. And it can't be that.

Dollina Buchu: I'm Dollina Buchu James Madison College. As I think about this one thing that really sticks out to me is that and I know people worked really hard at this but the first thing read that identifying is brand and reputation in this document and it's really ironic, you know. It kind of speaks to our culture, right? Well, wait a minute, we're part of the culture, but that's what we do. So instead of identifying, as I heard people say, you know, did damage being done to people, to humans? We're identifying first concerns about branding. This shows us a lot about ourselves and I think we need to correct that. Thank you.

Strong: Strong from engineering. I'm concerned about the reputation issue as well. Len very clearly said that three people, extraordinarily good people and have to be unanimous have to decide whether there is damage to the reputation of the university. And that I think it's perfect. The problem is not with the decision of whether there was damage to the reputation, but the term reputation. Reputation means public opinion. It doesn't mean anything else. And their reputation was at university like Foster Youth and that was quite accused Dr Strample, ex doctor Nassar did damage the reputation of the university. And appropriately so. So, I think actually the whole idea, the whole term of reputation and demonstrate has to be removed from that. It is not, it may be the only way to quantify as take a poll and see how many articles are there that say that so and so said something bad for the university or said something that hurt the university regardless of whether it's correct or not. And there have

been issues like that in the university for many years or somebody said something that made a lot of people, including politicians not necessarily right wing be upset with it. That is part of academic freedom and freedom of speech. So I think the reputation has related to public opinion, which is really what it means. It has to be removed from the discussion.

Speaker 1: Yes.

Terry Curry: So I wasn't a part of the decisions about what language would be used. But you CFA and UCFT I was at the meetings in which they discussed this and this reputation piece. So take a step back, what they were trying to do, correct me if I'm wrong, is to figure out how do we define egregious behavior, the kind of behavior that will lead us to say you shouldn't be paid and you should put your retirement benefits at risk. And after a lot of discussions, we don't believe we can define egregious behavior. But we believe three faculty members together, if they have to make a unanimous decision with node when they see it. And then they said, well, maybe there's some guidelines that we are to provide that suggest here are the kinds of things you might think about in deciding whether or not something is egregious and perhaps reputation as an example is and those four things were, not that it has to be one of these, but these are the kinds of things to be thought about in making that decision. And maybe that's one that that requires some modification.

But I guess your thoughts about the premise or the idea that the committees had about let's have three faculty members look at this behavior and let three of our faculty colleagues decide if this meets a standard. And even if you take the word egregious out a standard that is one such that this behavior should lead to a faculty member not receiving paid during this dismissal process or, or putting his or her a retirement benefits at risk. To me that's really the question more than what's the wording? And because in theory you could take all of that out. This was just their attempt to say, all right, what should they be thinking about in deciding whether or not this behavior meets the threshold?

Speaker 1: Right. I think my understanding of what was presented is that these are in fact just guidelines and that this is not the policy. These are guidelines to help enforce the policy. Yes, please.

Dan: Dan Gold Education. I was trying to think of an instance and either carrier, if you took out the first criteria you listed the reputation of the university, would there ever be a case or just used that one? Would there ever be a case that somebody would be dismissed without the benefits? Just on the public image relation piece without doing the other three or one or one, two or three of the other? So in a way, could you kind of get rid of that one, which gets you out of the public relations domain? In other words, would anybody ever just on that one alone. So I say, Hey, I don't like our president. They're full of, you know, what or whatever. And somebody says that's to me sort of academic freedom. Not Too smart on my part probably, but you know, would I be dismissed for that? But it

seems like the other two or three would almost be necessary conditions in the first one would kind of go. So I didn't know if you could just eliminate it.

Speaker 1: So I think yes, please.

Terry Curry: Okay. Can I make a motion to amend the motion?

