1. CALL TO ORDER
2. Approval of Agenda for October 3, 2017
3. Approval of Draft Minutes for September 5, 2017 (Appendix A)
4. President’s Remarks: Dr. Lou Anna K. Simon
5. Provost’s Remarks: Dr. June Youatt
6. Chairperson’s Remark: Dr. Laura McCabe
7. Committee Reports
8. NEW BUSINESS
   8.1. Relationship, Violence and Sexual Misconduct Policy (RVSM) and Annual Report, Jessica Norris, Title IX and ADA Compliance Program Director
   8.2. Possible Future Plans to Address Course Scheduling Issues where Academic Governance is Likely Very Important, Professor R. Sekhar Chivukula, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education and Dean of Undergraduate Studies, (Appendix B and C)
   8.3. Role of Student Instructional Rating System (SIRS) in Faculty Evaluation, Establishing an Ad Hoc Committee to Assess Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness, Reports from University Committee on Faculty Affairs (UCFA), Thomas Tomlinson, UCFA Chairperson, University Committee on Undergraduate Education (UCUE), Richard Miksicek, UCUE Chairperson, University Committee on Graduate Studies (UCGS), Jeremy Francis, Alternate for Chris Hogan, UCGS Chairperson, and COGS, Ashley Fuente, COGS President
   8.4. Mid-Semester Review Information, Reports from ASMSU, Lorenzo Santavicca, ASMSU President, University Committee on Undergraduate Education (UCUE), Richard Miksicek, UCUE Chairperson, University Committee on Faculty Affairs (UCFA), Thomas Tomlinson, UCFA Chairperson, and University Committee on Graduate Studies (UCGS), Jeremy Francis, Alternate for Chris Hogan, UCGS Chairperson
   8.5. Faculty Senate Input Results, Dr. Laura McCabe
      8.4.a. Faculty Senate Group Task Feedback (Appendix D)
      8.4.b. Faculty Senate Group Task Feedback Questions (Appendix E)
8.6. Search Procedure Document to Guide the Search for a New University Ombudsperson, Review and Approval, Terry Curry, Associate Provost and Associate Vice President, Academic Human Resources (Appendix F)

9. Draft Agenda for Faculty Senate for October 10, 2017
   9.2. Relationship, Violence and Sexual Misconduct Policy (RVSM) and Annual Report, Jessica Norris, Title IX and ADA Compliance Program Director
   9.3. Faculty Senate Input Results, Dr. Laura McCabe (Appendixes)

10. Draft Agenda for University Council for October 17, 2017
   10.1. University Committee on Curriculum (UCC) Report, Professor Marci Mechtel, UCC Chairperson (Information Item) (Appendix Short Report) (Long Report, click on Link)
   10.2. Academic Governance Overview, Dr. Gary Hoppenstand, Secretary for Academic Governance

11. ADJOURNMENT
1. CALL TO ORDER
The meeting was called to order at 3:15 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda for September 5, 2017
The agenda for September 5, 2017 was approved as presented.

3. Approval of Draft Minutes for April 4, 2017 (Appendix A)
The minutes for April 4, 2017 were approved as distributed.

4. President’s Remarks: Dr. Lou Anna K. Simon
President Simon stated that “these will be times that will test the mettle of our vales in very profound ways, and will also test us to see if we believe what we say, in many ways, that universities hold a special place to have clashes of ideas.” She added that universities are the one place in the world designed to engage in the clash of ideas, and they have engaged in this class over the long history of universities, dating back to the Middle Ages.

President Simon noted that the expectations of those clashes were built on intellectual foundations and civility. Even though one might not like what someone else said, however outlandish, that individual could have those conversations in a place called the university, without demonizing the person who has expressed the views we do not agree with. This role is being tested severely. If one were to look at the national polls, she added, the respect for universities is plummeting. Some would argue this decline is happening because universities have forsaken that role as being the model for the very difficult discussions that society must have in order to move forward.

At the core of what the university does, President Simon stated that universities have always had fringe elements, but they did not, through the most difficult times, define the university, the faculty, the staff, and the students. She said that when history is written 50 years from now, the relevance of universities will be defined as places for difficult
conversations and the role of scholars in those conversations. Because, she added: “In my model we are educating citizen scholars.”

