1. CALL TO ORDER
2. Approval of Agenda for January 8, 2019
3. Approval of Draft Minutes for November 6, 2018 (Appendix A)
4. President’s Remarks: Interim President John Engler
5. Provost’s Remarks: Dr. June Youatt
6. Chairperson’s Remarks: Acting Chairperson, Professor Deborah Moriarty
   6.1. Announcement of Dr. Laura McCabe voted in as an At-Large Member
7. Committee Reports
8. NEW BUSINESS
   8.1. Board of Trustees Response to Reclaim MSU Proposal, Dr. Jennifer Johnson, At-Large Member (Appendix B)
   8.2. Continuing Concerns Regarding Hostile Work Environment, Professor Deborah Moriarty
       8.3.1. How the Office of Institutional Equality (OIE) Works
       8.3.2. Workplace Bullying and Harassment
       https://www.mnsu.edu/csw/workplacebullying/msu_online_workplace_behavior_project_survey.pdf
   8.3. Healing Fund, Professor Greg Swain, At-Large Member (Appendix C)
   8.4. Budgetary Policy, Professor Deborah Moriarty (Appendix D)
   8.5. Mental Health Update, Dr. Tenille Gains, Interim Associate Director of Counseling Services (Appendix E)
   8.6. Provost Promotion and Tenure Memo to The Steering Committee, Professor Martin Crimp, CAC Chairperson of Engineering (Appendix F)
   8.7. Bylaws 3.3.1.1. and 3.3.1.2.1. Regarding CACC One-Year Term, Dr. Gary Hoppenstand (Appendix G)
9. Draft Agenda for Faculty Senate for January 15, 2019
   9.1. University Committee on Curriculum (UCC) Report, Professor Marci Mechtel, UCC Chairperson (Action Item) (Short Report, Appendix) (Long Report, click on link)
9.2. How the Office of Institutional Equality (OIE) Operates, Terry Curry, Associate Provost and Associate Vice President for Academic Human Resources (Information Item)

9.3. Discuss Upcoming All-University Climate Survey, https://www.mnsu.edu/csw/workplacebullying/msu_online_workplace_behavior_project_survey.pdf, Rebecca Campbell, Relationship Violence and Sexual Misconduct Expert Advisory Workgroup Chairperson (Information Item)

9.4. Discussion Regarding the Healing Fund, Provost Youatt (Information Item) (Appendix)

9.5. Mental Health Update from Counseling & Psychiatric Services (CAPS), Dr. Mark Patishnock, Director and Licensed Psychologist (Information Item) (Appendix)

9.6. Board of Trustees Response to Reclaim MSU Proposal, Dr. Jennifer Johnson, At-Large Member (Information Item) (Appendix)

9.7. High Risk Travel Process, Dr. Steve Hanson, Associate Provost and Dean, Dr. DeAndra Beck, Associate Dean for Research and Chris Daniel, Director of the office of Health Safety, International Studies and Programs (Information Item) (Appendixes)

10. Draft Agenda for University Council for January 22, 2019

10.1. University Committee on Curriculum (UCC) Report, Professor Marci Mechtel, UCC Chairperson (Information Item) (Short Report, Appendix) (Long Report, click on link)

10.2. Faculty Senate Work Session for 2018-2019, Professor John Beck, Human Resources and Labor Relations:

What should be on the list of “Asks” that we bring to our initial conversations with the new president?

What are the “Actions” we should be developing and leading that should not wait on, or be dependent upon, the arrival of the new president?

11. ADJOURNMENT
1. CALL TO ORDER

2. Approval of Agenda for November 6, 2018
   The agenda for November 6, 2018 was approved as distributed.

3. Approval of Draft Minutes for October 2, 2018
   The minutes for October 2, 2018 were approved as presented.

4. President’s Remarks: Interim President John Engler – Unable to attend

5. Provost’s Remarks: Dr. June Youatt
   Provost Youatt announced the establishment of a post-doc office. She reported that there was a reception the previous evening for 125 of the 500 post-docs, and that they seemed excited to have an office that supports them. She said that MSU is acknowledging their work and their contributions to the University.