Speaker 1: I think so, but maybe we should just look at the options that we have. So we have the options of approving it as presented. We have an option of amending the motion to... I would maybe not suggest wordsmithing it because sometimes that's just very, very difficult to do in a group this large. But perhaps taking out the first criteria. The other possibility is to take out all of the guidelines and simply leave it as agreed just behavior which leaves it open to the committee itself, the three person committee itself to decide what to do to make it, because it remember it has to be unanimous and the guidelines are simply there as a help. And the other possibility is to table it and move it back to committee. So I mean, I'm sure there are other possibilities, but those are just the options that I'm seeing from this particular group. So at this point in time, if someone would like to make a motion.

Len Fleck: I am willing to make a motion to strike that first example. And I think that would be a clean thing to do. I haven't heard objections about the other elements of the proposed policy and I think that would allow it to go forward if the amendment passes to a vote on the full proposal. And if that goes forward, the board of trustees, then we'll be able to draft the language and move this forward and replaced the policy they put in place unilaterally. But I don't want to make that motion if someone else has a different strategy or a way forward. Oh, I'll make the motion seconded.

Speaker 1: Is there discussion on the motion? Any discussion? All in favor of the amendment to the original motion. Say Aye. Opposed? Motion carries. So now we have a motion on. Pardon me? [inaudible 00:48:31] Yeah, you want to oppose, thank you. We have that on recording, right? We have one opposed. Anybody abstain? Sorry. Any abstentions? Okay, so now we have a motion on the floor to approve the dismissal for cause policy as amended.[inaudible 00:48:58] Yeah, it's already seconded, right? Any more discussion? Any other discussion? [inaudible 00:49:06] All in favor say Aye. Opposed? Motion carries. Thank you very much. Thank you doctor Fleck. Next we have marketing and use of MSU ideas portal. Christine Carter, chief of staff, executive vice president for administration.

Christine: Last presentation. Is that correct?[inaudible 00:49:35]. Sorry, can you hear me now? I understand this is your last meeting, is that correct?

Speaker 1: Yes.

Christine:

I will try to be as brief as possible. So I'm Christine Carter. I've been here for 24 years, 18 of which on the fourth floor of the administration building. I wear many hats and I'm actually surprised to know that I know five people in this room because most of my work involves working with support staff, leadership development. And one of my primary responsibilities is managing everything that goes to the board of the trustees within budget and finance, construction investment managers, and conflict of interest. So that's primary role that I have at the university. What I wanted to talk about is MSU ideas. So the being a large decentralized institution, there is a lot that goes on in silos such as what happens in this meeting that nobody knows about.

Prior to actually coming here, I didn't really know about academic governance and how this is structured and how things get done. So MSU ideas is actually a great platform for which you can do this sort of work and get great insight and feedback and suggestions from campus wide constituents as to the things that we're doing. So what I have learned is I'm very well connected here at the university, especially with sports staff, but I'm not as much with faculty. So what I'm looking for from all of you is to learn about this portal, be familiar with it and share it with your colleagues and think about ways in which you might be able to utilize this within your college within topics of discussion that you guys utilize and perhaps maybe even within this committee. So what I'm going to do is show you how it works, kind of a technical aspect of it, a synopsis of the challenges IE topics or questions that are posed, ideas posted and then invite you to participate.

So this is a crowdsourced idea management tool. It's backed by crowdcity.com. Currently it's accessible to all faculty staff on call and temporary employees. It does not include students at this time and that's because we have quite a bit of people who have access to this site. It's connected to EBS, so whatever you are in the system as a tenured faculty, fixed term support staff, etc. Your location is tied to what it is an EBS. So if you change it will change with you. There are currently 12 challenges out there, all by different topics. Most recently Judith Stoddard put out a topic on the arts strategy for which you can participate and engage in and there is a review and evaluation process. So I have one ambassador in this room that serves on this committee and they're assigned to review and evaluate all ideas that are posted within each portal and look at all the responses.