President Simon reported that the threat of litigation was predictable, and if one looks at the landscape in how this litigation has been resolved at other institutions, it has not necessarily been resolved in ways that bring comfort. Thus, she added, we will have to have some additional conversations about how Michigan State's role in this part of history will be played out, because our capacity to deal with this situation will be what history will care about in this difficult age for America.

President Simon stated that she signed a letter again today regarding DACA (Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals) that was released this afternoon by the AAU (American Association of Universities), believing that our voices are stronger together than apart. She said that we, as a university community, have to advocate ways that are both humane and represent social justice. She added that the current political uncertainty regarding immigration is disturbing and problematic.

President Simon reported the positive news that MSU’s student enrollment is up, and that the University had a good fundraising year. She also said that research is at an all-time high.

5. **Provost’s Remarks: Dr. June Youatt**

Provost Youatt stated that MSU is starting this year with more first-year students than anticipated, and that the University can accommodate these additional students with regards to course enrollments. She added that MSU opened the new Counseling Center in the Psychiatric Services Unit, which is now located on the third floor of the Olin Health Center (and called Integrated Behavioral Health). Thus, any of our students who are seeking assistance for behavioral health or emotional health issues go to one place, and they are guided to the right type of care from the beginning and with an integrated team.

Provost Youatt noted that MSU has more counselors this year than last year, and that the University is going to continue to add staff to that unit. She said that MSU expanded that care to also social workers in the Neighborhoods, students can be guided to the right help. In addition, a new service has been developed where students can receive telephone counseling in their native language. Students studying abroad will also have access to this service.

Provost Youatt announced that Thomas Jeitschko, from Economics, is now the new Graduate Dean. She added that Judith Stoddart is going to take a research leave from administrative work and step back from her Graduate Associate Dean role, adding that Stoddart has done an amazing job, and that MSU is very appreciative of her service.

Provost Youatt noted that MSU has to select a New Dean of the Lyman Briggs College, and congratulated Elizabeth Simmons for her appointment as Provost at UC San Diego.

Provost Youatt reported that MSU’s search for a Dean for Natural Science was unsuccessful, and that the search will continue this year. She said that, nationally, applications in finance return for Veterinarians. Provost Youatt stated that D2L posted a video about a panel of experts discussing the First Amendment issues on August 17th. She also announced that MSU would do a Title IX review.

6. **Chairperson’s Remark: Dr. Laura McCabe**
Professor Laura McCabe introduced herself as the new Chair of the Steering Committee. She reported that the Vice Chair of the Steering Committee is Deborah Moriarty, and that Gary Hoppenstand is the Secretary for Academic Governance, along with Sherry Lott as the Executive Secretary of the Academic Governance office. She also noted that there is an Academic Governance structure for MSU that is online that can provide useful information. Professor McCabe stated that our goal as the Steering Committee is to advise the Provost and also to collect information and action items from around campus and move it through Academic Governance. She said that the Steering Committee decides and sets the agendas for the Faculty Senate and University Council. In addition, the University Standing Committee Chairs give an update of their work at each Steering Committee meeting.

Professor McCabe concluded her remarks by saying that an open question period will be on the Faculty Senate that will allow the gathering of ideas and issues for the Steering Committee.

7. **Introductions**

The members of the Steering Committee introduced themselves and their departmental affiliations.

8. **Committee Reports**

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

Professor Mechtel reported that the UCC approved five new programs, 24 changes to programs, and no program deletions. The newly approved Minors are effective now, and they involve Comic Art and Graphic Novels, Forestry, Forestry Field Applications, Indian and South Asian Languages and Cultures, and Urban and Community Forestry. Regarding course approvals, 48 new courses have been approved, as well as 50 course changes, and four course deletions. Professor Mechtel noted that a report will be presented to Faculty Senate for approval.

**University Committee on Academic Governance (UCAG) – Professor Gayle Lourens – No Report**

**University Committee on Undergraduate Education (UCUE) – Professor Emily Tabuteau for R. Miksicek**

Professor Tabuteau reported that UCUE has not met yet this academic year, but that it met twice during the Spring Semester after the Steering Committee’s last meeting. On April 13th, UCUE approved one minor in Turf Mass Management, and approved three moratoria on Minors for Teacher Education and Elementary Education. Additional moratoria were mandated by the State of Michigan, which is dropping the Minors in Computer Science, History, and Russian. On April 27th, a very short meeting was held, and new officers were elected. In addition, student evaluations were informally discussed.