6. Chairperson’s Remark: Dr. Rob LaDuca
   Dr. LaDuca reported that the proposal for creation of a new Department of Orthopedics has been received, which should be routed through the University Committee on Faculty Affairs. He also discussed the issue regarding “risk of travel,” stating that MSU has a new Policy regarding International Travel to what are considered “risky countries,” as declared by the U.S. State Department. He said that individuals can still travel to these locations, but that they have to fill out a form that they acknowledge the risk.

   Dr. LaDuca stated that the Faculty Senate sent the Board of Trustees correspondence regarding their concern about the changes made by the Board of Trustees involving the Dismissal for Cause Policy. He said that a written reply was received from the Board of Trustees that reaffirmed that the Policy, as amended over the summer, would remain in place; however, Dr LaDuca noted, the Board of Trustees remain eager and open to receiving substantive changes to the Policy, as routed through the various committees, especially UCFA and UCFT, whereby something fair can be achieved.
Dr. LaDuca also reported on the proposal that requests that the Board of Trustee members who sit on the Presidential Search Committee serve as excisional members, where they would have voice but not vote. He added that this issue is being deliberated carefully, and that a written response will be provided within the next two weeks.

Dr. LaDuca discussed his trip with Dr. Hoppenstand to the Big Ten Academic Alliance meeting at the University of Iowa where all the chairs and vice chairs of the various faculty senates and university counsels, gathered to discuss Academic Governance issues. He reported on one of the major concerns raised at the meeting, which involved the American Association of University Professors placing sanctions on Big Ten Universities that have not followed shared governance procedures during Presidential searches. He discussed The University of Iowa’s situation, where they were placed under sanction by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) for their Presidential Search process, and the four-year process involved removing the sanction. He concluded his remarks by saying the problems encountered by the University of Iowa could help inform MSU with their Presidential search.

7. Committee Reports
   
   University Committee on Curriculum (UCC) – Professor Marci Mechtel
   Dr. Mechtel reported that the UCC Full Committee met in October and approved the following: regarding programs, two new Programs were approved, highlighted by an M.S. in Nutrition and Dietetics, effective Spring Semester of 2019, and a Quantitative Risk Analytics B.S., effective Fall Semester of 2019. She noted that this later Program is intended to help those not wanting to go into Actuarial Sciences, and that would be very marketable in the insurance industry. Regarding Program changes: there were twelve Program changes and three Program deletions. Regarding courses: thirty-four new courses were approved, along with seventy-seven course changes, and thirteen course deletions. Regarding Moratoriums: she said that a moratorium in the Geological Sciences, Ph.D. Program was approved, effective Spring Semester of 2019 to Spring Semester of 2024. She also stated that a discontinuation of the Computer Science Disciplinary Teaching Minor for Elementary and Secondary Education was approved, effective Spring Semester of 2019, as well as the Ethics and Development Graduate Specialization, effective Spring Semester of 2018.

   University Committee on Undergraduate Education (UCUE) – Professor Richard Bellon
   Professor Richard Bellon reported that most of the meeting addressed curricular issues that do not have implications for the larger university. Interim Associate Provost Largent discussed MSU’s traditional Academic Orientation Program (AOP) will be transitioning to a New Student Orientation (NSO). Part of the new orientation will be to engage faculty participation. Ryan Yang, Assistant Director, Information Technology, discussed the new Student Computer Policy, effective Fall, 2019. UCUE members expressed concern for the financial impact of this change. The fact that the computer policy is mandated allows the cost of the laptop to be covered by financial aid. UCUE unanimously agreed that the Honors College should have a representative on UCUE with voice.

   University Committee on Faculty Tenure (UCFT) – Professor Len Fleck
Dr. Fleck reported that UCFT submitted their letter to the Board of Trustees, and that they are in the process of putting together a group of six members of UCFA to develop an alternate policy, and engage the conversation with the Board of Trustees.

