

Professor Moria: Hello everyone. Before I call the meeting to order, I'd just like to repeat what I just said, which is that the piece of paper that you have for feedback on the Minskoff Pavilion and the international center. If you could fill that out, put down any comments that you feel are relevant and if you leave the one on the table where you're sitting, then they will be picked up at the end of the meeting. We want to make sure that we have feedback from everyone who is involved. And now I'd like to call the meeting to order. Is there a motion to approve the agenda? Second? Anything added to the agenda? All in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries. Is there a motion to approve the draft minutes for November 12th? Second? Any additions? Deletions? All in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries. President's remarks, Dr. Stanley.

Dr. Stanley: Thank you so much. Good afternoon everybody and Happy New Year. I'm pleased to be back for my second semester at Michigan State University, so thank you. I think you're going to have an update on the provost search at the university council meeting, so I'll save that for then or actually Stephanie Anthony, I think will be presenting one there so I'll save that for then. I announced Friday that we will be conducting a nationwide search for a new chief diversity officer with the title of vice president as well pending approval of that position by the board of trustees, Paulette Granberry Russell has done outstanding work in this area for the past 22 years and she will continue in the advisory role while we do this search and look for a new one and then she will transition away from the office. This senior level position will port directly to me and we're collaborative across campus.

Dr. Stanley: One of the things we know is there's many great efforts taking place across the campus for diversity, equity, inclusion. We want ways to coordinate those activities and the CDO will be charged with doing that and as a vice presidential and senior level, I hope they'll be better able to do these kind of coordination activities. We really think this is an important part of our diversity, equity and inclusion plan. This person will be the point for actually implementing that plan that we come up with as an institution. So it will be nice to have someone who's accountable essentially to all of us for getting that plan instituted.

Dr. Stanley: Last month, the governor appointed a new trustee to replace Nancy Schlichting who resigned. I think everybody's aware that Renee Knake, who currently the Doherty chair in legal ethics at the University of Houston Law Center, but prior to 2016 she spent more than 10 years at MSU and earned tenure in the MSU college of law. So we welcome back Professor Knake to Michigan State University and to her role on the board of trustees.

Dr. Stanley: I wanted to give an RVSM update. I shared a letter to the campus community back on January 3rd which you may have seen, which detailed, I think, some of the progress we're trying to make in addressing relationship violence and sexual misconduct. I outlined what we're doing in response to reviews conducted by the Department of Education, Department of Health and Human Services. These include an updated notice of non-discrimination, anti harassment and non-

retaliation statement, which is posted on the university website as well as on the websites for our Office of Civil Rights and the Office of Institutional Equity. We've actually made a number of updates to our RVSM policy and I'm happy to answer questions about those if you're interested at the end of my comments. We continue to update the university's progress in providing more details on the MSEs our commitment page, and again, I encourage you to go there to use that dashboard and take a look at it and see the kind of things we're doing.

Dr. Stanley: But I did want to mention a couple of important hires we've made in this area, I think, since we last met. So Melody Warner is the new director of the Office of Institutional Equity. She joins us from Eastern Michigan University where she was a title nine coordinator. She will oversee all investigations under the relationship violence and sexual misconduct and anti-discrimination policies. At EMU she really built the title nine office from the ground up, including drafting policies and designing and implementing all title nine operations systems and processes and one of the things she did was really improve the timeliness of the investigations at Eastern Michigan University and we look forward to having that. That is one of the areas I think we have identified as a problem at Michigan State University, as you're aware, in the long times it takes us to conduct these investigations so she did some very good work there in finding ways to maintain the integrity of the process and yet speed it up and so we look forward to progress in that.

Dr. Stanley: Our new associate vice president for the Office of Civil Rights and the title nine education compliance is Tonya Yakimak. She will join us on February 3rd. She will lead MSU's Prevention, Outreach and Education Department, the Office of Institutional Equity and Resolution Office and be a key asset as we continue to expand our RVSM prevention and response efforts. She has more than 20 years experience in higher education and compliance work. Most recently she was the title nine and section five coordinator at Wake Forest University in North Carolina and we're very pleased that she was coming to Michigan State University. She will replace Rob Kent who has been interim associate vice president since June, 2018. He will stay on an advisory role until March 1st and that he'll return to the Office of the General Counsel.

Dr. Stanley: I think we may have talked before about the results of the no more at MSU campus wide survey and I know there'll be an opportunity further on for the Senate to hear about it so I won't talk about that anymore. But I will say that the RVSM Expert Advisory Workgroup is holding a series of meetings with the campus community to discuss those survey results, answer questions and solicit ideas for improving MSU's culture. And as I mentioned before, I think that feedback along with what we heard in meetings with survivors will help inform a strategic plan for RVSM prevention efforts, policy updates and resource development. And that process is led by Andrea Mumford and Professor Rebecca Campbell, who are my special advisors in this area.

Dr. Stanley: I think with the appointments of the individuals I just talked about, I think we're starting to assemble a new team to deal with some of these issues. And again, I'm hoping we're going to be making progress, but again, all of us will be engaged in this work but I'm pleased with the team we've been able to assemble. I've talked a lot about the planning initiatives and I don't have anything terribly new to say about that. Just to say the progress continues on our strategic planning steering committee led by vice president Vinny Gore and library dean Joseph Salem. The committee has met, they've begun their work and again, I'm very enthusiastic about this process and we're counting on them to develop really a comprehensive plan that includes an engagement process for gathering input from campus and external stakeholders, including campus leaders, community leaders, alumni, all about the university's vision, value and strategic direction. And I look forward to having the committee chairs come and present to the faculty Senate, so you'll have an opportunity to discuss with them this important this series of issues.

Dr. Stanley: And again, the same work is going on. Great work is going on from the committee on diversity equity inclusion steering committee. They also are about to have their first meeting. They've already set up a charge for the committee and they will be meeting again, as I said, very soon. It is co-chaired by honors college dean, Cynthia Jackson Elmore and migrant student services director, Louis Garcia, but again there is cross membership between this and the strategic planning committee to make sure that they're operating in close contact as they do their work.

Dr. Stanley: I continue to do my meetings with the cores and cops group student leaders, so I've been meeting with them now on a monthly basis so we met Monday night. It's been a very good process I think going forward. I think there's a lot of exchange of information but also a lot of commitment to change that's taking place from our point of view and I think, again, a lot of this is centered on the campus multicultural center and we've established committee now that will be developing an RFP that will go out to solicit architects to start in a design and consideration process for what will be, we hope, an important building on campus to help demonstrate, again, our commitment to diverse and inclusive community. So with that, I think I'm going to stop. I think I'll stop at this point in time and answering questions people have, if they have any. Hearing none. I'm done.

Professor Moria: Hearing none. Thank you very much. Moving onto the interim provost remarks, Dr. Sullivan.

Dr. Sullivan: Thank you. Well, welcome to the new semester everybody. I came back too.

Dr. Stanley: And I'm very grateful.

Professor Moria: We're all very grateful.