And then they're submitted to the steering committee and eventually get to both Sateesh and June so that they are fully aware of what's happening on campus and what we're thinking. So if you go to the [homepage@ideas.msu.edu](http://homepage@ideas.msu.edu), this is where you log in. There's a really brief two minute videos. So if I can't have time to go and talk to everybody, you can quickly see when it's about within that video there. Click on login. The very first time that you're going to get into this portal, you have to go through five brief steps. After this you only

have to log in with your net id and your password. You have to agree to privacy terms. You can add a photo if you want to. You can add your skills and bio, you can bypass all of this. And then it's got your information from EBS that you can review as well.

Once you're in there, there are four buttons for which you can kind of engage to see what's happening. See what the FAQs are, getting started questions and that who's who now activity. So you can kind of see what's happening. When you click on share your ideas, that's how you can find out what's actually occurring within the site so you can see the 12 different challenges that we have and how many people are engaged in that. How many people are voting up, so if you're familiar with Facebook, it's kind of similar to that in terms of you can vote something up, you can vote it down, you can add a comment, etc. Within the activity page, this is where you can see every time you do something, you are assigned a point, actually multiple points depending on what you do, but it really doesn't mean anything other than you're actively engaged, which is what we really like to see.

You can view things based on what's most discussed, what's top voted, who's new to the system and kind of what the topics are up at the top. At some point here we're going to highlight some of the things that are actually moving forward and kind of the hot topics because you can get lost within this if you're not within each individual challenge. So when you click on a specific challenge such as the arts strategy, at the very top you can see how many ideas were posted to this suggestion, how many people are engaged in it. This is relatively new. It's got a description. It tells you who's overseeing it at the very bottom and what the expectations are. So yes, you can submit your feedback, you can submit your idea and you want to know what's going to happen. You want to have some feedback back as terms of did you hear me? Do you know what's going on? What are the next steps?

If you want to post your own idea, you click on the bottom one to do that. And if you don't want to get into the portal every single day or whenever you feel like it, you can subscribe to the challenge so that you're notified by email. Or you can subscribe to an actual thread. So if someone's talking about something like merit raises within that, just say we had that particular challenge out there and you want to see what everybody's saying. You can subscribe to the thread so that you get an email every time something new is posted. When you submit a post, this is the form you have to enter the title, the description, you can tag someone, you can add an attachment if you want to. You can add an image if you want to.

On the right hand side is what it looks like when it's actually posted. This is an example of some of the ideas that have already been posted within the 12 challenges that we have. So as you can see, two things that are happening at the moment is when we had NLK day, we asked for ideas about how we can make it better and more inclusive for support staff, faculty, eta. And they wanted to

have a community service project. So we actually made that happen. The MSU policies, as you know, manual business procedures, bylaws, ordinances, all that kind of stuff. It's all over the place. And so there was a suggestion about having that in one easy to find location that is in the works and it's soon to come.

Framework. So, like I said, everything starts with the question, whatever that is. And the administrator is the only person who can actually pose that. So you can't go out there and put out a topic and have everybody kind of rallied around that, it has to be done at the administrator level. There's ambassadors assigned to every single thing. So if you create something, you need to have a team of individuals who is assigned to kind of monitor that and see what's happening. And then there's a steering committee who oversees the whole portal to kind of be in the know in terms of what's happening, what the postings are, kind of what the look and feel is going and at the end, June institution made aware of everything that gets posted to this site. A recommendation, responses and action steps are updated within the portal. And if you voted, you commented, if you did anything, you will get a response when something is there. So within FAQs, like I said, there's points that are assigned to kind of talks about the overall process.

A lot of times people ask, who has access? We have a gazillion different types of employees here on campus. So essentially our faculty, our academic staff, our support staff, temporary on call and no pay faculty and academic staff. If there is something inappropriate that is posted, one can flag it. Administrators are the only ones who can delete it, but obviously we get notified for that. Like I said, this is not an anonymous thing, which is like something good. So you can't go out there blasting it and that stand behind whatever your thought is. We haven't had that sort of thing within the space, but if there was, we have the ability to flag and delete it. And like I said, if you ever changed departments, your information when you posted back when you are in the Eng and Natural Resources and you moved over to Social Science or whatever, your most recent information would be associated with you at the time that you move.