University Committee on Faculty Affairs (UCFA) – Dr. Mark Waddell
Dr. Waddell reported that UCFA met last week and was visited by Dr. Norman Beauchamp, Dean of the College of Human Medicine, to discuss the Proposed Joint Department of Orthopedics. He said that UCFA approved the Proposal. He noted that UCFA also reviewed the Provost's Biannual Memo and approved it as well. He added that UCFA is overseeing the search for the new Faculty Grievance Official, noting that they had received four applicants, interviewing two of the applicants thus far and just interviewed two of them this afternoon. He concluded his Report by saying that by the beginning of December, UCFA will be able to speak with the Provost and provide her with the Committee’s feedback.

University Committee on Graduate Studies (UCGS) – Dr. Gwen Wittenbaum
Dr. Wittenbaum reported that UCGS has met twice since the October Steering Committee meeting, approving fifteen program requests. In addition, she noted that the Research Integrity Officer Jim, Pivarnik, came to visit. Since UCGS is the body that reviews this office every other year, the Annual Report from the Research Integrity Office was provided. She said her Committee is considering doing a more in-depth review (instead of conducting one every other year), in order to have a more in-depth five-year review, which would provide a more rigorous in-depth review of that office.

University Committee on Student Affairs (UCSA) – Katherine Rifiotis
Katherine Rifiotis reported that Dave Byelich gave a presentation on block tuition, which raised many questions for students who were on the Committee, as well as for other faculty concerned about student success. She noted that there are over 200 policies and procedures that need to be changed, so how these changes are implemented are of crucial importance.

Council of Graduate Students (COGS) – Ben Burke
Ben Burke reported that COGS discussed concerns involving Block Tuition, as well as the proposed Medical School Integration. COGS will meet with Dr. Amalfitano next Wednesday with their full Counsel to provide their input. It was noted that the second main issue that COGS is discussing right now involves graduate students with families, concerns about being able to access funding on campus for childcare. COGS is looking at some of the different options that can be provided.

8. NEW BUSINESS

8.1. High Risk Travel Process, Dr. Steve Hanson, Associate Provost and Dean, International Studies and Programs
Dr. Hanson reported on MSU’s Policy regarding Travel to “High Risk” countries. He noted the development of a Global Travel Registry and the establishment of a new unit on Safety and Security Issues. The intent is not to hinder travel, but to make individuals aware of the risks involved.
8.2. **Bylaw 4.4.1., to Make Honors College Voice-and-Vote Representation Possible, Richard Bellon, University Committee on Undergraduate Education (UCUE) Chairperson, and Matt Zierler, Associate Dean, James Madison**

A discussion was presented to allow the MSU Honors College to have voice and vote representation on the University Committee on Undergraduate Education. This item was requested to be move this issue to UCAG for review and discussion, and then on to University Council for adoption of the Bylaw amendment.

8.3. **Request for New Academic Unit, Department of African American and African Studies, Proposal, Provost June Youatt**

Dr. Hewett proposed that he would like to submit to the relevant committees the Proposal to Establish a Department of African-American and African Studies in the College of Arts and Letters. Discussion ensued. Provost Youatt noted that this Proposal was one of the strongest that she has ever read. The Proposal was referred to UCGS, UCUE, and UCFA.

8.4. **Mary Finn, Official Faculty Senate Representative on the Presidential Search Committee, Slated for Faculty Senate in November, Dr. Rob LaDuca**

Dr. LaDuca reported that as an information item, Mary Finn would come to the Faculty Senate to provide a status update on the Presidential Search.

8.5. **The Academic Year Calendar, Professor Deborah Moriarty, Vice Chairperson**

Professor Moriarty reported the results of a survey that was sent out to the entire MSU faculty from the Task Force at that time. The recommendation was to eliminate one week from Spring Semester, at the beginning of the semester, so that the Spring Semester calendar would start after Martin Luther King day, and would lengthen the time between the Fall Semester and Spring Semester break, thus offering the opportunity for a “J term,” (or “Spartan Session), which would allow three weeks for the inclusion of intensive courses.