Dr. Sullivan: I do want you to know that the college budget planning meetings with the deans are taking place. About half of those have been finished so far. These meetings are not principally about dollars and cents yet. These meetings are principally about plans for the future, anticipated hiring, anticipated retirements, so new strategic directions and so on. This will be a significant semester for reviews of deans and directors. Deans and directors typically receive an appointment for five years and there's a requirement that no later than the fifth year there will be a review. So at the moment we have those reviews underway in the residential college in the arts and humanities, business, engineering, international studies and programs, and the honors college. We will start four more in the near future, arts and letters, communication arts and sciences, the facility for rare isotope beams and nursing. Typically faculty members will receive a questionnaire usually from faculty advisory council about the performance of the current dean or director. If you receive that, I do encourage you to provide us information. It's very helpful to us in the search or lack of search as the case may be.

Dr. Sullivan: Melanie Jacobs has been appointed the interim dean of the college of law. That was effective January 1st and I'll be working with the faculty in the college on their search for a new dean. This appointment was approved by the school of law board because we've not yet achieved full integration with the school of law, but on January 1st by action of the December MSU board of trustees, we accepted the law faculty and staff as full members of the Michigan State University payroll, and so that part of the integration has now been accomplished and I will be working with their FAC and others to create a search committee as they look for their new dean. Similarly, I will be speaking with the FAC in social sciences and also with the chairs and directors in social sciences to talk about an interim dean and then a search committee to work with the college on a new dean for social sciences.

Dr. Sullivan: As I think you all know, Dean Rachel Croson has been named the new provost at the University of Minnesota. Minnesota wanted an early start and so she will be assuming that position March 31st so that means that we'll work fairly quickly to identify some candidates for the interim position there. Also at the December board of trustees meeting, they appointed the approval of Mark Largent to be associate provost and undergraduate dean effective January 1st for a two year term. That search occurred before I became provost and so I acted on the file that was available in the office. The spring conversation with me and with executive vice president for health sciences Norman Beauchamp will be Friday, January 24th between 9:00 AM and 11:00 AM. You are all welcome to come if you would like. We have a check in and beverages starting at 8:30 and the program begins at nine. It's in the Kellogg Center in the big 10 room, room A. We have a number of things to talk about, but I'm going to give a good bit of this time over to Dr. Beauchamp so he can talk about how he envisions his portfolio and the sorts of things he sees us doing in the health sciences.

Dr. Sullivan: Many of you may have seen a notice concerning SIS. SIS is the student information system. Everybody uses it. It's old, it's creaky and doesn't work very well. We will be implementing a new system, but we are taking a pause in that implementation so that we can spend time doing testing of it to be sure it really works when we put it in and to be sure that we have an opportunity to talk with the user community. That's all of you who will be using it, so that implementation will be postponed by a year, but I think we'll have a better install for doing this.

Dr. Sullivan: I've been closely monitoring admissions for next year. This morning we ticked ahead of the number of deposits that we had at this time last year and we're almost at 40,000 applications. We're down about one and a half percent on Michigan residents. That's not unexpected. We've got a thousand fewer Michigan high school graduates this year than last year and we have made up for it with out of state applicants. Of course our yield tends to be lower for out of state applicants. All of you will have a role to play in admissions this spring because we expect to be bringing a lot of groups of admitted students here. We know that one of the real selling points for them is actually seeing the university, having a chance to talk to some students and faculty. We hope you'll participate in that if you're asked to do so.

Dr. Sullivan: Here's a matter on which I do need some faculty help. This year Ramadan begins the evening of Thursday, April 23rd and it ends at sunrise on Sunday, May 23rd. The finals week is Monday, April 27th through Friday May 1st. That means that our observant Muslim students will be fasting during the final exam period. We're going to encourage faculty to make accommodations available to those students who may want it and from speaking informally with members of the Muslim community, we believe those accommodations will be most necessary for late afternoon exams. So what we're doing so far is that we're going to make food available in both the residence halls, in the libraries, being sure it's available from sundown through sunrise. And the testing center will be available to administer tests without the usual testing fee if you'd like to refer a student who should have an afternoon exam to having a morning exam so that it makes their life a little bit easier. What I need help with is finding a way to make sure this message reaches your colleagues. We know that we can send out emails, but we also know that all of you get lots and lots of emails and you can get overwhelmed with them. So I'll be looking for some ways to seek your help in that. We have eight weeks to think about this but I think it's the right thing to do.

Dr. Sullivan: Beginning Saturday and going through next week we have our annual MLK celebration. I want to bring it to your attention there's a very extensive calendar available. There are a lot of very good events planned and I hope you'll make an effort to attend at least one of them. I want to call your attention to two feature length films that will be available Saturday evening at 5:30 and 8:00 and also Sunday evening at 5:30 and 8:00. One of these is On the Basis of Sex, which is a film about the life of Ruth Bader Ginsburg. I have seen it. I think you would enjoy it. I've seen the other one too, which is Hidden Figures and Hidden Figures

is the story of a group of African American women who were hired by NASA to do mathematical computing and they were discriminated against and treated badly, but it's because of them we had such a successful Mercury space program so I think you would enjoy seeing either one of those and there are a number of other events associated with it.

Dr. Sullivan: 2020 is a major year for us to emphasize civic engagement for ourselves and for our students. April 1st is the census day. The census is constitutionally required, occurs once every 10 years in years ending in zero. It's a big event for Michigan because the current projections appear of Michigan is going to lose a member of Congress based on the enumeration so there'll be a real push to get our students and all of you correctly enumerated, once, only once and in the right place and for a student the right place is at the university where they've spent nine months of the year and not back at home even if their dependents of mom and dad. All this is explained in a great deal more detail in my upcoming book, *Census 2020 Understanding the Issues*, coming out in March from Springer.

Professor Moria: Available on Amazon?

Dr. Sullivan: Yeah, available on Amazon and cheaper in the eBook format, but I have been working on this. It is my own area of specialty and for those of you in the more quantitative side, I have the lead article in the *Harvard Data Science Review* this month, which is also about the 2020 census and I think I'll stop there.

Professor Moria: Any questions for provost Sullivan? Thank you. I want to start off by saying that today's meeting will end at 5:00 PM and if we have business that needs to be carried over to the next meeting or to the March meeting then that's what we will do. I apologize for the lateness of our last meeting. Brian Quinn, the university council was not available until 4:30 and we ended up going very, very late but that this meeting will end at 5:00 PM and we will plan to do that in the future. I was not able to be at the steering committee meeting and I want to give a thank you to Dr. Anna Pegler-Gordon and to Sherry Lott who have taken extensive notes of the steering committee so that I can report on the steering committee meeting.

Professor Moria: The first item is that the next meeting of faculty Senate will be completely devoted to the OCR report and it will be a facilitated meeting. You have already received a copy of the report. We sent out an email and a copy of the report. We will send it out again prior to the meeting. I would encourage everyone to become familiar with the report. It will be a facilitated meeting and Dr. Guzzetta, do you have anything to add to that that would be helpful for people? Yeah.

Dr. Guzzetta: Is this one on? Yeah. Hello, yes. Great. Well yes, thank you all for your willingness even though that's a bit of an assumption that you're willing to go through this document. There are a number of us that requested this procedure and I believe you all saw the email of the request. Essentially just the idea of it a

little bit is to take up President Stanley's invitation which came on the very first meeting this year in September when he said he had read the document and mentioned to us where we could find it and so some of us did go ahead and begin to read it and found it a very rich and resourceful document that we felt would behoove our close reading and consideration.

Dr. Guzzetta: The objectives for the meeting are really to better understand it and understand the culture and structures that it portrays at MSU and then to see what we might collectively think of together how to approach those. So it's very much in tune with much of what we've discussed at faculty Senate these past couple of years. As Professor Moriarty said, it will be facilitated so somebody will lead us with those discussions and we really hope that something helpful comes out of it.