**University Committee on Graduate Studies (UCGS) – Professor Chris Hogan – Jeremy Francis for Fall Semester**

**University Committee in Faculty Affairs (UCFA) – Professor Thomas Tomlinson – No Report**
9. NEW BUSINESS

9.1. Proposed East Lansing Income Tax and How Faculty can Respond, Mark Burnham, Vice President, Governmental Affairs, and Janet Lillie, Assistant Vice President, Governmental Affairs

Mark Burnham presented the proposed City of East Lansing income tax that will be on the ballot this coming November. He stated that the East Lansing City Council is proposing a 1% income tax for residents, and a 1/2% income tax for non-resident income (to begin on January 1, 2018) that is linked to a deduction of the property tax for the residents of the City of East Lansing. Such a proposed tax structure would raise an addition $10 million dollars in revenue, and that approximately $5 million dollars of tax relief would be given back to property owners as a tax reduction. A discussion ensued on the impact and various dimensions of this income tax proposal.


Lorenzo Santavicca presented the documents regarding the mid-semester feedback proposal that was sent out to everyone on campus. He stated that this effort has been long in the making for ASMSU and advocacy work here at MSU. He noted that ASMSU worked with Lyman Briggs College last fall on the mid-semester feedback proposal, which would be designed only for professors and their students. The hope, he said, is that this proposal can be encouraged among faculty and students, but not mandated. A discussion of the proposal ensued.

A motion was made to move the mid-semester feedback proposal to UCUE, UCGS and UCFA, to see how this can be implemented across campus. R. LaDuca and D. Moriarty first and seconded. Motion carried. This item will be brought back to the Steering Committee in October.

9.3. Role of Student Instructional Rating System (SIRS) in Faculty Evaluation, Establish an Ad Hoc Committee to Assess Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness, Thomas Tomlinson, UCFA Chairperson

Professor Thomas Tomlinson reported that some individuals expressed concerns about the ways in which the SIRS forms, by themselves, were being used for the evaluation of teaching effectiveness and reviewing faculty for merit raises, promotion, and tenure. This is a problematic situation, because there is evidence that female faculty members are judged more harshly on student evaluations than are male faculty members. He added that there is genuine concern about the use of a single instrument for merit review and promotion, especially one like the SIRS forms, and this situation explains how this issue came before the University Committee on
Faculty Affairs. He adds that because this matter is not just one to be considered by UCFA, it was referred to the Steering Committee to make decisions about how to handle this issue going forward, including how to coordinate the work of the various committees who have a potential stake regarding input. A discussion ensued.

A motion was made to move the SIRS concerns to UCGS, UCUE and COGS, and then to return it back to the October Steering Committee meeting with their report. UCFA will develop a problem statement for the various committees. R. LaDuca and G. Lourens first and seconded the motion. **Motion Carried.**

**9.4. 2018 Health Care Plan Design, Renee Rivard, Director, Human Resources**  
Joe Galardi, Assistant Director of Human Resources

Joe Galardi presented a report on the MSU Healthcare Dashboard. He noted that MSU is seeing double digit increases in prescription drug costs. He added that for the last year (2016-2017), MSU experienced a 12.6% increase. Part of that increase, he said, comes from the fact that within the faculty population, MSU had some high cost claimants. In addition, he noted, MSU had a considerable number of "shock claims." He stated that shock claims are for members that have healthcare experiences over $100,000 during the course of the year. Galardi explained the concept of “net cost avoidance.” He said that when we talk about net cost avoidance, we are taking into consideration any treatment that was prescribed, and potentially change by the recommendation of that status. He added that conversations about this concept have occurred quite often with the Faculty Healthcare Council. A discussion ensued.

