
Absent: L. Fleck, L. McCabe, D. Straiton, K. Rifiotis, D. Westrin

1. CALL TO ORDER
The meeting was called to order at 3:16 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda for March 12, 2019
The agenda for March 12, 2019 was approved as presented.

3. Approval of Draft Minutes for February 12, 2019
The minutes for February 12, 2019 were approved as distributed.

4. President’s Remarks: Acting President Satish Udpa

President Udpa reported that he continued to meet with some of the survivors and their parents, adding that he met with a parent last week who argued strenuously that we need to treat the second wave of survivors with greater flexibility. He said that he was very willing to apologize, but at the end of the day, MSU is constrained by what the University can do as far as finances are concerned. He noted that, at this point in time, he cannot commit to anything beyond the $75 million that the University agreed to, adding that the parent understood why, and they both agreed to meet again.

President Udpa stated that MSU is reviewing the efforts of the Chief Investment Officer. He said that this area is doing very well this year, and that the returns on MSU’s investments have been very good. He also said that there is some interest in looking at the financial model for supporting that office, and that he is having discussions both with the Provost and with some members of the Board of Trustees to figure out how the University can support that office in the future. He added that MSU wants to insure that they have the flexibility to invest and receive adequate financial returns. MSU has to make sure that the University’s interests are served.

President Udpa also said that he is examining the President's Advisory Committees in order to see what is working and what is not working. He added that if there are some suggestions for changes, then he will come back to the Steering Committee for input and advice. He noted as an example the cost in constructing a new pool, that the desire is there for this project, but that the cost at this time is problematic.
5. **Provost’s Remarks:** Dr. June Youatt

Provost Youatt reported that she and Acting President Udpa toured the new Integrative Science and Technology building that will open in August, noting that individuals there will be doing computational genetics work, neuroscience work, and reproductive science work. She says that the building looks wonderful, and that it is going to house a number of MSU’s faculty scientists and some of the University’s GI2 hires. A positive benefit of this new facility, she added, is that this building will allow people to move out of Giltner Hall, which is over a hundred years old, thus allowing a significant improvement. In addition, she stated that this move will free-up space at other locations. The completion of this facility, she stated, is ahead of schedule, and the cost is $20 million less than the research building facility in Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Provost Youatt reported that MSU has given priority to student counseling and psychiatric services. She said that the support in student health has moved to the behavioral side. She stated that student health services are as much student services as they are health services, and involve a range of services that is not strictly medical care. She noted that more counselors have been added to the staff, and that MSU now has twenty-four hour remote counseling service.

6. **Chairperson’s Remarks:** Professor Deborah Moriarty

Chairperson Moriarty reported that the technical recording process of the Steering Committee meetings have changed, so that a more accurate account can be recorded. She also noted that the other thing is that she wanted to let individuals know how many people voted for the At-Large Members during the elections, and decided that such information will better facilitate informing the academic community. She reported that for the At-Large member vote, the total votes casted was 983, out of 3,346 possible votes.

Professor Hoppenstand added that the past two years have had the highest voter turnout for elections in a long time.

7. **Committee Reports**

**University Committee on Academic Governance (UCAG) – Amanda Tickner**

Professor Tickner reported that UCAG’s last meeting was devoted to assembling nominees for various University election positions. She added that for the next UCAG meeting, feedback was received regarding the University Bylaws revision, and that UCAG will review this feedback and review the comments received from the various committees that were sent the proposed Bylaws revisions. She added that these comments will be presented to the Steering Committee in April for its review.

**University Committee on Curriculum (UCC) – Marci Mechtel**

Professor Mechtel reported that UCC met and approved the following program changes: no new programs were approved; twenty-nine program changes were approved; and there were no program deletions. Regarding courses; forty-five new courses were approved; ninety-two course changes were approved; and three course deletions were approved. She added that there were no moratoriums or discontinuations to report.
A motion was made and seconded to put this Report on the Faculty Senate agenda, as an action item, and on the University Council agenda, as an Information item. The motion carried.

University Committee on Undergraduate Education (UCUE) – Rich Bellon

Professor Bellon reported that UCUE discussed the Academic Calendar. He also said that the search process for the permanent Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education is now underway, which is currently held on an interim basis by Mark Largent. He noted that UCUE’s role in this process was to produce a search procedure document. He stated that UCUE employed the documents from the previous search for the Associate Provost of Undergraduate Education, as well as the documents for the Provost for Graduate Education. He added that UCUE produced this new document, and sent it out for comment. He added that it distributed for a vote, and while the vote is technically still open, more than half of the Committee has voted for approval. He said that he forwarded this information to Terry Curry.