Professor Moria: Thank you very much. Another next item on the steering committee agenda was the clarification of 100% employment. There was discussion of the impacts on non tenure track faculty of the outside work for pay policy and the dual employment policy. Academic human resources is already in discussion with the college of arts and letters regarding these policies but we'll be sure to include discussion of non tenure track faculty. In addition UCFA, University Committee on Faculty Affairs, has responsibility for these policies. So the steering committee sent this to UCFA for review.

Professor Moria: Next is the University Committee of the Libraries. I met with the steering committee of the library and they had many, many issues that they wanted to have brought before the University Steering Committee and I suggested that might be a good idea if there was a representative from the University Committee Library Committee on the steering committee, they are not represented but they are represented here in faculty Senate and it seems to me to be a bit of an omission and it would save a lot of referrals as opposed to just to have someone there. So that has been referred to the University Committee on Academic Governance because that would be a bylaw change.

Professor Moria: Fall break has been was a report from interim provost Sullivan and that has also been referred to UCFA I believe, and they will be discussing that. The secretary for Academic Governance Office forming a committee to discuss the restructuring. So the formation that was decided upon at the steering committee was two volunteers. That's Dr. Lawrence Martin and Dr. Martin Crimp have volunteered to be on that committee, a member from the University Committee on Academic Governance, our present secretary for academic governance, Gary Hoppenstand and undergraduate, a graduate student and an at large member of the steering committee and it was requested that we have someone either as on the committee or as an advisor who could talk about the budgetary implications.

Professor Moria: As I think you probably recall at the last faculty Senate meeting there was discussion about a listening zone. When this was brought to the steering



committee, undergraduate and graduate student representatives mentioned that they believe such a zone already exists in the people's park area behind Wells Hall and that since there was not a push from students to consider this matter the steering committee decided not to pursue it further unless there is more interest from the students. And I believe that that is it. Any questions or anything for the people who were at the meeting that I have left out? No. Okay. We're good. All right, so we can move on to new business. The university and curriculum report from Dr. Marci Mechtel.

Dr. Mechtel: It feels weird to have my back to people. I'm Dr. Mechtel, College of Nursing, chair of University Committee for Curriculum. UCC met at the end of November and approved the following. For programs, there's two new programs both effective summer of 2020 and includes a popular culture studies minor and a teaching leadership graduate certificate. There were an additional six program changes and three continuations that were effective by the end of fall 2019 and they include a Latin disciplinary teaching minor, food safety graduate specialization and food safety and taxes college graduate certificate. The last two were deleted because there's new programs in these topic areas that were recently approved by UCC. For courses, we approved 16 new courses, 36 course changes and one deletion. As always there's the link, appendix B, is the short report and the long report is available. So at this time I would like to make a motion to accept the report of UCC.

Professor Moria: Second? Any discussion? All in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries. Thank you. Next we have budget discussion, faculty input on next year's budget for Dave Byelich, vice president of the Office of Planning and Budgets.

Dave Byelich: [inaudible 00:25:43]. Give me one second. All set. All set. Okay. Thank you. Professor Moriarty provided an update to me and her comment was the goal is to bring areas where the faculty can provide insight into feedback. And she went on to say that I remember this as a discussion, not a presentation and I thought about that a bit and I queried my friends. Professor Sullivan helped me with a little bit of format in terms of how to proceed here. But what we have is probably four areas here if I could just show you them in the materials. These are the materials that you have on your desk. Okay. So what I'd like to do is to go through these four areas and then if I can do a little bit of a preface on them and then ask you what is missing. Is there commentary here that you would wish to amend? Is there commentary here that you would wish to underline or even to delete?

Dave Byelich: So the first set of information on page two are really the planning parameters that we engage in. I mean we obviously have challenges. There are some unavoidable cost increases that should not be surprising to you, I don't think. But there may be others and then some observations on our tuition and our reliance on that tuition area. Okay. So that's the planning parameters that we have. Secondly, in the material, we have a set of comments on the environment, on our appropriation, on residency and so forth. In terms of our tuition, we have



less students who are out of state students and most of the big 10, there's some notation here in that third area. If we go keep going, our sponsored programs and our emerging continuing strength and continuing building of strength in that area and then some commentary on our endowment and our fundraising and so forth. That then concludes the environment and we get into, at this point, the actual budget variables.

Dave Byelich: And these variables as you'll note, don't have the normal well we intend to do 4% on this or 2% on that, but rather what we have is their prominence in the budget and then the areas that influence them and then also then the planning considerations and if you look through that you can see in terms of the tuition and so forth, the various items and issues that we're concerned about. And in many respects, for example, when we turn to salaries and so forth, the faculty and academic staff, obviously there's recruitment and retention here, but if there are other areas, if there are areas in terms of our work on diversity and inclusion where we might be in a position to do things differently. Those are all issues that we would like to solicit so we can come back with an actual numbers and a more of a traditional budget kind of a presentation.

Dave Byelich: But what we're trying to say here is are we asking ourselves the right questions? Are there issues that we are missing? Are there components here that you would like to emphasize or deemphasize as we go forward. The last set of issues that we have here is what we refer to as a 10 year financial framework and on this framework obviously academic competitiveness is something that we will continue to address year in, year out and for example, the global impact hires were one that came under the academic competitiveness. All of these things are important to us on a multiyear basis so are these the right atoms? Is this the right package? Would you add to this? Would you delete from this? Those are the kinds of questions that we're asking and any kind of contribution that you might have, whether here in the room or whether you wish to email to me at just my last name, [Byelich@msu.edu](mailto:Byelich@msu.edu), or through Professor Moriarty and we would be happy to then follow up either through email or directly with you if there are enough people that have interests in reviewing this further, but we'd be happy to follow up in that way.

Dave Byelich: So first order of business, as you go through this, are there suggestions that you might have as we look at the various pieces that are there in front of you? Okay. Issues that we have, that may not be enough grist to get into the conversation, but I want to be true to Deborah here on this. Let me talk to you a little bit as we look at issues. Our appropriation support, one of the backgrounds in this material is that today Dr. Stanley operates Michigan State University with the same state resources per student as that that we had in 1991. Now that's not with any kind of funny calculations for controlling for inflation. In fact, if we control for inflation, that takes us back pre 1970 in terms of the resources that we have here. And it's unfortunate, but it's a true component of Michigan State and part of our environment that we have to work with.

Dave Byelich: We mentioned a few minutes ago that our proportion of domestic non-resident students is less than most of the big 10 peers. Big 10 peers, non-resident students, about 42% on average for the undergraduates. For us, our numbers around 25, 26 or 27% depending upon the year. This is an area that, again, represents an area of focus for the institution to try to invest additional resources to build that component of non-resident students in order to fill a gap that actually exists of approximately 80 to \$100 million that comes from our lagging in the number of non-resident students. Okay. Obviously we receive more resources from non-resident students as we do resident students. This has to do with a classroom issue in terms of the diversity of our environment that we're teaching in, but it also has, obviously, a resource issue. So again, that is an issue that we have out there and that we're trying to look at.