A motion was made and first and seconded to send the Healthcare assessment to the Faculty Senate. **Motion Carried.**

**Comments from the floor**

None

**10. Draft Agenda for Faculty Senate for September 12, 2017**

10.1. University Committee on Curriculum (UCC Report), Professor Marci Mechtel, UCC Chairperson (Information Item)

10.2. 2018 Health Care Plan Design, Renee Rivard, Director, Human Resources  
Joe Galardi, Assistant Director of Human Resources

10.3. Faculty Senate Agenda Setting, Professor John Beck, Human Resources and Labor Relations

**11. Draft Agenda for University Council for September 19, 2017**

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

11.2. Proposed East Lansing Income Tax and How Faculty can Respond, Mark Burnham, Vice President, Governmental Affairs, and Janet Lillie, Assistant Vice President, Governmental Affairs
12. ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn was first and seconded. **Motion carried.** The meeting was adjourned at 4:57 pm.
To: MSU Deans, Chairs, and Directors

From: R. Sekhar Chivukula, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education

Re: Undergraduate Course Scheduling and Student Success

As we begin course scheduling for next year, I write to explain the need to adjust MSU undergraduate course scheduling practices to facilitate student success. As illustrated in the diagram below, the scheduling patterns we have been using result in a very high congestion of courses offered between 10am and 3pm, especially on Mondays and Wednesdays. Such congestion prevents schedule flexibility for students, making it difficult for them to enroll in a full slate of courses relevant to their degree and maintain “credit momentum” (averaging the 15 credits per semester needed to complete an undergraduate degree in four years). As a result, while we have enough classrooms and faculty members to meet our needs during peak demand, our students are not able to register for enough classes each semester because the courses they need are too frequently taught at the same times.

Starting Times for 100/200-Level Courses, FS17

Seat capacity of 100 and 200 level FS17 courses, plotted against starting time and day.

Two course scheduling practices in particular exacerbate this problem:

1. We schedule many courses to meet on Monday and Wednesday for 80 minutes each. Such a schedule often eliminates the use of Fridays and prevents a student from taking a 50 minute Monday/Wednesday/Friday class during two (and, with travel time, which recent studies have shown average twenty-five minutes between classes, sometimes three) time slots.

2. Relatively few classes are scheduled outside the 10am and 3pm window, significantly restricting the number of hours per day available for courses.
To facilitate student success, we ask that to the largest extent possible, you utilize 50 minute course schedules on Monday/Wednesday/Friday, and 80 min schedules on Tuesday/Thursday and spread out daily schedules beyond the 10am to 3pm block. We ask that you pay particular attention to large enrollment classes and those satisfying university requirements for large numbers of students, to make sure they are available throughout the week.

Note that moving Monday/Wednesday courses to Tuesday/Thursday would simply increase crowding on Tuesdays and Thursdays. Please give consideration to reformatting course timing to fit properly in a Monday/Wednesday/Friday slot or, at the very least, scheduling outside the peak 10am to 3pm timeframe.

The US18/FS18/SS19 Work Copy to begin the course scheduling process for next year has just become available – and the deadline for completion is Friday, Nov. 3, 2017. Proposed work copy will be reviewed in light of the above considerations.

If you would like to review the scheduling distribution of current (or past) course schedules from your unit, please contact Mark Largent, Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies at largent@msu.edu. The Registrar’s Office is working to provide seat capacity distribution reports and charts which can be run once a unit’s schedule is input into the work copy – this capacity will allow units to review their own data and make adjustments prior to the Nov. 3, 2017 deadline. If you have questions about the reports that can be run, please contact Kris Schuette, Associate Director of Technology, at schuett1@msu.edu or Kimberley Blair-Chambers, Associate Registrar, at blairch4@msu.edu.
To: MSU Deans, Chairs, and Directors

From: R. Sekhar Chivukula, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education

Re: AY18-19 Course Scheduling – trial MWF four-credit schedule option

I am writing to follow-up on the memo sent Sept. 18, 2017 describing the need to adjust MSU undergraduate course-scheduling practices to facilitate student success. In particular, I noted that our current practices lead to a high congestion of courses on Mondays and Wednesdays, and which start between the hours of 10am - 3pm. The response to the memo has been very positive, and I appreciate all of the hard work going on across campus to find ways to enable our students to enroll in a full slate of courses relevant to their degrees.

However, as many have noted, in part the congestion arises because currently four-credit classes can only be taught two-days per week (MW or TTh) or four-days per week (MTWTh). To address this issue, on a trial basis for AY18-19, we will introduce a new three-day per week course schedule which can accommodate four-credit classes on MWF. Details of this option are given below.