Professor Moriarty also presented the concept of a Fall Semester break, since the Fall and Spring Semesters at MSU are of unequal length, and that having a Fall Semester break would benefit students. Discussion ensued. It was decided to move this discussion on to UCFA, UCSA, UCUE, UCGS and COGS for their review.

8.6. **Discussions on how to Move Forward with Faculty Senate Endorsed Proposal, Professor Andaluna Borcila, James Madison College**

Dr. Borcila discussed how to move forward productively with the Faculty Senate endorsed Proposal. Discussion ensued on the reminder of the Faculty Senate Proposal to the Board of Trustees.

8.7. **Discussion of the Minutes of The Steering Committee, Faculty Senate and University Council, Professor Deborah Moriarty, Vice Chairperson**

It was discussed that the minutes taken at the Steering Committee, Faculty Senate, and University Council should just include a brief statement of the major issues discussed, and a statement of the action items presented. For those who wish for a
more fulsome account, both print transcripts and audio transcripts for each meeting would be provided in links to the minutes. Discussion ensued. It was agreed to send this issue on to University Council for approval.

8.8. **Bylaw Revisions Reviewed and Approved from the University Committee on Academic Governance (UCAG) to move to Faculty Senate, for their discussion, Amanda Tickner, UCAG Chairperson**

A presentation was made by Dr. Tickner and Tyler Sylvestri regarding University By-Laws revisions by the University Committee on Academic Governance Ad Hoc group. Discussion ensued. An amended motion to move the By-Law revisions to Faculty Senate for discussion was made. The motion carried.

8.9. **Discussion on: David Ware suggestions from the Board of Trustees meeting on October 26, 2018, Dr. Jennifer Johnson, At-Large Member**

Dr. Johnson discussed the issue of having a “best practices” review established for the Board of Trustees, to insure the same accountability as everyone else in the University. The idea would involve making the Board of Trustees accountable to third party evaluation, to write and make explicit code of conduct for Board members, and to be completely transparent in disclosing actual and perceived conflicts of interest including athletic tickets. It was decided to wait until the new Board of Trustee members are elected to proceed. It was agreed to put this item on the February agenda to revisit at the Steering Committee.

8.10. **Discussion on: What is the role of Faculty Governance in issues such as the concerns we heard about re the Math Department at the Board meeting on October 26, 2018? Dr. Jennifer Johnson, At-Large Member**

Dr. Johnson reported on the Board of Trustees meeting, where an individual from the Math Department spoke. Dr. Johnson noted that this individual was quite distressed. She posed the question: “when a faculty member brings up a concern in a public forum, what is the role of faculty governance, if any, in doing anything about it?” Discussion ensued.

8.11. **Report Back on Letter from Dianne Byrum re: Faculty Tenure Revocation, Professor Deborah Moriarty, Vice Chairperson**

This issue was not covered.

9. **Draft Agenda for Faculty Senate for November 13, 2018**

9.1. University Committee on Curriculum (UCC) Report, Professor Marci Mechtel, UCC Chairperson (Action Item) (Short Report, Appendix) (Long Report, click on link)

9.2. High Risk Travel Process, Dr. Steve Hanson, Associate Provost and Dean, International Studies and Programs (Information Item) (Appendixes)

9.3. Bylaw Revisions Reviewed and Approved in the University Committee on Academic Governance (UCAG), for discussion, Amanda Tickner, UCAG Chairperson, Tyler Sylvestri and Laura Dilley (Information Item) (Appendixes)
9.4. Mary Finn, Official Faculty Senate Representative on the Presidential Search Committee (Information Item)

9.5. Joint Appointment for Orthopedics for Endorsement (Appendix) (Action Item)

A motion to approve the draft agenda for the November Faculty Senate was made and seconded. The motion carried.