When you retire or if you're on discipline and you leave, you no longer have access to the site, but your stuff doesn't go away unless it's deleted. So why bother? I'm hoping, obviously, like I said, I'm very well connected within support staff. I'm not so much with faculty and academic staff. So I want you to think about ways in which you might be able to utilize the site within your college, within the work that you do, topics that you discuss even within this forum here. It's a way for you to get ideas, suggestions, feedback from a wide range of people. Obviously just faculty and staff, not students. So you can also segment every challenge. So let's just say you created a challenge within arts and letters and you only want a certain subset of people to have access to that and to comment and to view it. We can do that and only allow different individuals to see it and not the entire campus that has access. So that's another great benefit of this. So I want you to share it. I want you to communicate it with other



people, think about ways that we could use it, especially on the faculty side. And send me any suggestions or thoughts to [ideas@msu.edu](mailto:ideas@msu.edu) any questions?

Speaker 1: I have a question.

Christine: Yeah.

Speaker 1: I noticed that your steering committee doesn't seem to have any faculty on it.

Christine: Kelly is. Is she not?

Speaker 1: Where is she?

Christine: Kelly [crosstalk 00:58:45].

Speaker 1: She's an associate dean?

Christine: Okay. So I am totally willing and open and able to add faculty members to that. So if you had suggestions and want to be on it, I would welcome that and that's great.

Speaker 1: I think that would be an excellent idea to add faculty because people, I mean these are obviously well respected people but then Benny Gor and Cathy Wilbur and Mike Zag or definitely...

Christine: Administrators.

Speaker 1: Administrators. Right. So it looks like you've sort of stacked with administrators. And for the faculty we would like to have our represented.

Christine: I completely agree. And again, I don't know any of you, so if you want to be a part of this or you have a suggestion, please send me their name and we'll get them on board.

Speaker 1: Sounds great. Okay. Is there other questions?

Christine: Okay. Happy summer.

Speaker 1: Thank you. Was that a somebody in the back? No. Okay. Alright. We now have comments from the floor. Any comments from the floor? Yes, please.

Nunes: So I know it's 4:15 and everybody wants to leave. I understand this. But this is our last opportunity. So I wanted to start a conversation. It's a conversation about how we change the MSU Senate so that we can have conversations. Because the way we operate, I've only been here for one year, but I do not feel like we can have conversations during our meetings. This is a setting that is

prone to being lectured. That's exactly what this room is used for. The timeline in which we operate, the way we get things on agendas, the way we received the agendas, all of this is the same for the last many decades and we have moved with technology. We have moved in the way that we communicate and I think that the Senate should move too, I mean we should come to the present days and how we operate and we should consider what we can do to make this much more effective than it is today.

We all have probably thousands of things waiting for our attention outside, right? But we have chosen to give time to this. We sit through these meetings and the question is how can we make this more effective so that we can make our voices more impactful? We can help the university move forward. I do not feel that my contribution is what it could be. And I know that others feel the same way. So I have had the opportunity to talk to people and say, Oh my goodness, there we go and it's another hour and we didn't really get much done. So it is hard with a large group of people. So I know the arguments against it, but I don't want to hear those arguments because I know those have been sorted by other groups, other groups are able to communicate effectively in 40 or 50 people.

So just the setting here, I could rearrange this in a way that we would be looking at each other and having a conversation. So I understand this is the last chance we have this year to even start this conversation, but I would like to start it and I would like to urge the steering committee to follow through on this. Perhaps by telling us, okay, a subgroup of you figure out how this is, this can happen. But I would like by October or September when our first meeting comes around that we already have a different way to have a conversation.