Please note that:

(1) requests to schedule courses in this new pattern must come from colleges, and not from individual units/departments,

(2) requests from colleges to use this alternative schedule must bundle a set of courses/sections of similar size that would fully occupy a particular room for the entire week, and

(3) only a limited number of such requests can be honored this first year. High-enrollment first- and second-year courses taken by students from across the university will have priority for moving to the new format. If this experiment proves successful, our intention would be to move away from the MW four-credit course schedule except in circumstances where the 2 x 110min format is justified by pedagogical considerations.

The new optional course schedule, developed by Karen Tindall in the Registrar’s office includes a new 3 x 70 min schedule on MWF and is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MWF</th>
<th>TTh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00-9:10</td>
<td>8:00-9:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30-10:40</td>
<td>10:20-12:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-12:10</td>
<td>12:40-2:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-1:40</td>
<td>3:00-4:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00-3:10</td>
<td>5:10-7:00p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30-4:40</td>
<td>7:20-9:10p</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MW
5:00-6:50
7:10-9:00p

Following this schedule, there could be 14 four-credit classes in each room. Friday usage would be from 8am - 4:40pm, and Monday-Thursday usage would be from 8am - ~9pm. Using the current 2 day/2 hours (with nothing is offered after 6:50p), there are only be 10 classes in a room and no Friday class meetings. Hence, from a room standpoint, this new schedule is far more efficient and opens new options for students to schedule classes. (Note that we are open to using some of the TTh slots in this new schedule for 3 credit courses, which would leave a longer time between classes on those days — this may make it easier to find complete “bundles” of courses to occupy a particular room for the entire week, see below. We can also adjust the start times of classes starting later than 5pm or later, if needed and possible.)

In terms of concern about “interleaving” with the usual schedule (the interface of this novel schedule with other courses students take on our usual schedules): our data indicate that students currently have an average of ~120 mins between classes. We believe this large gap between courses is itself driven by course congestion and therefore, even with the interleaving issue, students will be able to schedule a more complete slate of courses with this new pattern.

We will dedicate a few rooms to this alternative schedule *if* we can fully occupy the time slots in these rooms. In order to efficiently manage this process, we ask that units coordinate with their college to develop bundles of courses/sections that fully occupy this new schedule, and could be accommodated in a single room dedicated to this purpose. Fully scheduling such rooms will allow us pull these rooms and the corresponding courses/sections and run our usual scheduling processes on the rest.

Colleges that are interested, or have questions, should be in touch with Karen Tindall <tindall@msu.edu> to discuss options. Karen and others in the Registrar’s Office are also happy to help identify appropriate rooms if we know which courses/sections are interested in this new schedule.

Thanks,

Sekhar
Student Success, Credit Momentum, and Course Scheduling

R. Sekhar Chivukula, Ph.D.
Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education
Dean of Undergraduate Studies

Steering Committee, Oct. 3, 2017
MSU Student Success Vision

• At MSU we have high expectations and believe every student we admit has the ability to succeed and graduate. Our job is to ensure that every one of our students has an equal opportunity to do so.

• We are committed to helping our students reduce their time and cost of degree as they navigate the right academic path to grow their knowledge, pursue their passion, and discover their purpose.

• As a part of achieving this goal, we are focused on closing opportunity gaps for lower-income, first-generation, and underrepresented minority student populations.

• MSU aspires to create a national model for students to be successful.
MSU Student Success
AY 2017-2018

Go Green
Go 15

Spartan Pathways

Increase Graduation Rates & Close Opportunity Gaps

Spartan Identity

Spartan CommUnity
• Engage students, parents, advisors, and faculty to encourage MSU students to enroll in an average of 15 credits per semester and 30 credits in each year, and to have a completion conversation with their advisor.