10. **Draft Agenda for University Council for November 20, 2018**

10.1. University Committee on Curriculum (UCC) Report, Professor Marci Mechtel, UCC Chairperson (Information Item) (Short Report, Appendix) (Long Report, click on link)

10.2. Discussion of the Minutes of The Steering Committee, Faculty Senate and University Council, Professor Deborah Moriarty, Vice Chairperson

10.3. Bylaw 4.4.1., to Make Honors College Voice-and-Vote Representation Possible, Richard Bellon, University Committee on Undergraduate Education (UCUE) Chairperson, and Matt Zierler, Associate Dean, Academic Operations, Honors College

10.4. Faculty Senate Work Session for 2018-2019, Professor John Beck, Human Resources and Labor Relations

A motion to approve the draft agenda for the November University Council was made and seconded. The motion carried.

11. **ADJOURNMENT**

A motion to adjourn was made and seconded. The motion carried. 5:05 p.m.
Michigan State University Faculty Senate
Owen Graduate Hall
735 E. Shaw Lane, Room W32
East Lansing, MI 48825

To the Faculty Senate,

Thank you for your November 9th memorandum regarding the Reclaim MSU Policy Proposal. The Board had the opportunity to consider and discuss the proposal at our December meeting. Our responses are as follows:

- **Item 1:** Please clarify the intended purpose of the proposed University Board. Is the University Board intended as a restructuring of the existing Board of Trustees or as a new board to work collaboratively with and in an advisory capacity to the Board of Trustees? The materials provided, wherein the University Board was merged into the existing Board of Trustees bylaws, made this difficult to understand.

- **Items 2 and 3:** We believe these concerns have subsequently been addressed, as reflected in the composition of the Presidential Search Committee and the inclusive and transparent process the Committee has followed. The November 28th Community Letter from the Co-Chairs of the Search Committee also addressed these concerns and more.

- **Items 4 and 5:** As you are aware, these changes would require constitutional amendments and are outside the authority of the Board of Trustees. In addition, the changes would impact other educational institutions that should have an equal opportunity to contribute to the discussion around these issues.

As always, we appreciate receiving the input of faculty, students, and other members of the community on issues of importance to the university. We look forward to continuing to work together for the betterment of MSU.

Sincerely,

Brian Breslin, Chairperson

cc: Board of Trustees, J. Engler, J. Youatt, N. Barr, R. Young
January 3, 2019

Dear Interim President Engler and Trustees:

The Steering Committee is writing once again to indicate that we think the decision to close the Healing Assistance Fund needs serious reconsideration. Unfortunately, this issue was not considered at the BOT meeting last month.

Following are possible solutions that should be explored in response to the arguments made in support of closing the Healing Assistance Fund.

1) “The firm hired to administer the fund, investigate the claims and disperse the funds mismanaged things, charged exorbitant fees, etc.” Solution: Hire a new firm to administer the fund. Hiring a subpar firm is a failure of the MSU administration. Potential claimants should not be penalized for this.

2) “Victims as claimants in the settled lawsuit are or could request support from the Healing Assistance Fund”. Solution: A quality fund administrator should easily be able to confirm that a claimant under the settlement is not requesting support from the Healing Assistance Fund. It could be clearly articulated that claimants in the major settlement are not eligible for financial support from the Healing Assistance Fund.

3) “Everyone impacted by MSU’s failure and Nassar was part of the major settlement and few will come forward to request support from Healing Assistance Fund.” Solution: Leave the fund open for some period of time (e.g., 6-12 months) and see what claims are made. If no one comes forward during this period, then MSU will have a legitimate reason to close the fund. It does no harm and does not place MSU in any financial distress to reopen a fund and to leave it open for a reasonable period of time.

As leaders, we often have no hesitation to tout accomplishments made under our watch. Good leaders should also have the fortitude and courage to step forward and accept responsibility when negative things happen under their watch. We urge you to step forward and have the conviction to do the right thing! Send the right message to the MSU community!

MSU Steering Committee
Although there are many important topics to discuss as we search for a new president, I would like budgetary policy to be front and center. The policy of annual 1–2% departmental budget cuts has led to a consistent policy of budget centralization that makes academic innovation and responsiveness impossible. I for one refuse to serve as department chair under these constraints.