Speaker 1: Can I just say that the steering committee would be delighted to have suggestions but what I've heard right now is what is not right. It would be wonderful if you could tell us what you think would be a better solution? Because the steering committee has spent many hours thinking and talking about how to make this better.

Nunes: So I think first of all, we need to have perhaps a sense that it's, I'm not just the only ones. I know that there's a handful of people I've talked to that share my opinion but it is unclear to me whether everybody shares my opinion. Right. So obviously we're not going to change anything. It's just five people in a sentence think this way. And the rest of it are quite happy with the status quo. So the first thing perhaps is to get a sense, how many of you would actually welcome a change in format that would enable better conversations? So perhaps we can have just a show of hands. How many of you would actually like to have change? Can we have a show of hands? Okay. That looks like pretty close to everybody, so that's good.

Speaker 1: As I say, this has been an ongoing conversation for as long as I have been in any way involved in academic governance.

Nunes: So let me then put forward another idea that is, how many of you would welcome participating in some form in this conversation over the summer? Okay. So we have some hands. Okay. For those people, can you email me? And we will start.

Speaker 1: Could you give us your email?

Nunes: Nunes@efro.msu.edu.

Speaker 1: That's N.U.N.E.S?

Nunes: Yes.

Speaker 1: @efro.msu.edu. And please, whatever you come up with, please send that to the steering committee. Because the steering committee and to the at large members, the steering committee with the at large members can certainly look at it and then it will come to the steering committee and then we can discuss it. Thank you.

Angelo: Thank you very much to Phenomena Nunes. I'm Angelo number two from James Madison College and I just wanted to make a couple of quick points. I really look forward to working with others on changing the format because the way the format actually impacts the content and the way in which we've talked to each other might help us reassess our roles as faculty senators. In terms of the governance of this institution, I suggest that at the beginning of next year we have one of our specialists in institutional courage come and talk to faculty Senate about our culture and how we could change it so that we can better represent faculty. The idea of leadership at this institution has been basically, I don't know how to put it formatted around the of the administration. The idea is that if you want to be a leader that you need to become an administrator. But we as faculty might not want to become administrators. And I think we really need to regain that sense of significance of faculty voice.

And on that point, I want to thank everybody from faculty Senate official leadership. I really also want to thank people who I've worked with on Senate as colleagues, untenured and tenured, who have lifted their voices in spite of the fact that it's a scary thing to do sometimes. And that's not been the culture here. People have worked on petition to open the presidential search. It's been a lot of work working with other people. They've come up and spoken at this microphone or another one about their desire for change and how they can specifically see that implemented. They've written an op Ed for the Lansing State Journal about the need for presidential searches. They've gone to BOT meetings and basically they've taken risks and spend a lot of time working on pushing things forward. So I want to thank all of you, but I also really as a member of this body, I want to thank those people who have gotten on an out of their way to do all this additional work. So thank you for being my colleagues on this body.

Speaker 1: Thank you. And please again, if you have mentioned that you wanted to have somebody come and speak at faculty Senate, please forward that to the steering committee because that can easily be put on the agenda. Other comments from the floor? Yes, please.

Roberto Foley: Roberto Foley College of Engineering. In talking about people who can come in here and talk to us. I like to make one recommendation. I like to have a doctor, Paulette Granbury Uracil come in and spend maybe half of our meeting with us one of these days. I have a come to one or the courses that I teach every year because you know, accept it or not, we all have implicit biases that govern everything that we do. And I think having somebody like that who has had all that training come in and talk to us about implicit bias, I think we'll be excellent for this committee.

Speaker 1: Again, can you put that in an email and send it to the steering committee? Academic governance.

Roberto Foley: Will do.

Speaker 1: Thank you. Other comments from the floor? Is there a motion to adjourn? Is there a second? All in favor say, I. have a great summer. Thank you.