• Credit momentum is strongly correlated with higher levels of academic success for students from all backgrounds.
Relationship Between First Year Credit Loads and Six Year Graduation Rates

- < 15 Fall & Spring: 74%
- 15+ Fall Only: 81%
- 15+ Spring Only: 86%
- 15+ Fall & Spring: 88%

Entering Students from 2011. Source: MSU’s Institutional Studies
Percent of First-Year Students Who Enrolled in 15+ Credits in Their First Fall Semesters

Source: MSU’s Institutional Studies
Top 10 Departments that Saw Increases in Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Additional Credits</th>
<th>Percent Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>1679</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISS</td>
<td>1244</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>104.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinesiology</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISB</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Nutrition &amp; Food</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Course Scheduling to Maximize Success

R. Sekhar Chivukula, Ph.D.
Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education
Dean of Undergraduate Studies
Professor of Physics
Seat Capacity by Starting Times for Courses, FS/SS 17

Note congestion of courses starting MW between 10am - 3pm

Few courses taught on Friday
Seat Capacity by Starting Times for 100/200-Level Courses, FS17

Source: OPB
Percentage Filled by Starting Time, All Courses FS/SS 17
Class Meeting Times for Current MSU Course Schedule Patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>50 Minutes (1)</th>
<th>80 Minutes (1 1/2)</th>
<th>110 Minutes (2)</th>
<th>170 Minutes (3)</th>
<th>230 Minutes (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 - 8:50</td>
<td>8:00 - 9:20</td>
<td>8:00 - 9:50</td>
<td>8:00 - 10:50</td>
<td>8:00 - 11:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:10 - 10:00</td>
<td>8:30 - 9:50</td>
<td>10:20 - 12:10</td>
<td>9:10 - 12:00</td>
<td>9:10 - 1:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 - 12:20</td>
<td>12:40 - 2:00</td>
<td>3:00 - 4:50</td>
<td>11:30 - 2:20</td>
<td>11:30 - 3:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:40 - 1:30</td>
<td>1:00 - 2:20*</td>
<td>4:10 - 6:00</td>
<td>12:40 - 3:30</td>
<td>12:40 - 4:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:50 - 2:40</td>
<td>2:40 - 4:00*</td>
<td>5 PM - 6:50</td>
<td>1:50 - 4:40</td>
<td>1:50 - 5:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 - 3:50</td>
<td>3:00 - 4:20</td>
<td>6 PM - 7:50</td>
<td>3:00 - 5:50</td>
<td>3:00 - 6:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:10 - 5:00</td>
<td>4:10 - 5:30</td>
<td>7 PM - 8:50</td>
<td>4:10 - 7:00</td>
<td>4:10 - 8:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:20 - 6:10</td>
<td>5 PM - 6:20</td>
<td>8 PM - 9:50</td>
<td>5:00 - 7:50</td>
<td>5:00 - 8:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30 - 7:20</td>
<td>6 PM - 7:20</td>
<td>6 PM - 8:50</td>
<td>6 PM - 9:50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 PM - 7:50</td>
<td>7 PM - 8:20</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 PM - 9:50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 - 8:20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7:10 - 10 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MW or TTh ONLY
Trial 70 Minute Schedule (1 1/3 Credits)

8:00 – 9:10
9:30 – 10:40
11:00 – 12:10
12:30 – 1:40
2:00 – 3:10
3:30 – 4:40

MWF 4-Credit
Course Schedule
Questions?
FS Group Task Feedback

1. How can we increase the relevance of governance for our colleagues across our units/departments?

   Group 1: undergrad education (affordable for future, hands on teaching, needs assessment), grad student funding packages, diversity, what it means to be a world grant university (combined questions)

   Group 2: interactive sessions, report from FS rep from every college on agenda

   Group 3: find ways to motivate greater involvement at every level, two-way, helping faculty feel involved, establishing real input, improving communication, clarifying IRP processes (common rule), RCR master programs to be trained for research careers (combined questions)

   Group 4: how relevant intended to be, be more political & issue own statements, initiate from the bottom up from colleagues and departments, understand budgeting process (what influence can we have on major priorities)

   Group 5: top-down disseminating info better & down-up more input on issues important to them (two-way)

   Group 6: newsletter to touch on important things to be communicated to faculty, give a chance for feedback, understand complicated issues being voted on – have material in advanced to have a more informed decision, what powers do bylaws give – have brief intro on the powers & responsibilities

   Group 7: dashboard on website to input issues and see how they are progressing through academic governance & what stage they are at

2. Issues/concerns to be addressed this year in governance:

   Group 2: Funding / diversity, supporting student/faculty mental health

   Group 4: graded inflation & academic standards (in relation to mental health), rec centers for mental health resources