I believe that this issue should be made well known to candidates for the position of President, and I am very interested in their plans to make changes to this policy.
Fall 2018 CAPS Report-Mental Health Update
January 8, 2019

A. CAPS Staffing
   - 28 “Counselors”: “Counselor”= Counselor, Psychologist, Clinical Social Worker
   - Ratio of 1 “counselor” per ~1,800
   - 24 currently hired; 4 active searches
     - Substance Use Coordinator, Crisis Counselor, International Specialist, Generalist Psychologist/Counselor
   - Psychiatrists & Psychiatric Nurses
   - Clinical Coordinators
   - Medical Assistants
   - Trainees
   - Healthcare Assistants
   - Administrative Support Professionals

B. Updates
   - Staffing Expansion
   - Location Expansion
   - Service Expansion
     - 24/7/365 Virtual Counseling Services – “My SSP”
     - Groups
     - Embedded Counselors
   - Clinical & Cultural Integration
   - Student Mental Health Coalition
   - Re-designing clinical system from the student-perspective
     - New Screening/Intake System
     - New Follow-up Care System
     - New Referral System for certain services (SAP, SP, RCPD)
### C. Fall 2018 Counseling Data Snapshot (Client Self-Report during Screening): Presenting Concerns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>8/20/18 – 12/31/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>Stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>Depression/Sadness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>Academic Concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>Feeling Alone/Socially Isolated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>Sleep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>Self-Esteem/Confidence Concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>Family Concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>Relationship Issues – Romantic Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>Eating Concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>Body Image Concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>Relationship Issues – Peers/Friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>Anger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>ADHD/Attention Difficulties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>Career Concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>Adjusting to New Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>Financial Concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>Suicidal Thoughts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>Health/Medical Concerns Impacting Mental Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Trauma – Sexual Assault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Self-Injury (e.g., cutting, hitting, burning)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D. Utilization Rates: August 8/20-12/31

- Utilization Rate of Student Body (enrollment)
- Total Screening Appointments:
- Individual Counseling Appointments:
November 14, 2018

MEMORANDUM

TO: Deans, School Directors, and Chairpersons

FROM: June Youan, Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs

SUBJECT: Appointment, Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Recommendations

Michigan State University is a research-intensive, land-grant university of international scope. It is a member of the Association of American Universities (AAU), whose members are recognized worldwide for the quality and breadth of their scholarship, research, and undergraduate, graduate, and graduate-professional educational programs. MSU is one of only 18 universities that are designated as both land-grant and AAU.

“Bolder by Design” is MSU’s strategic planning initiative that will position the university as the nation’s leading land-grant research institution. Based upon our core values of quality, inclusiveness, and connectivity, the University is dedicated to educating tomorrow’s leaders and scholars through our undergraduate, graduate, graduate-professional, and lifelong education programs. Through its faculty, MSU will create knowledge and find new and innovative ways to extend its applications, to serve Michigan, the nation, and the international community. The faculty must infuse progressive scholarship into the full range of our teaching programs. At MSU, faculty are expected to be both active scholars and student-focused educators, demonstrating substantial scholarship and ability to promote learning through our on-campus and off-campus education and research programs. The essence of scholarship is the thoughtful discovery, transmission, and application of knowledge, including creative activities, that is based in the ideas and methods of recognized disciplines, professions, and interdisciplinary fields. What qualifies an activity as scholarship is that it be deeply informed by the most recent knowledge in the field, that the knowledge is skillfully interpreted and deployed, and that the activity is carried out with intelligent openness to new information, debate, and criticism.

1 The Office of the Provost sends this policy bi-annually to deans, directors, and chairpersons to assist them in reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions. During its annual review, the University Committee on Faculty Affairs and the University Committee on Faculty Tenure can suggest changes.

2 See President’s Statement on Core Values: [http://president.msu.edu/advancing-msu/statement-on-core-values.html](http://president.msu.edu/advancing-msu/statement-on-core-values.html)

3 See Faculty Rights and Responsibilities policy in the Faculty Handbook: [https://www.hr.msu.edu/policies-procedures/faculty-academic-staff/faculty-handbook/faculty_rights.html](https://www.hr.msu.edu/policies-procedures/faculty-academic-staff/faculty-handbook/faculty_rights.html)
MSU is committed to improve continuously. To do so means vigorous, effective recruitment and selection of new faculty who are encouraged and helped to grow professionally, through mentoring and development. These new faculty members are evaluated by demanding standards and required procedures for reappointment, tenure, and promotion recommendations. Our expectation is that they will thrive at MSU, as well as in the changing national and international landscape. Our policies, procedures, criteria, and decisions on recruitment, reappointment, award of tenure, promotions, and salary changes must be guided by the goal of enhancing academic excellence, taking into account the mission and goals of the department, school, college, and University, including the MSU commitment to diversity and inclusion. Departments/schools and colleges are required to review regularly their standards, criteria, and procedures to this end. These personnel decisions, in large measure, will determine MSU’s reputation and prominence for many years to come.

Initially, a review of the mission and goals of the University, college, and unit and their related personnel needs, fiscal constraints, and any other relevant factors must occur to determine if the applicable position(s) should be retained even if the performance of the probationary period is acceptable (see statement on Non-Tenured Faculty in the Tenure System, Faculty Handbook). If so, the unit initiates recommendations for appointment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure, following rigorous evaluation at the unit level, including peer review. All involved in these deliberations must apply high standards of performance consistent with appropriate expectations of faculty at leading research-intensive, land-grant universities.

Faculty must be both active scholars and student-focused educators and must meet academic standards that assure enhanced quality of the unit for years to come. Individual personnel actions recommending tenure should result in the continuing excellence of the academic unit(s) as a whole and MSU more broadly. For example, anyone considered for tenure should meet or exceed the requirements of the unit for tenure and be in the top echelon of peers at a similar career stage nationally or internationally in the field or discipline.

Chairpersons and directors make the unit-level recommendations. Unit-level recommendations are subject to review and approval or disapproval at the college and university levels. Recommendations are to be based on explicit unit criteria and quality evaluations that are consistent with college and university policies and goals.

As provided in the Bylaws for Academic Governance, the faculty, operating in the advisory mode, is to provide advice to the chairperson/director as described in unit bylaws. Each department, school, and comparable unit is required to have procedures and criteria that are clearly formulated and relevant to evaluating the performance of faculty members (see Statement on Non-Tenured Faculty in the Tenure System, Faculty Handbook). The Bylaws for Academic Governance includes the following statement that is of fundamental importance:

A department chairperson or school director serves as the chief representative of his or her department or school within the University. He or she is responsible for the unit’s educational, research, and service programs-including the outreach components of all three; budgetary matters, academic facilities, and personnel matters, taking into account

4 See Mentoring Policy in the Faculty Handbook: https://hr.msu.edu/policies-procedures/faculty-academic-staff/faculty-handbook/mentoring_policy.html
the advisory procedures of the unit. The chairperson or director has special obligation to build a department or school strong in scholarship, teaching capacity, and service. (2.1.2.1.)

Chairpersons or directors make judgments taking into consideration peer evaluations and other supporting information, yet unit administrators are responsible as individuals for the recommendations made.

Assessment of faculty performance should recognize the importance of both teaching and research and their extension beyond the borders of the campus as part of the outreach dimension. Assessment should take into account the quality of outcomes as well as their quantity; it should also acknowledge the creativity of faculty effort and its impact on students, on others the University serves, and on the field(s) in which the faculty member works. In many cases, faculty demonstrate excellence through individual scholarly activities. Collaborative scholarly efforts, cross-disciplinary activities, and the integration of scholarship into the creation, application, and dissemination of knowledge are also recognized as relevant dimensions of faculty performance.

Deans independently review each recommendation for appointment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure and in each case will focus primarily on how effectively the individual performs academic duties. They approve or disapprove recommendations, taking into account unit, college, and university criteria and other factors such as quality, progress, resources, program needs, percent of tenured faculty in the unit, and any other relevant university policies and goals (see below).