University Committee on Faculty Tenure (UCFT) – Len Fleck

Professor Fleck provided the following report from UCFT:

“1) We agreed that we should have a three-person review panel, randomly chosen, made up of Dismissal for Cause Review Officers (not including any from the college of the accused). That panel, in consultation with the President shall decide whether the accused individual will be denied pay during the dismissal hearing process. Theresa Kelley says (in the document we reviewed at our last meeting) that the President “makes a recommendation” to the panel. The panel may or may not agree with that recommendation; however, their judgment is final.

2) We agreed that the judgment of the panel must be unanimous. This is related to point #3 below. The conduct of the accused faculty member must be “egregious” to justify denial of pay. We have more confidence in a judgment of “egregiousness” with three faculty members who concur in that judgment as opposed to a simple majority.

3) We agreed that the standard for denial of pay should be “egregious” behavior. We noted that several levels of judgment regarding the accused’s behavior have occurred before the issue comes before the UCFT for dismissal consideration. This suggests that the behavior is at least “serious” and perhaps “egregious.” There is no simple way to define “egregious.” But we can offer the following criteria/considerations as guidelines for identifying egregious behavior:
   a. The behavior represents substantial damage to the reputation of the university
   b. The behavior (or interrupted intent to commit the behavior) represents violence against any member of the university community
   c. The behavior (or interrupted intent to commit the behavior) represents substantial damage to university property (physical or intellectual)
   d. The behavior (or interrupted intent to commit the behavior) represents substantial fiscal violations of norms (fraud or actual theft), or substantial violation of scholarly norms (fabrication or falsification of research data)
4) We agreed that if that panel judges the accused faculty member’s behavior to be egregious, and they are denied pay, then they may still choose to retire before the hearing process begins. If they do not retire at that point, then their retirement benefits are at risk. They do not have the option of retiring later in the hearing/dismissal process. [Concerns were expressed in the full committee meeting that this individual might be denied due process since they may not appear before this panel to plead their case. However, we noted that this individual would have pled their case several times in earlier stages of the disciplinary process. The record of their pleadings would be part of the thick packet of information that would be reviewed by this three-person panel. In that respect, some degree of due process is protected.]

5) We agreed that if a faculty member is being considered for dismissal, but their behavior is not judged egregious, then they may stay on duty and be paid. They may then go through the hearing process as far as they wish with the option to retire at any point before the Board of Trustees renders a final decision. However, if the Board of Trustees approves their dismissal, then they have lost retirement benefits because they have been fired (in effect).”

University Committee on Graduate Studies (UCGS) – Gwen Wittenbaum

Professor Wittenbaum reported that UCGS approved ten program requests, as well as a recommendation for salary increase for non-GEU graduate assistants.

University Committee on Faculty Affairs (UCFA) – Mark Waddell

Professor Waddell reported that UCFA has been dealing with proposed changes to MSU's Consensual Amorous Relationships Policy. He noted that the Policy was examined as a Committee, and then voted to approve it. He also stated that the Emeritus Policy, which was approved by UCFA, went to University Council two weeks ago. He added that here were some concerns raised by some individuals about the wording of the Policy, and potential implications of that Policy, so the motion to approve was tabled. He said that the Policy was sent back to UCFA, adding that Dr. Curry made some small changes that will help it proceed further. He added that the Policy was, again, approved earlier this afternoon by UCFA, and will be moving forward again.

Council of Graduate Students (COGS) – Ben Burke

Ben Burke reported that COGS has had a critical shortage of students who are able to fill Committee assignments, and that COGS has been trying to explore the best ways of having graduate students serve on the Committee. He said that efforts are being made to engage faculty in helping promote the Council of Graduate Students. He noted that COGS is open to ideas, but that COGS is trying to work towards reaching more graduate students in a broader spectrum, in order to communicate the importance of Academic Governance and Student Governance as a recruitment tactic. Discussion ensued.

University Committee on Student Affairs (UCSA) – Katherine Rifiotis (not present) – Mario Kakos reported in her absence.

Mario Kakos reported that in the Student Services building there was a pepper spray bottle that blew, which required an evacuation of the building. He said notes were taken of the incident, as best remembered.
ASMSU – Mario Kakos

Mario Kakos reported that ASMSU passed several bills at their last meeting. He noted that ASMSU approved student representatives for the University Hearing Board. He added that ASMSU passed a bill that would put the Student Athletic Advisory Committee on the ballot this spring for students who would vote on making it a voting seat in the General Assembly. It would be about a proposal for the students to decide if they want it to be on there. He added that another bill was passed that advocated for an Economics Degree in a Bachelor of Science, to be a STEM major primarily for international students. He said that currently ASMSU is holding its General Assembly elections, adding that voting will be held from April 1 through April 8. He concluded his remarks by stating that at UCSA’s last meeting, Mark Largent gave a substantial presentation regarding flat rate tuition. It was pretty much the whole meeting on the moving parts of flat rate tuition.

8. NEW BUSINESS

8.1. Academic Year Calendar Reports from University Committee on Faculty Affairs (UCFA), University Committee on Undergraduate Education (UCUE), University Committee on Graduate Studies (UCGS), University Committee on Student Affairs (UCSA), and Council of Graduate Students (COGS), Chairperson Deborah Moriarty

Professor Moriarty reported that three essential items regarding the Academic Year Calendar report were requested from UCFA, UCUE, UCGS, UCSA and COGS. She said: “One [item] was making the semesters the same length, so that instead of having two semesters of two different lengths, the other [item] was a Fall Break, and the [third item] was the possibility of a J term. I think we can maybe consider those separately in terms of what kind of reaction you got from your Committees in terms of whether or not they are interested in re-examining or examining that. We'll start down with graduate . . . Just looking for reactions to having semesters the same length, reactions to J term, and reactions to [a] Fall Break.”

UCGS: Gwen Wittenbaum

Professor Wittenbaum from UCGS reported that the opinion of UCGS members was mixed. She stated: “We didn't really focus on those specific potential changes, but rather should we reinstate a conversation about examining the Academic Calendar and maybe those issues come up, or maybe different issues come up, so that's really where we focused, not on those specific issues. I think there were concerns about labs, particularly in the Natural Sciences, that have labs on Fridays, and potentially having a Fall Break, and how that would affect Fridays and Mondays for graduate students. There seem to be a consensus that maybe that would be more beneficial to undergraduate students, but not so much to graduate students.”

She added: “I think [for] some colleges that this would be a good idea to explore this again; others thought what's the reason for doing it, and is there a reason that has to deal with quality of education, the educational experience, so that there should be some foundation, some reason, some values guiding it that are more than convenience.
I would say mixed. I can't give you a consensus . . . We really did not have a consensus on whether to explore this.”

**UCUE: Richard Bellon**

Professor Richard Bellon from UCUE reported that their deliberations were similar to UCGS’s. He stated: “We took a straw poll, and it seemed to break down roughly in equal, in three parts, the people who were opposed, people who are interested, and then people who were uncertain. People who are ‘for’ like the prospect of a J term, or at least [a] potentially Fall Break. The people who were against tended to see this as changing the calendar to make it different, but not necessarily better, because any changes you make are going to radiate throughout the entire system. Everything is going . . . to come with disruptions and losses, as well as benefits, like the J term for example. That would push the end of Spring Semester, and some of the members pointed out, ‘Well, it's advantage to our students to be able to finish up so early in the summer for employment opportunities, and you'd lose a little bit of that with this change.’”

He added: “Also, one of the things that we were unanimous about is that is the type that any changes that do take place really have to be systematic, that any, if you make a change you can't just say, ‘Okay, we want full term because that by ... or Fall Break, because by necessity that changes everything.’ You have to look at this holistically. We also, while UCUE would want to be very deeply involved in this, we not only would . . . not want to lead on this, we actually don't think that any particular committee would take the lead on this. In 2016, a steering committee sent to UCUE a proposal to study Fall Break, and so they ... a subcommittee produced a report; it came back to Steering Committee where it died. Apparently, in the process of doing this report, the Subcommittee members discovered that there would have been a previous committee that looked on this, but nobody could actually find the report. There is a concern that if you broaden this, I think that that's really important.”

**UCC: Marci Mechtel**

Professor Mechtel from UCC stated: “We did discuss this at our last meeting on February 28, and again, like all of them a real mix. Although it was really interesting, because I got an email from one member that said no Fall Break, because he didn't have students come back to class after Spring Break. I think the consensus was that more ... the fact that the equal; semester length, it was, I think, the most ... they weren't really, again, seeing a lot of benefits of J term especially in considering block tuition, what would the impact of block tuition be on J terms, because no one would take 15 credits units. Would that be priced differently? Again, a mixed bag. I think the most consensus was, yes, having Fall start on a Monday, and have a regular week that week, would probably be one of the most beneficial things to try and even out the weeks.”

**UCFA: Mark Waddell**

Professor Waddell from UCFA stated: “We talked about this actually this afternoon. Yeah, mixed is also how I would characterize it. There was some concern from faculty in Colleges like Nursing, in Orthopedic Medicine, that they have clinical expectations and schedules for their students and others that they didn't ... they were concerned that
changes, any change to the Academic Calendar might affect adversely their students and those expectations. Because that's not clear how that would affect them, they weren't sure how they felt about potential changes. Very low support from faculty for J term. That was not something that people saw it as an advantage for faculty at least.”

He added: “There was also very little interest, I think, in stretching the Fall before Labor Day, say, or any closer to later December as well, which isn't surprising I guess. Ambivalence, I think. The notion of a Fall Break though was pretty ... was seen as actually a pretty good thing. Not surprisingly, the fact that many students take a Fall Break anyhow before Thanksgiving. There's all ... we could potentially build some of that in as well as actual time that we give them as opposed to them taking. That was, I think, the one thing that most members of the committee were most positive about is a Fall Break.”

**COGS: Ben Burke**

Ben Burke from COGS stated: “The main discussion that I've had with students is encouraging a Fall Break. Just from our perspective, from a mental health standpoint is that you grind through so much more in the Fall Semester than you do having a break like you do in the Spring Semester. It really helps because I know ... ASMSU had this discussion ... and see a climb in rates of people using counseling services in the Fall Semester than do in the Spring, and so we think the Fall Break might be a good source of helping augment that to a degree. That's one area that we've looked at. Then, tomorrow night our full Council meets and I'll be able to present the full idea to the whole council as well, but that's the feedback we've gotten so far.”

**ASMSU: Mario Kakos**

Mario Kakos from ASMU stated: “It's generally the same. It's more supportive for a Fall Break, because of these mental health crises a lot of students find themselves in during that first semester, especially for a freshman navigating their way into college.”

Vigorous discussion ensued.

Provost Youatt stated: “The one thing that ... I don't know if I'll be here 20 more years but if I am, I'd go down on this one starting never on a Monday again. The reason that we start on Wednesday is so our first year students can move in on Sunday. If you remember, having freshman come here and spend the first weekend without something to do was not just disruptive to the town because they can get over it. The last year we did that we had twenty-eight students in [the Sparrow] emergency room with alcohol poisoning.”

She added: “The year we started on Wednesday, the Saturday night before we had zero, and we've had zero ever since. For me, it has always been a health and safety issue. Not that you're advocating to put students in the hospital, but again, this is like lost history again. People don't know, they don't remember why Fall starts on Wednesday and how Wednesday is Monday, because you teach a half-term class. With the Wednesday as Monday thing, then ... and then the Thursday, Friday off, you do have the same number of days in that semester, the same number of Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, except if you teach a half term.”
Vigorous discussion ensued.

8.2. **Report from UCAG on Bylaws Revisions Status, Amanda Tickner, University Committee on Academic Governance (UCAG) Chairperson**

Professor Tickner reported that a report will be presented at the next Steering Committee meeting.

8.3. **Questions from Faculty Senate for the Presidential Search Committee, Chairperson Deborah Moriarty**

Professor Moriarty reported on questions from the Faculty Senate for the Presidential Search Committee. She said that there was an email sent out, based on our last Faculty Senate meeting, where Trustee Dianne Byrum asked for our input from the Faculty Senate regarding questions for the Presidential Search Committee. At the meeting, she asked for approximately three questions she sent. Professor Moriarty said that based on that request, an email was sent Faculty Senate for input. Then, Professor Moriarty noted, Trustee Byrum sent out another email to her and the At-Large Members asking for additional questions. Professor Moriarty said that she spoke with Trustee Byrum on the phone. Questions were assembled and grouped into themes by Professor Greg Swain and Professor Jennifer Johnson. And then came up with questions based on those themes. Professor Moriarty added that the Steering Committee has those two sets of questions. Discussion ensued.

Provost Youatt stated: “My understanding was that you got questions, and the three especially that you chose the three big areas that were representative of what the faculty wanted to know, and certainly asking a candidate how they understood the role of the Arts and Humanities in undergraduate education is a great question. In fact, all of these are good questions, but these are stated in ways that are... they're leading, they're negative, they convey a... I'm not sure they really represent the Faculty at large, I really don't. This is someone who is with a very specific point of view getting their specific question in front of someone instead of representing our faculty, our 3000 faculty and asking them the question that would be helpful.”

Provost Youatt added: “I think there are a couple of questions in the way they're asked that will not be taken seriously, and if you get a written response, it will just be a political response; it won't be a sincere one, because of the way it's asked. If you ask someone do you like top-down governance, what candidate is going to say yes? If you ask them the role of governance in an institution, then you have to get a thoughtful answer. But if you ask them, are you going to keep doing things top-down in an age of secrecy, I can write the answer now and you could too.”

Provost Youatt stated: “If no one minds I will speak to someone on the Search Committee and ask if they would like, maybe a little reworking of the three. I think passing along the questions the people asked directly to the Search Committee is absolutely appropriate. These are the ones I wouldn't have expected anyone to tinker with, because they're the questions people submitted, right? But I think if you're asking, if we are asking as a faculty three anchor questions around culture and governance and vision, then these questions are still good questions but I think they're asked in ways that we'll not get answers that... not get thoughtful answers. I think, as I
said, I think they'll be very politically crafted, because who wouldn't? If they have any interest, they'll get back with the Steering Committee, not through me. If they don't, they don't.” Discussion ensued.

It was moved and seconded that the At-Large members of the Steering Committee revise the questions, and circulate them, so that the newly revised questions go back to the Steering Committee. **The motion carried.**

**8.4. Email Voting on Agenda Items, Chairperson Deborah Moriarty**

Chairperson Moriarty discussed the option of email voting on agenda items. Professor Hoppenstand said that there needs to be a formal method or procedure in place, and recommended that a “point individual” be established to communicate with instead of four or five individuals. Professor Mechtel stated that this is a great idea, and that it should be sent to UCAG as the responsible Committee. A motion was made and seconded for a policy to be developed by UCAG. **The motion carried.**

**8.5. FAR Report, Michael Kaplowitz, At-Large Member and FAR Chair**

Professor Kaplowitz stated that he has the honor of serving as one of MSU’s two Faculty Athletic Representatives (FAR). In the past, he noted the Faculty Athletic Representative made a presentation to University Council in Fall Semester, and that presentation was their only report to Academic Governance. He requested to present the Report to the University Council. This Report, he noted, would include four basic areas. He said that he would prepare a PowerPoint presentation of the Report for the University Council to review.

A motion was made to put on the University Council agenda and was seconded. **The motion carried.**

**8.6. Faculty Senate List Serve, Chairperson Deborah Moriarty**

Professor Moriarty discussed concerns about the MSU Faculty Senate list serve, regarding the security of the list serve, and the universal-respond function of the list serve, and other issues. She asked if the current practice of the MSU Faculty list serve remain the same, or if these concerns should be addressed.

A motion was made and seconded that UCAG develop an email communication and voting guidelines for possible adoption in the MSU Bylaws. **The motion carried.**

Recommendations informally were made to involve other committees with this process with the Secretary for Academic Governance office.

**8.7. Scholarly Publishing and Communications, Joseph Salem, University Librarian**

Joseph Salem offered a presentation on the cost and complexity of journal subscriptions, including the negotiating of rights permissions and the possibility of an “Open Access Policy” for scholarly publications. He also discussed how the Library is working with MSU IT and with the College of Arts and Letters to launch MSU’s first institutional repository, something called MSU Commons, based on the humanities commons platform that will be interdisciplinary or non-disciplinary.

A motion was made and seconded to place this item on the Faculty Senate agenda. **The motion carried.**
9. **Draft Agenda for Faculty Senate for March 19, 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. Scholarly Publishing and Communications, Joseph Salem, University Librarian (Information Item) (Appendix)

A motion was made and seconded to approve the Faculty Senate agenda for March 19, 2019. **The motion carried.**

10. **Draft Agenda for University Council for March 26, 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. FAR Report, Michael Kaplowitz, Faculty Athletic Council Representative (Appendix)

10.3. Consensual Relationship Policy, Mark Waddell and Terry Curry (Information Item) (Appendix)

10.4. Faculty Emeritus Policy, Professor Mark Waddell, UCFA Chairperson (Action Item) (Appendix)

A motion was made and seconded to approve the University Council agenda for March 26, 2019. **The motion carried.**

11. **ADJOURNMENT**

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn. **The motion carried.** 5:07 p.m.