   Group 5: plans from university point of view on expanding research budget & facilities, info tech and security, uses on capital campaign funds addressed ahead of time

   Group 6: competition between bikes & mopeds on sidewalks (parking conflicts), budget FNA fund distributions (doesn’t seem to be balanced from some departments)

   Group 7: safety/ mobility on campus, medical center on campus for both faculty and students, continuing technology to be more interactive, mental health
Faculty Senate Group Task Feedback
Faculty Senate Meeting
September 12, 2017

1. How can we increase the relevance of Governance for our colleagues across our units/departments?

- More clearly present what it is that Academic Governance governs (Illustrative issues/topics, recent and past decisions and their impacts).

- Remind faculty why it is important, consistently report issues to all levels (college, department), do something visibly important.

- Information dissemination throughout Steering Committee, ensuring a two-way process.

- Make it seem like Non-college faculty voices count, demonstrate our input (FS broadly). Impacting University Policy not just a rubber stamp, transparent communication back to department about what is discussed.

- Information transparency.

- Decision making capabilities-as much information is told post-decision.

- Making faculty voice count and matter. What is the relationship between faculty voice and administration? Communication for faculty and students.

- Almost all meetings are spent listening to reports, even though there was a set agenda last year. I think the only issue on the agenda that we addressed was the statement on diversity (yet there was only one meeting, 30-minute discussion on the statement). Should address immigration issues for faculty staff and students, and retirement contributions for summer teaching,

- Increase faculty authority.

- Representatives to report on issues discussed, planning etc. to their respective departments and/or chairs to make sure information gets through.

- Academic Governance at college meetings.

- Define a majority vote of FS for all changes and initiative at MSU.

- Inform, so they have something to respond to.
• Circulate to FS constituency of meeting agendas plus bullet points of President’s remarks, Provost’s remarks, and major reports. It is not as relevant as it might be because non-members do not know what goes on here.

• Periodic briefings, explicit process of obtaining feedback and input from colleagues based on survey tools, etc.

• Help faculty see implications of decisions debated/discussed in faculty governance. Advertise topics in advance so people with interest and expertise can come or funnel thoughts to their representatives. Consider making them “open.” Put matters from the President and the Provost visible to all.

• More faculty input in administrative decisions, including their selection, except only advisory. Faculty feedback/evaluation of administrators. Faculty knowledge of department budgets, including spending priorities.

• Increase transparency with larger community.
2. What are the top 3 issues or concerns that you would like to make sure we address this year in Governance:

- Political polarization, post-truth, alternative facts, misinformation.
- East Lansing income tax opposition, grade inflation/academic standards discussion, inclusion/free speech balance.
- Campus mobility revisited (mopeds), and maternity leave.
- Moped Policy and enforcement, town and gown relationship, parental benefits and opportunity for on campus childcare for faculty and staff. DOJ and PR requirements (teaching component).
- Emerging the faculty, better academic citizenship as it is encouraged to our students.
- Graduate student support, grant supports/incentives, and diversity.
- Selective exemptions for RCR requirements for professional master’s programs, encourage MSU IRB to guide the “proposed revisions to the common rule” that IRB requirements would be for gaining approval for social science research.
- Plan for future university investment in science and engineering buildings, infrastructure, and faculty. Diversity acceptance, addressing the division that exist in society that will translate to the campus.
- Report back to colleges agenda on CAC. Participation in Academic Governance, incentivize, OIE relevance and changes, communication between colleges, bicycle safety, and budget.
- Are we working towards increasing the total international student number? If yes, what is the plan? How do we keep enrollment of international students?
- Destruction of open space on campus regulations and enforcement. Lack of faculty input in the decision-making process.
- How to discuss controversial issues in our classes, health care, income tax, student health care and mental health.
• Improving transparency in University decisions, more practice addressing sexual misconduct at the level of faculty and graduate students, major initiative at the MSU level of diversity and inclusion.

• Traffic and bike safety.

• Consequences of increased enrollment and research dollars/expenditures. More explicit interaction between faculty and upper administration (preempt a divisive environment). Information security and how it can be improved.

• Working/teaching in divisive times, supporting faculty, staff, and students. More opportunities for collaborative work and sharing. Support for faculty of color, LGTB faculty.