The Office of the Provost will review each recommendation. In each case the Office of the Provost also will concentrate primarily on the evidence of the individual’s effectiveness in the performance of academic duties. Within this context, faculty must demonstrate substantive and sustainable achievement in both teaching and research, and the infusion of this scholarship into outreach programs, where applicable.

In addition, the Office of the Provost will consider, as applicable, the following elements, relating to quality and either individual performance or institutional, contextual factors:

The factors that relate most closely to individual performance include, but are not limited to:

- Sufficient evidence of consistent and persistent professional improvement and effectiveness at MSU to predict continued professional achievement and growth for the remainder of the individual’s academic career.
- Evidence of having met the standards of the college and department/school for recommendation of appointment, reappointment, award of tenure, and promotion as documented in annual review letters.

The factors that relate most closely to institutional, contextual factors include, but are not limited to:

- Standards of the college and department/school for recommendation of appointment, reappointment, award of tenure, and promotion, including the unit’s progress toward achieving and maintaining diversity and recognizing it in its definition of quality.
- Fiscal constraints.
- Extent to which program commitments require the continuation of faculty (relevant primarily for decisions on reappointments and awards of tenure).
• Advancement of the shared university agenda, including scholarship across the mission.

Deans and directors are to assure that unit administrators in their college make clear to the concerned faculty, in a timely fashion, the procedures and criteria that they will use in making tenure system reappointment and promotion recommendations. Forms for “Recommendation for Reappointment, Promotion or Tenure Action” outline many of the activities that are relevant to decisions on promotion, tenure, and reappointment. As stated above, “the chairperson or director has a special obligation to build academic units strong in scholarship, teaching capacity, and outreach.” To discharge this responsibility, academic administrators must apply rigorous standards in making reappointment, tenure, and promotion recommendations. The achievement and performance level required must be competitive with faculties of leading research-intensive, land-grant universities of international scope (hereafter referred to as peer universities):

1. Reappointment with award of tenure: Each tenure recommendation should be based on a clear record of sustained, outstanding achievements in education and scholarship across the mission, consistent with performance levels expected at peer universities.
   
   o For the faculty member appointed initially as associate professor on a probationary basis in the tenure system who has established such a record, the tenure recommendation is effective upon reappointment after one probationary appointment period.

2. A recommendation for promotion from assistant professor to associate professor in the tenure system should be based on several years of sustained, outstanding achievements in education and scholarship across the mission, consistent with performance levels expected for promotion to associate professor at peer universities. A reasonably long period in rank before promotion is usually necessary to provide a basis in actual performance for predicting capacity to become an expert of national and/or international stature and long-term, high-quality professional achievement.

   A recommendation for promotion from associate professor to professor in the tenure system should be based on several years of sustained, outstanding achievements in education and scholarship across the mission, consistent with performance levels expected at peer universities. A reasonably long period in rank before promotion is usually necessary to provide a basis in actual performance to permit endorsement of the individual as an expert of national and/or international stature and to predict continuous, long-term, high-quality professional achievement.

Bearing in mind the University’s continuing objective of an excellent, diverse faculty, the unit and college must refrain from doubtful recommendations of reappointment, tenure, or promotion. The dean must evaluate carefully each recommendation to ensure that it is well grounded and fully justified.
3.3. THE FACULTY SENATE

3.3.1. Composition of the Faculty Senate

1.1.1.1. The first contingent of voting members of the Faculty Senate will be composed of faculty representatives from each college at the University. The college advisory committee/council in each college will conduct the election of that college’s representatives. The Secretary for Academic Governance will oversee the elections.

1.1.1.2. Elected Faculty Representatives

1.1.1.2.1. Each college shall have at least two representatives, one of whom will be the Chairperson of the College Advisory Committee. Each college shall have one additional representative for every additional fifty voting faculty in excess of one hundred (1.1.2.1) not to exceed five total representatives. Each college with three or more representatives shall have at least one non-tenured faculty member among its representatives. See 2.2.5.1.