Dave Byelich: Under the academic competitiveness issue, we have seen the hiring of now approximately a hundred new faculty members largely in the STEM disciplines. This has improved our research findings and our standing and so forth. If you look at the number, our diversity numbers, our diversity numbers have not improved. So I'm not suggesting a one for one trade off, but there are different kinds of objectives depending upon our level, our area of emphasis and where this institution wants to move. And so those are the questions that we're trying to ask and trying to solicit your views on. If we go a little bit further into this, we have, and I'll look here for a moment, we mentioned the faculty support, but we also have issues of fringe benefits, for example, our health care that is available to you and I throughout the year and so forth. You have a question? Yeah. Alrighty. Contribution? Sure.

Andaluna Borcil: Should I do questions later or ...

Dave Byelich: Whatever you think. I'm happy to take them later. I'm happy to take them now. Your question now might help people try to sort out how we're moving here.

Andaluna Borcil: So thank you for this-

Dave Byelich: Could you identify yourself please.

Andaluna Borcil: Andaluna Borcila, James Madison College. Hi everybody. Happy New Year. So I'm just wondering, and I don't know if you're the person to ask this question about, but I as a faculty Senate member would really like to know more about the trajectory that our health insurance coverage has taken and what our priorities are for that because I, at least, I know two things that have happened since I've been here. Basically the health coverage overall has gotten worse and that's one, but I think it's also become more differentiated between different levels of coverage for executive, for instance, packages as opposed to regular faculty packages as opposed to packages that are actually unions ask for. I know this is an aspect of the budget that I don't think we've actually talked about. This is an aspect that's of concern to me as a faculty person. And so I'm wondering if this is something that we can actually talk, I don't know, in the future meeting,

so what is the trend been with that? What are priorities? And I think that faculty could have a voice in that. Thank you.

Dave Byelich: Thank you. Yes?

Anna Pegler-Gor: Anna Pegler-Gordon also James Madison College. I understand because you are asked to come here and give us a broad overview that these are very broad numbers but these numbers, I got to be honest, don't make a ton of sense to me because I don't know how many faculty and academic staff are covered by 430 million or the support staff as well. And again on the question of trajectory, I think it would be really helpful and I think that she did maybe bring this question up when we were asked early on for a set of questions to think about what do we see changing and then also for us to be able to provide input. What are you thinking about for the coming year? And the specific questions I would have are around, I know there was a fair amount of coverage last year in the, I think it was the Chronicle of Higher Education about administrators and how universities are getting more and more top-heavy.

Anna Pegler-Gor: I would never print so many color copies because I don't have the money to do that. So how much money over time say compared to 10 years ago is going into upper level administration? Where is that going? Obviously some things are really important like hiring a new chief diversity officer, but what's that trajectory? What's the anticipated trajectory? Are we going to continue to increase spending more money on administration? Also in faculty, just getting a sense of how is that comparing also to the big 10 in terms of salary considerations and then support staff as well. How do we see that changing? Do we have more or less support staff?

Anna Pegler-Gor: I think most faculty feel maybe wrongly and it would be great to have that big picture information. At least in my experience, we feel like we're getting less and less support staff to do the work that we continue to do. Those to me would be the questions, also around graduate assistants, that will be really helpful to see the trajectory and understand where are we going and what are your projections? So we can say, as a faculty, "Yeah, it's great that we're working more and more with graduate assistants, but we're concerned that they're getting less and less per student and the same for administration, faculty support staff and so on." Does that make sense? I don't know if that's helpful.

Dave Byelich: If I could, let me just comment for just a moment. If we get the topic areas that you are most interested in. Okay. And maybe from here or maybe from other sources, we can easily put together a report that is given on paper or, I'd rather in paper than a PowerPoint, but we can do whatever is helpful. And to provide that as part of an ongoing consultation because the issues that you have are very addressable. I would say in terms of healthcare, that was one item. I think the good news is, and the bad news is, that we all have the same healthcare coverage that Dr. Stanley has. There isn't an executive policy on healthcare, but those kinds of things can be brought out and can be discussed and in more

fulsome terms. Professor Gordon, any help that you might have in terms of a list of items that you would be interested in, please let us know. We're happy to work with you and we'll put that together and recirculate it here to make sure that it's part of our ongoing consultation process.

Professor Moria: If I could just make a comment, if I could just make a quick comment. The healthcare, we have three options for healthcare. We have the blue care network, we have community blue and we have, I forget what the other one's called ...

Dave Byelich: Consumer-driven plan.

Professor Moria: Consumer-driven and everyone has those options. The community blue is the most expensive and covers out of network things. The blue care network is becoming evermore popular and the consumer-driven is something that a lot of young faculty buy into because it's a lot less expensive. But everyone in the university, I'm on the faculty healthcare committee, which is why I know this. Everyone in the university has those same options and nothing is different. The question that I would ask is a number of years ago the University Committee on Faculty Affairs decided to take over increases above a certain amount in healthcare coverage based on the fact that the university would try to move us up into the middle of the big 10 in terms of salary and I would like to know, I think a lot of people might like to know, where we are in terms of the big 10 in terms of faculty salaries and what priority that has in terms of the budget.

Dave Byelich: Sure. Again, I'm happy to add that to the material at this point. I think we're a little bit below the midpoint of the big 10 on salaries, but we can share with you that information. There are different ways to do it in terms of straight up salaries. There is also some cost of living considerations that are also part of this discussion that enter into places like Maryland, New Brunswick and some other areas. So we're happy to share that information. We have that as well. Let's put that on our list for our little paper between us here. Okay?

Professor Moria: Great. Yes? Right over here. Sorry. We have people already.

Marty Crimp: I'm Marty Crimp, College of Engineering. I'm actually really pleased to look at this because as far as I can tell, we don't pay administrators anything. Really what I'm saying is it appears administrators are hidden in this. Okay. Where do they fall? And I think the question about how many there are in numbers is a very important thing when you look at budgets.

Dave Byelich: Okay, thank you. That breakdown of administrators versus faculty and so forth, we have all of that. That's something that can be put together. It's pretty straightforward. Pardon me.

Marty Crimp: They're not a category anywhere in here that I can see.

Dave Byelich: That is true. That is true. The deans, the department chairs, the vice presidents and so forth are subsumed within the faculty category but that can be broken out. It's straightforward. Yes?

Roberto Foley: Roberto Foley, engineering. The first question I would like to ask is if you're asking for input, I really need to get some of that input from my colleagues. So can I share this with people in my college?

Dave Byelich: Of course. Of course you can.

Roberto Foley: Okay. Secondly, I'm reading the last two columns and it seems to appear that things are going to be improved and that's why you are asking for these various amounts. The problem for me is I have no frame of reference. So if you say, for example, we're going to need 430 million for faculty and academic staff, what was it this year? What was it in 2019?

Dave Byelich: I understand.

Roberto Foley: And I think that kind of information will help me a little bit better say, "Okay, this is useful. That is not useful." The third thing that I want to say, and I'm probably going to get in trouble with this, but I get in trouble all the time so it doesn't matter anymore. And John's going to go back to the question that the Marty asked, the administrative part. I don't know about other colleges, but in our college administration has just boom, boom, boom, boom going up. This associate in that associate in, so on, so forth. A lot of that has to do with understandably deans spending a lot more of their time fundraising and I understand the need for fundraising but the problem is that, as faculty, we are totally in the dark. We don't know what the fundraising is actually getting to intents or programming.

Roberto Foley: Now I know that some of the fundraising is a bit difficult because, pardon me, I don't want to say this, but I've been told that dozens situation, we are waiting for people to pass away. So I'm not saying that that part of the fundraising you don't have any control over, but there are also contributions from industry and places like that and we don't get any of that information. I don't think I've ever seen these numbers before so to me that's an improvement in transparency, which I'm very, very grateful for because transparency is something that Michigan State has rarely sucked at so I really like this and thank you.

Dave Byelich: Let us add our development proceeds to our list of items that would be helpful to have. I would point out that the numbers here are simply the existing base and it simply shows the magnitude of the area. It is not a recommendation in terms of going forward. Okay.

Professor Moria: Just for your information, you don't need to say passed away. In the development business, we call them matured.

Roberto Foley: Okay, thank you.

Dr. Guzzetta: Hi. Juliet Guzzetta, College of Arts and Letters. This is a big macro question, but I was wondering if you or President Stanley could talk a little bit about how the state funding works. I know I've seen charts where that's just dropped just dramatically over decades and I really wonder if there's any hope for the state to significantly contribute again or if this is just the federal trends are what they are, so state and federal funding. And with that, if you speak with presidents of U of M and Wayne State and other Michigan schools, and if you all go together to the state to ask for more funding for IRAdd, just how that works and if there's hope.

Dr. Stanley: I'll take that. So I can't say I'm as optimistic as I was when I first became a president 10 years ago because I think if the same thing happens over and over again, it's hard to become optimistic it will change. And I think the pattern pretty much across the country with a few states exceptions, has been a reduction in state funding. And really what you see is if you see it, you can draw two curves and one curve is the price of tuition and the other curve is state allocation and they'd go like this basically and crossover. So the amount of money being spent total on education has gone up a little, but it's not as much as people would expect but whose paying has changed significantly.

Dr. Stanley: And the other major player is now the federal government. So at one point in time the federal government was not such a major supporter of higher education. Now through Pell grants and some of the loan programs they have they help support that. And so they are a major player as well. So there've been a few states over the past few years that had windfalls in things like oil and so on, shale and fracking, that ended up increasing their state funding. But in general the trend has been down and I was really impressed when I came here last year and there was a 3% increase. That's pretty modest, but that's still something. But of course, as you know, it ended up getting enacted where it's about 0.5% or so. So I think we can't count on it. We continue to ask for it. The Michigan Association of State Universities works together to lobby to meet elected officials to talk about the need. And we've made many visits. We've visited I think with students, without students, all sorts of things to try and get them to engage more and at this moment in time it hasn't been an easy sell.

Dr. Stanley: And that's consistent with Gallup and other polling around the country that say people are less enchanted with higher education than they were in the past. That's on both sides of the political divide. So on the left you have complaints about the cost of college, on the right you have complaints about ideological content within colleges and universities as well and both of them have made people more distrustful essentially of us in general. And there's also a narrative that's still continuing of course about the value of college overall in terms of people's career and so they point to examples like Steve jobs and others who did very well without going to college and so that's another thing.

Dr. Stanley: So all of that is to say that I think we will continue to advocate for this. The return on investment for the state is extraordinary. If you look at what MSU is bringing in to the state in terms of our economic impact, in terms of the money we bring in for the federal government, the returns taxpayer dollars back to MSU, the return on investment is extraordinary for that money they're putting forward. And of course they're supporting some great research in agriculture and other things that are making a difference to the state. So the ROI is great, but again there's a lot of competing demands and I'm not confident that we're going to continue to make progress in that area.

Ayalla Ruvio: Hi everyone. I'm Ayalla Ruvio from the College of Business. This is a question that I was actually been asked to present by one of my senior colleagues at the business school, and I hope I'm conveying it correctly. So it refers to the allocation of resources across colleges and it is my understanding that as of now, resources are being allocated pretty much equally across colleges. However, we are being charged or need to pay expenses as resource centers. So is there any plan to change this policy to amend this in some way?

Dave Byelich: Let me comment in this manner. The institution's budget is an incremental one so you start with the prior year's base. As you move forward, the first action that is taken is a reduction. It's a 1% reduction, whether it is my office, your office, whomever's. That 1% is then accumulated at the university level and it's about a \$6 million pool. So it is taken, it is withdrawn on a uniform basis, but it's allocation back to the unit is done differentially. Okay. So there are some units that depending upon their programming and their needs and so forth, those allocations come back differentially large. Others may not receive an allocation back. Okay. So those are the issues that can make for a differential between colleges and there is a differential. If you look in our books from year to year to year, you can see that there are significant changes that have occurred over time.

Dave Byelich: So again, I'd be happy to sit down with colleges or dean's advisory committees or so forth if they have questions or concerns about this. And again, I'm not advocating for the status quo, but I can certainly explain what it is and I can certainly listen to suggestions to move in one direction or another and would be pleased to do that actually. Okay.

Ayalla Ruvio: Thank you.

Dr. Stanley: If I could add to that, one of the things we should be talking about in strategic planning will be the budgeting model essentially for the university because they're all alternatives to this incremental model but they have trade offs, they have things that will advantage and disadvantage different entities within the university. But I think it's the right time to have that kind of discussion. So the school we don't talk about has an RCM model basically. Terry came from University of Virginia that has an RCM model. It's a different approach. It's based really on responsibility centered management based on the functions



that are taking place. How much teaching is a unit doing? What's that? That counts for something and there's different ways you can assign value to people's activity and so then that becomes the way to incent people sometimes to do more in a given area, but also for units that are very small, maybe high quality but very small it may be difficult for them to do enough of those tasks to generate the revenue they need to continue to be excellent.

Dr. Stanley: So there's lots of discussions that have to take place, but there are advantages to that type of model. So I think that's a discussion we should have as a university and think about because it's a major change. It would involve a lot of effort and change. It's not as simple thing to do but it can be done. Certainly many other institutions have done it, but I would want to have really the will of the university behind such a change I think before we brought it forward.

Anna Pegler-Gor: President Stanley, could you guys say what an RCA model is?

Dr. Stanley: So I was trying to give it ... Terry, do you want to talk about how it worked at Virginia really? To me it's really basically people are getting budgets are being allocated based on the work you're doing essentially for the university. So units that are teaching more and are teaching more classes, whether it's in their majors or not in their majors, are going to be getting more revenue essentially. So people who do a lot of teaching have a lot of initial big courses that are going in may do better in such a model than people who are doing smaller classes and so on. But go ahead and do a better job than me.

Dr. Sullivan: Well, I don't know if I can do that, but there's an example I give to help explain why we moved to the process we moved to, which was the dean of one of the large undergraduate colleges came to me and said, "Professor so-and-so has a wonderful idea for a great course and the students would like it and that course would grow to be very large. And so of course I told him he can't do it." And I said, "What?" And the response was, "Well, if I get more students, I won't have any way to support them so there's no point in doing it." And I realized that our current budget method simply meant nobody ever wanted to try anything new because they would have to scrape to find the resources to do it themselves. So what we did was to basically turn the budget model upside down and the flow of funds to a college came from the number of students you had, the number of majors you had, a portion of IDC returned and your development funds.

Dr. Sullivan: And if a school wished to cross list a course with another school, they could split the tuition revenue. Or if you had two PIs from different colleges, they could split the IDC. Okay. Then in return, the university began to charge for things they were already providing for free. Okay. So when the university pays for the utilities, nobody has any incentive to turn off the lights. But when you're going to pay for the utilities, all of a sudden those lights go off. A simple example of this for Michigan, the dean of Ellison A walked into a laboratory where the fume hood was running 24 hours a day. Two weeks later, they had motion detectors

there so that the fume hood was only running when there were people in the laboratory, right? Because he was having to pay for the electricity.

Dr. Sullivan: So it changes the incentives if you find a way to save money, you get the money. Right now if you find a way to save the money, you don't know what happens to it. But there are always places where this doesn't work very well and an example, and I'm not picking on you, those of you from the college of nursing, but it's nursing and one of the reasons is the accreditation requirements in nursing require, I think it's a one to eight ratio of faculty to students. A ratio that is much more resource intensive than you would find at a lot of schools. So you want to have a school of nursing, you want it to have state of the art equipment and you want it to have enough faculty, it's going to require some subsidy. And there are some other fields that typically require subsidy. Music.

Dr. Sullivan: So that's one of the things the state appropriation got used for. It was used to help subsidize those schools that for various reasons couldn't make it on their own. And then anything entrepreneurial a dean did the dean got to keep, and it unleashed creativity in terms of all sorts of programs and so on of the sort we'd never seen before at Virginia. And I think what happened was that everybody ended up being a little bit better off. Now, was it a painful process? Yes it was. It was hard to go through it. A lot of people didn't understand it. A lot of people felt advantaged by the old procedure and one of the units most advantaged by the old procedure was the hospital because they felt they didn't have to share their profits with anybody. And what they discovered was we withdrew the state appropriation from the medical school and instead had the hospital do profit sharing with the medical school because those were the faculty who were their doctors and the medical students who were doing rotations there.

Dr. Sullivan: So anyway, there are a lot of things to consider. It does take time, but there are ways to better align incentives and also to better align cost structures to encourage cost savings. Right now, at least as I look at MSU, I don't see anybody very much encouraged to save money. I see lots of people encouraged to save money, particularly at the end of a fiscal year when you spend it almost frivolously, so nothing gets swept. That's not probably the best way for us to do business. I don't know if that was better than you or not.

Dr. Stanley: Oh, I think it was better than me. I think, as I said, there's a number of ... It's a complicated procedure. Clearly there's a central tax because it's hard to bill for things like police and so on in an easy way and so on, and utilities, things like that. Utilities you can bill for based on square footage of buildings and so-and-so. So it really does change the way the university runs. But as I say, it's been very successful for some and not so for others. So I think this is why, again, this would be something that I would want faculty, staff buy in and students should understand what potential impact it might have on them as well. So I think we're really lucky because we really do have the poster child for this system up the road. And that's, I think, an advantage in terms of thinking about it.

- Andaluna Borcil: But is there-
- Dr. Stanley: Could you speak to the microphone?
- Professor Moria: Yeah, you should go ...
- Andaluna Borcil: My question is is there openness to start a discussion about it and how would you suggest-
- Dr. Stanley: I think my feeling is that this is just the kind of thing as we started doing the strategic plan, that when you're doing listening sessions, when you're working online, I'm committed to doing it. I wouldn't have brought it up if I didn't think it was a good idea to talk about it, right? So I think the short answer is it's going to happen. In terms of discussion I think it should be a working group for the strategic plan to think about how this would take place and then to get some of the information and ideas together. So short answer. Yes.
- Alex Hauser: Alex Hauser, non-college faculty representing the library. One thing I'd like to see explored more or considered in the budget, especially for current faculty staff and support staff, but also when we look at recruiting diverse candidates from minority pools, first-generation pools, is student loans. Factoring them into the cost of living, almost everyone has student loans now. Is there a way that we can help support the payment per month? There are places who are offering some type of, we will offer you this much money in exchange for you contributing to your 403B. I would like to see that explored a little more just because I think student loans disproportionately affect students who are first generation, have gone through not gone to grad school before, don't have that experience, don't have their degree fully funded or supported. So I think it's definitely worth looking at, especially when we are looking at recruiting a more diverse workforce that more closely matches our student body.
- Dr. Stanley: Thank you.
- Alex Hauser: Thank you.
- Dave Byelich: Let us add that to that list. The other thing just to keep in mind is that there are programs that rather than being the traditional loan program, are programs where the student receives the proceeds upfront but then agrees to contribute a certain proportion of income downstream once they're employed. Purdue is, for example, has worked on this and there may be other options. So let's look at it and let's make sure that the options and so forth are together for you.
- Alex Hauser: Thank you.
- Professor Moria: Yes?

Jeff MacKeigan: Oh Jeff MacKeigan, College of Human Medicine. I wanted to highlight two things that came out of this handout, so thank you very much. One was an area of strength, certainly under academic competitiveness. I'm fortunate to be one of the GII hires. There was 82 hires, goal a hundred but 82 were hired. That money was very well spent and very well utilized across the 82. When you look at the ROI on those hires and you can, it's very good. I won't quote the number because it could be off, but it's a good return on investment and that is shared across colleges. So college who Madison was a recipient but then engineering and many colleges benefited and I know you're considering seriously a GI three initiative. I would be the first person to line up and say you should do that and think about how to do more. It also increases the rankings and the competitiveness within that and it just drives new pro programs and existing programs.

Jeff MacKeigan: And then the other area that was a surprise to me to be tracking lower was on page, maybe it was five, was the philanthropy in the capital campaign. I was surprised to see that that came out as 11th on the right side there. We know about the success about the capital campaign of raising 1.8 billion, but how can we continue to raise that type of money but also not rank so poorly. I hail from an hour from here in Grand Rapids and I got to meet President Stanley certainly through a maybe a fundraiser if you will, at Steelcase and also interim pro Sullivan through other CAC things around interim deans. Grand Rapids as an example. Lansing example, the entire state is one of the most giving states and Grand Rapids only trails behind Salt Lake City in giving of dollars. And so I was just very shocked that that was 11th and that's how we're going to see new programs and continue our competitiveness. So surprising that it was 11th.

Dave Byelich: I appreciate that. One thing that I might add and it will put that on the list as well. One thing I might add though is that this university, through no fault of anyone here in this room was very late into the fundraising issue. And again, Dr. Hannah believed that the contribution of the public to a public university came through their tax bills. We know that that's different today. And so I mention it only because I think that the people that are here are doing an extraordinary job. We probably need to devote more effort to it, but we got a late start and we need now to catch up. Thank you.

Filomena Nunes: Filomena Nunes, Facility for Rare Isotope Beams. So first of all, let me say that I'm really happy that you came to our meeting and that you providing us with this information and the willingness to share and discuss. I think this is very useful. Many of us faculty don't really have a good idea of how the budget is composed and we might actually get erroneous idea just by reading a newspaper article sometimes. So I think this is really informative for us and in becoming better informed we might also help in providing some useful suggestions. So there are a couple of things I'd like to say about additional information that you might be willing to include in the next version of this.

Filomena Nunes: So one of them has to do with new initiatives. So there are things that the university decides is important and they will pursue it and it's unclear with the breakdown that you have here, how that comes about in a budget. Take this, the new educational science building that is going to be on I suppose operational next year. This was a major investment. The university decided this was good. It took some time to come into place, but somehow you had to work it into your budget and it would be nice to have some transparency on how that comes about.

Filomena Nunes: The other thing, it was already mentioned but I'd like to mention it too, all of these as trends are very important and I'm sure making your budget, you look at the trends all the time. And I think for us it's also very informational to look at the trends and understand what are the difficulties based on those trends. So if in addition to giving just the numbers for fiscal year 20 we could have the previous fiscal years, I don't know, five years before that would help considerably in understanding where the trends are pointing.

Filomena Nunes: Another point that I'd like to make is to do with distant learning. So that some universities are expanding the revenue coming from distant learning and I don't know that we tracking that at all, but it would be nice to know what fraction of this comes from distant learning. And would it make sense for us to expand that further?

Dave Byelich: Thank you.

Filomena Nunes: The other comment has to do with grants. So many of us write grants and have to work into indirect costs in our grants. And the indirect costs that is charged by the university has also changed and there are, I'm sure, reasons behind those changes. Costs are going up and so typically this number, this percentage goes up. We do compare poorly with some universities and not so bad with others, but it's actually funding agencies like NSF have not increased their awards considerably and so an increase in indirect cost represents a decrease in real dollars for the researcher. And so I think that it would be good to also see trends there and to understand what is the weight that is given to those aspects when working that into a budget.

Dave Byelich: Those are extraordinary questions. We will follow up with you on them.

Filomena Nunes: And there's one more.

Dave Byelich: Okay.

Filomena Nunes: So the last one has to do with your financial framework, the 10 year financial framework, so there are all these points. So of course I haven't had a lot of time to reflect on this, but there's one that just shouts out at me as being missing here and that is impact to community. So it seems like that doesn't really fit into any of the aspects that you're covering and I think it is an important role of a

university and we do bring back to the community in various ways. So I'd like that to be considered too.

Dave Byelich: Thank you. Thank you. I appreciate it. Thank you. I looked at my two bosses over here but go right ahead.

Bree Holtz: Thank you. Bree Holtz from Communication Arts and Sciences. I noticed on here you have the tuition and fees, but what I guess I'm not really understanding is the difference now in block tuition and how that's impacted this.

Dave Byelich: Sure. Be happy to include that as well. That's an easy one to do.

Dr. Stanley: Mine is maybe more of a comment for us as senators is I've been in higher education now 42 years. I came here in 77. It was a much different environment. I left and went other places, came back, maybe about 80% of the budget came from the state then. You did your research, you did your studies, and now as faculty, do we have a responsibility in fundraising? Now you could take this to tenure promotion. We have research teaching service. But the reality is a lot of people get judged. If you are brought in in STEM and you're coming up for tenure and you don't have an NIH or NSF, you may not be getting it. If you're in another area that may not be, Chaucer, English literature where there's not big money, but should all of us have some responsibility for fundraising?

Dr. Stanley: Maybe it's online, maybe it's the grant area. Because at least my experience when I started it wasn't, but now we're in the corporate university and faculty always griped there's never enough money for my program, including mine. And there isn't enough money and how do we help contribute? One of the problems is these are such big issues and big numbers. But the idea is if we're trying to attract more out of state students, does every faculty member know what we're strongest in, what states we're targeting out of state students? Do we throw some MSU little brochures or whatever you use when we travel? Are we all recruiters in a round about way? At the same time I know how tricky this is like with development, if they're asking for \$15 million from Kellogg, they don't want me knocking on the door asking for 500 so there's got to be good communication, but I think the university has changed and sometimes we always want the money, but we're running small businesses in many ways and a large business overall. So how do we deal with that?

Dave Byelich: Thank you. Those are great issues.

Professor Moria: Thank you. What we will do is get a list of these things that have been brought up and we will forward them to the Office of Planning and Budgets and we will get a report back that we can give to the faculty Senate.

Dave Byelich: Thank you so much.

Professor Moria: Thank you very much. Next on the agenda is the online strategy for graduate education with Jeff Grable. Is he here yet? He's driving back from Detroit and if he's not here, I just hope he's safe on the road. And let's move on in the meantime to the Minskoff building discussion and we will then after that when he gets here, we'll move to his

Anna Pegler-Gor: Anna Pegler-Gordon. And I'm an at large member of the steering committee so I was charged to just introduce this. So Dave Byelich's attendance was also part of the recommendations that were provided by the report on improving the effectiveness of MSU faculty Senate that we were introduced to faculty Senate at the beginning of the fall semester 2019 and then one of the other recommendations was that Senate meetings be held in a flex room arranged in a circular format with microphones to enhance participation and enable genuine discussions of the topics. So as part of that, we did have a preliminary discussion located the Minskoff Pavilion.

Anna Pegler-Gor: You have this, please do fill these out to give feedback and we'll compile those and share them with the steering committee in deciding on moving forward for next academic year. But in the immediate also we wanted to basically just invite discussion and comments from people about the experience of being in the Minskoff Pavilion last meeting versus being in this format that we used previously. What did you like? What didn't you like? What would you like to see moving forward? So essentially I'm just inviting people to share on that.

Professor Moria: You have the forms to fill out. And the reason that we did the forms in addition to this possible discussion is I think it's very important that everyone has a voice and that we are able to not just have a vote, but also find out what people's opinions are. So please fill it out. Please give us your input and that input will be compiled and it'll be taken to the steering committee. And if you have things to say right now, please happy to hear them. Yes?

Andaluna Borcil: Andaluna Borcila, James Madison College. I haven't thought this through all the way through, but I do welcome a different space, the Minskoff Pavilion, and I think that this arrangement is not a good one. And I appreciate the ad hoc committee's work and they suggested this space, my two concerns about that space, but we were only there once and it was a very charged meeting. My two concerns were about that space are that it seemed like it was a bit small and there were a few people who came into the meeting who didn't have seating, if I remember correctly, or it was hard for them to find seating. And I don't know if there's anything we could do about that in terms of just the amount of chairs there or if there is a limit to that.

Andaluna Borcil: But the other concern was that the way in which these were the space was a range, we couldn't actually see each other. So it was this awkwardness where we're facing each other's backs. And I know these could be small things. I think it's so important for a deliberative and a discussion space to be one that actually is organized so that people can face each other while they engage with each



other and deliberate about these important topics. So I totally prefer that space to this one and the arrangement there to what we have here and I think that change is really necessary. But those were just a couple of problems with that space and parking wasn't very easy, but hey, thank you.

Professor Moria: Thank you. Yes?

Alyssa Dunn: Hi. I'm Alyssa Dunn from the College of Education. I agree with what Andaluna said about the importance of having a space where we can really dialogue and see each other. I teach small classes. I think it's great, especially for these heated topics, but I just can't rationalize spending \$500 to hold a Senate meeting. We just looked at the budget. I'm in an area that is not grant funded so to me \$500 seems like a lot of money. I have students who can't afford to eat and I just think I would not be comfortable paying \$500 for us to find a space to talk that is more conducive to talking. So I really appreciate the ad hoc committee's work on this and I want to find a better space than this, but not one that costs \$500.

Professor Moria: Thank you. Any other comments? They say you have ... Please write the comments down and then we'll get back to you and we'll let you know what the comments were. Why don't we move to the recommendation to the president to make MSU a signatory for times up healthcare. This is again Dr. Pegler-Gordon. She's moving to a different microphone.

Anna Pegler-Gor: I'm going to come up here just to bring up the, I think I can bring up the time's up. Hmm. It went missing. Here it is, maybe. Here we go. The time's up healthcare. So sorry, I'm doing this on behalf of vice chair, Jennifer Johnson, and she had brought the recommendation to the steering committee to bring to faculty Senate essentially to resolve that faculty Senate recommends that the president makes MSU a signatory institution for time's up healthcare. And this would be advisory to the president and obviously would require the president to look into this in more detail. My understanding is that the College of Human Medicine is currently considering this but a number of the signatories have both the university and the health medicine role or hospital role signatory. So that doesn't preclude the university from becoming a signatory.

Anna Pegler-Gor: And the purpose of this, it's the branch within the times up movement, which is particularly concerned and maybe you've also been hearing in the state legislature, they've been discussing this, the issues that healthcare workers, particularly nurses, but also medical students face in terms of sexual harassment and gender discrimination. Women, as it says here, make up nearly 80% of the healthcare workforce. There's a question about equity because women only represent 20% of the decision makers. But also that the research estimates that 50% of women medical students experience harassment and 28% of nurses experience specifically sexual harassment. And so the purpose of being a signatory to this is that to declare these signatory institutions employ at least 100 healthcare workers and they basically declare that commit to the

following core tenants that sexual harassment and inequity have no place in the healthcare work place so that we're committed to preventing sexual harassment and gender inequity and also to protecting those who are targets of harassment and discrimination.

Anna Pegler-Gor: Secondly, to state that we believe women should have equitable opportunity support and compensation. And third, to understand that we cannot address a problem without understanding its scope and impact so that we commit as an institution to measure and track sexual harassment and gender inequity occurring in our institution, which it's my understanding and I think the discussion at the steering committee was that we already have those commitments and we already do and are required to measure and track sexual harassment and so on. So that is essentially the proposal.

Professor Moria: This is an action item so we would need a motion.

Anna Pegler-Gor: So that would be in the form of a resolution you saying to ... I would say the motion would be to faculty Senate recommends that the president make MSU a signatory institution for time's up healthcare.

Professor Moria: Is there a second? Okay. Discussion.

Dr. Stanley: I feel obligated to say something. I think first of all I am in complete agreement with the principles put forward by time's up. As some of you may know, both my daughters are physicians completed medical school. My wife is a physician and I've seen firsthand from them. I haven't seen firsthand, but I've heard from them some of the issues they've confronted and certainly seen in my wife's career, some of the barriers that women have faced in healthcare so this is meaningful for me. In anticipation of this resolution, I asked executive vice president Beauchamp to work with the College of Human Medicine, the College of Nursing and the College of Osteopathic Medicine to get them engaged to make sure, but I see no barriers to getting this done.

Dr. Stanley: And I think the issue would just be how to sign it and whether it's more impactful to have the individual colleges sign as some institutions, Yale has done for example, or is it more impactful to have a single signage from the university as a whole? And I think both of those could work and I think he and I were going to discuss that, but I can assure you there will be signage from either the independent groups ... I shouldn't assure you because I've asked him to take a look at it, but I'm pretty sure the recommendation he'll come up with from our conversations is either three schools sign separately, all of them associated with MSU or the university signs as an umbrella for the three. But we will be signatories I think to this going forward. But please feel you may make that recommendation to me.

Professor Moria: Other discussion?

Ayalla Ruvio: Sorry for being here again, but my question is why healthcare and not any other element of this university? Have you ever looked at the numbers of women in this university in terms of assistant professors versus full professors? The last numbers that I have seen was we are 50% at assistant level, but as you go higher in the decision making ability at full professor, I think we less than 20%. That's what I've seen. It might be new data that I'm not aware of. So I just don't understand why we're doing this and we're not doing it across. By the way, we are not that different as a university just as a full disclosure, unfortunately.

Professor Moria: Could you please state your name and college? Sorry.

Ayalla Ruvio: Ayalla Ruvio, College of Business.

Professor Moria: Thank you very much.

Dr. Stanley: I don't think they're exclusive. I don't think our commitment to this particular cause means the university is not committed to the others as well. I think the whole principles, again, behind things like diversity, equity and inclusion planning are to review those kinds of numbers and understand the steps we need to improve in areas where there is not gender equity. So I don't see as inclusive one or the other. But again, I think this is an affirmative action as opposed to a one that's stopping something else from happening.

Professor Moria: Yes?

Roberto Foley: Roberto Foley, College of Engineering. I can understand why we are trying first in healthcare. Everybody here knows what happened over the last 20 years. But the suggestion that I would like to make is that perhaps whatever model is created as a result of this effort that also be available to the other units in the college because medicine is not the only place where people are not keeping their hands to themselves. It's happening in other places too.

Dr. Stanley: So again, if I can respond, I think there's what I would consider a difference in thought on this. I think there's a thought that by signing this, we're not committing to other areas as part of the OCR report, which you'll do as part of our response to Clary. We have obligations to do this tracking across the university and it's things we want to do and do. So this is happening across the university. Nothing in this commitment as it's made is really going beyond commitments we've made to the university as a whole and to the federal government. So there's nothing here that goes beyond the things we're doing already. I think I see this as a way to publicly state that we care about this particular issue but I don't see it as a way that's saying we don't care about other issues as well. So I'm not sure I interpret this in the same way you are.

Professor Moria: Yes?

- Jeff MacKeigan: Jeff MacKeigan, College of Human Medicine. I just wanted to clarify a little bit to help the discussion and educate ourselves because I was doing it as we were speaking is that this specific request on time's up focused on entertainment, healthcare, advertising and technology. And so I think the emphasis and discussion we've had is correct. But the reason why it maybe doesn't go beyond healthcare is because that was the only four that you could choose from for this program. So I don't think we need to write two more because this specific request for this signatory does only include healthcare and entertainment. So I just didn't want to mislead discussion that we were focusing on that the university wasn't concerned about this across other industries.
- Anna Pegler-Gor: Right. And I'm afraid ... Anna Pegler-Gordan. I'm not familiar because I think Jennifer Johnson brought this before the steering committee to the faculty Senate because she's in the healthcare field. I'm not and I just said I would introduce it for our consideration today.
- Jeff MacKeigan: So there aren't other opportunities that I can see beyond healthcare for the university to sign on.
- Professor Moria: Thank you. Other discussion? Anyone? Are we ready to vote? So we've got our clickers. So A is yes, B is no or yay, nay and C is abstain. Make sure your clicker is on. And how long is the vote?
- Dr. Stanley: 38 seconds. 39, 40 seconds now.
- Professor Moria: Okay. We okay. Everybody voted? Let's see what the results are. All right, the motion passes. Is that Dr. Grable who just came in? No, I can't see that far. I'm sorry. In that case, we have a slight dilemma in that we have one more item and we have no one to present. So rather than playing games, right. I think we need to carry that over to the next meeting and we'll wait until, and that will be March, not February because February is devoted to the OCR report. Is there a motion to return? Is there a second?
- Dr. Stanley: Floor first.
- Professor Moria: Oh, I'm sorry. Comments from the floor.
- Jeff MacKeigan: Where do you want these turned in?
- Dr. Stanley: Leave them on your desk.
- Professor Moria: Leave them on your desk and when they pick up the name things, they will pick those up also. And thank you very much for doing that. Other comments from the floor? Is there a motion to adjourn? Is there a second? All in favor say aye. Happy New Year everyone. See you in February. Oh, see you're next week actually at university council.

This transcript was exported on Jan 17, 2020 - view latest version [here](#).