• Class availability for students, as numbers increase, especially for non-tech classes, included is hiring for teaching. Student safety in all aspects. Community building including emphasizing positive non-academic activities, such as club sports.

• Privacy and info security for faculty. Development of current academic departments via additional funding. Strong commitment to inclusive, diverse campus. Understanding implicit bias.
1. The search shall be open to senior faculty members or executive managers at Michigan State University. The Provost, in consultation with the President, shall prepare a job announcement for distribution using various campus communications channels. Nominations will be accepted from any source.

2. The Search and Review Committee shall be established consisting of individuals selected by the Provost (see attached recommendations). No person who permits his or her name to be entered as a candidate for the position shall continue to serve on the Committee.

3. The Search and Review Committee shall be constituted as follows:
   a. One graduate student to be selected by the Dean of the Graduate School in consultation with COGS
   b. Two undergraduate students:
      i. One selected by the Vice President for Student Affairs
      ii. One selected by UCSA in consultation with ASMSU
   c. Two staff from the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs and Services
   d. Two faculty representatives selected from a group of three nominated by UCFA
   e. Two assistant/associate deans selected by the Deans of the Graduate School and Undergraduate Studies
   f. One representative from the Office of the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education and Dean of Undergraduate Studies
   g. The Provost in consultation with the President may appoint as many as two additional members of the committee if necessary to ensure a diverse Committee.

4. The Provost, after consultation with the President, shall select a chairperson from among the tenure system faculty at Michigan State University. The chairperson will sign all correspondence as required by the Committee. The Office of the Provost shall provide clerical support, maintain candidate folders (electronically or as paper copy), and make folders available to the Committee.

5. The Committee may take actions if at least two-thirds of the members are present.

6. The Committee shall establish operating procedures consistent with these guidelines and, in consultation with the Provost and President, define the criteria for evaluation of candidates.

7. Qualified candidates will be actively sought. Special efforts will be made to identify women and minority candidates. A recruitment plan developed by the Committee in consultation with the Provost will be approved in advance by the Office of Inclusion and Intercultural Initiatives. The Office of the Provost may also undertake special recruitment efforts to identify women and minority candidates. If the initial applicant pool does not include a reasonable proportion of women and minorities, additional
efforts to identify such candidates will be undertaken before the screening process begins.

8. Initial screening will be based on the candidate’s letter of interest and curriculum vitae; formal acknowledgement of candidacy may not necessarily be required until letters of reference are requested. All involved in the search process – the Provost and the Committee – shall ensure confidentiality to maximize the retention of candidates.

9. The Committee shall screen candidates to determine which individuals are best qualified. The Committee will present to the President or Provost evaluative comments including recommendations using designations such as unacceptable, acceptable, and highly acceptable. All candidates shall be assessed using uniform criteria developed by the Committee from the job posting. The Committee will provide reviews of all candidates to the Provost. Such reports will be deemed confidential.

10. Once the Committee completes a set of candidate reviews the Provost or designee shall be informed. After receiving the advice of the Committee, the Provost, in consultation with the President, shall decide on the list of candidates to move on to the next stage in the search process. These advisory consultations and action shall be deemed confidential.

11. The Office of the Provost will solicit letters of recommendation and schedule the on-campus interviews for the final group of candidates. This schedule shall include the President, Provost, Vice President for Student Affairs and Services, members of the Council of Deans or their designee, and the Committee. In addition, this schedule may include other faculty, representatives of the staff and students, and other administrators as appropriate. The final on-campus interview schedule will be developed by the Committee in consultation with the Provost. Background information on each final candidate will be made available to interview participants.

12. All individuals who meet with the candidate shall be provided the opportunity to submit a written evaluation or otherwise communicate with the Committee, who shall share a summary of these evaluations with the Provost on a confidential basis.

13. At the conclusion of the on-campus interviews, the Committee shall assess the final candidates (see item 9 for assessment designations) and present their advisory report at a meeting with the President or Provost. The Provost shall meet with the Committee prior to entering into negotiations with the candidate(s) selected by the Provost after consultation with the President.

14. All aspects of the search and review procedure shall conform to the University's Affirmative Action Hiring Procedure for Faculty and Academic Staff.

Dr. Laura McCabe, Chair of Steering Committee

June Pierce Youatt, Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs