MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY COUNCIL APPROVED AGENDA
JANUARY 23, 2018 3:15 PM
115 INTERNATIONAL CENTER

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. Approval of Agenda for January 23, 2018

3. Approval of Draft Minutes for November 28, 2017 (Appendix A)

4. President’s Remarks: Dr. Lou Anna K. Simon

5. Provost’s Remarks: Dr. June Youatt

6. Chairperson’s Remarks: Dr. Laura McCabe

7. NEW BUSINESS

7.1. President Lou Anna K. Simon’s Leadership at Michigan State University, Professor Anna-Pegler Gordon, University Council Member

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

7.3. Proposed Changes to the Student Rights and Responsibilities Document, Lorenzo Santavicca, ASMSU President (Action Item) (Appendixes C & D)

7.4. Mid-Semester Feedback Discussion, Reports by UCUE, UCGS and UCFA (Information Item) (Appendixes E, F, G, H and I)

7.5. Freedom of Speech on Campus – Faculty Discussion, Presentation and Panel Discussion, Michael Lawrence, Professor of Law, Foster Swift Professor of Constitutional Law, MSU; Additional Panelist: Sue Carter and Kristine Zayko (Information Item)

8. Comments from the floor

9. ADJOURNMENT
Approved:
2016-2017: Meeting #3

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY COUNCIL DRAFT MINUTES
NOVEMBER 28, 2017 3:15 PM
115 INTERNATIONAL CENTER


1. CALL TO ORDER
The meeting was called to order at 3:30 pm.

2. Approval of Agenda for November 28, 2017
The agenda for November 28, 2017 was approved as amended, switching order of items.

3. Approval of Draft Minutes for October 17, 2017
The minutes for October 17, 2017 were approved as distributed.

4. President’s Remarks: Dr. Lou Anna K. Simon
President Simon reported that, regarding the issue of tuition numbers increasing, public polls indicate that there is skepticism about the value of higher education. She notes that part of what is a counter message to this public perception is all of the good work that MSU faculty does, as well as the fact that when MSU students leave the University, they are prepared not simply for their first job, but for many other opportunities in their career. The focus at Michigan State, she adds, has always been on tuition costs.
President Simon stated that the reason the tuition increases exists is because the dollars from the State have gone down. That's really the message as you think about the disruptive force. The other thing that you should all be proud of, she said, is that about 15% of MSU’s total student credit hours are mediated: 13% are all online, and 2% are hybrid. There are also 37 degree programs that are entirely online all at the graduate level. While many Universities have transitioned to online instruction, MSU has done it carefully, through the hard work of individual academic units.

Regarding the various legal actions against the University, President Simon urged people to go to MSU’s “Commitment Website” to read about the report on the Title IX program, the report on the review of the health team, and the report on athletics. She noted that MSU conducted another Title IX review in 2014. Also, as a part of the MSU’s Commitment Website, President Simon urged people to look at the history of the changes Michigan State has made over time.

President Simon said that the Commitment Website provides a way of keeping track of statements and other issues that are related to Doctor Nassar. She said that MSU will move forward in good faith any litigation that goes with this matter, and what might be an institutional responsibility for an individual who acted in a horrific fashion.

President Simon reported that the list of effects of the Federal tax law on higher education is very long and constantly changing, and in a number of cases will have a negative impact on higher education. She notes that the one issue that is receiving the most attention is the taxing of educational benefits that would encompass graduate students.

5. **Provost’s Remarks**: Dr. June Youatt (Out of town)

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

Vice Chairperson Deborah Moriarty reported that Chairperson Laura McCabe is currently in Hong Kong. She wished Happy Holidays to everyone, and for those who celebrate Christmas, several music events are available. One is Handel’s Messiah on December 9th, and the other one is A Jazzy Little Christmas with the Professors of Jazz on December 16th.

7. **NEW BUSINESS**

7.1. **General Student Regulation**, Lorenzo Santavicca, ASMSU President

Lorenzo Santavicca presented the General Student Regulation Report for vote.

Mr. Santavicca reported that placed in front of the membership of the University Council was a copy of the General Student Regulations. He noted that a few amendments to this document are being proposed. The most notable amendment, he stated, involves the regulations related to the protection of individuals without reference to where the alleged activity occurs, or when the alleged misconduct involves hazing or acts causing or explicitly threatening to cause serious bodily harm to other individuals. He said that amendment was one of the most notable changes that is being proposed in the General Student Regulations, in an effort to be more proactive with issues of concern.

Mr. Santavicca stated that MSU students wanted to make the concerns involving hazing at the forefront of how we at MSU be more active in policy procedures involving events relating to hazing, or any actions explicitly threatening to cause
serious bodily harm. I will note that one of the conversations that we had in UCSA was about to what extent we talk about acts causing or explicitly threatening to cause serious bodily harm. Other major amendment changes, he noted, involved possession or use of any drug prohibited by Federal or State laws.

In addition, he reported on the amendment involving production and commercialization of intellectual property, as well as the amendments regarding academic misconduct and student plagiarism. A motion was made to approve the amended General Student Regulations and was first and seconded. Discussion ensued. The motion carried.

The General Student Regulation can be viewed on the Academic Governance Website.

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

UCC Chairperson Marci Mechtel presented the UCC Report. She stated that there were nine program changes, and no program deletions. She also stated that the UCC approved 17 new courses, 35 course changes, and 2 course deletions.

A motion was made to approve the Report and was first and seconded. The motion carried.

7.3. Possible Future Plans to Address Course Scheduling Issues, Professor R. Sekhar Chivukula, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education and Dean of Undergraduate Studies

Dr. Sekhar presented on Future Plans to Address Course Scheduling Issues at MSU. He began by defining the context for student success at MSU broadly. Noting that MSU admits its students on the basis that the University believes they can succeed. MSU believes all students have the ability to learn, persist and graduate in a timely fashion, he added. Dr. Sekhar reported that one measure of how MSU is doing in terms of student success is the graduation rate. He said that the standard federally reported graduation rate is the six-year graduation rate, adding that regarding MSU’s entering cohorts between 2007 and 2011, the overall graduation rate has stayed around 80%, which is a success story. This level is about 8% higher than might be expected when compared to other institutions.

Dr. Sekhar noted that the graduation rate for African-American students at MSU is almost 20 percentage points less in some years, and MSU’s graduate rate for Hispanic students tends to be 10 percentage points less. He stated that MSU is interested in raising the graduation rate overall, and closing those graduation gaps. MSU is interested in making sure everyone does better, drawing attention to the significant change and the significant increase in the graduation rate for African-American students from the Fall Semester of 2010 cohort to the Fall Semester of 2011 cohort, from 59% to 65%.

Dr. Sekhar discussed “Spartan Identity,” an attempt to create a coherent vision of what an MSU undergraduate education involves, so that MSU can align its undergraduate education efforts. He then went on to briefly explain the initiatives of “Go Green, Go 15,” MSU’s credit momentum campaign and its implications for course scheduling.
and “Spartan Pathways”. These involve building a cohesive integrated framework for students, from the time they apply to Michigan State University to the time they are admitted to Michigan State University, to their bridge and orientation programs in the summer, to their first year and into the second year, in order to make sure that MSU effectively deals with that transition from high school to college.

The Presentation can be viewed on the Academic Governance Website.

7.4. Behavioral Threat Assessment Team Report, Amy Ray, Investigative Division, MSU Police Department

Amy Ray presented the Behavioral Threat Assessment Team Report. She reported that her team basically deals any report of threat, odd behavior, violent ideology, expressed violent ideas, suicidal ideation, odd and erratic behaviors. She noted that BTAT is housed with the University, and that BTAU is housed with the Police Department specifically. The unit is comprised of herself, Detective Sergeant Kennedy Parker and Detective Ryan Staffer. They receive daily reports of threat from our patrol officers who may have encountered situations on the road or interactions with students or interactions with employees that they feel the BTA unit needs to know about for discussion. I have people directly contact me through phone calls or emails with a referral.

She said that basically any report of threat, odd behavior, violent ideology, expressed violent ideas, suicidal ideation, or odd erratic behaviors get reported to MSU Police Department BTAU, which is the Behavioral Threat Assessment Unit. The unit, she states, is comprised of herself, Detective Sergeant Kennedy Parker, and Detective Ryan Staffer. She added that BTAU receives daily reports of threat from MSU’s patrol officers who may have encountered situations on the road, or interactions with students, or interactions with employees who feel that the BTAU unit needs to be involved.

The purpose of BTAT (the Behavioral Threat Assessment Team), Officer Ray stated, is to assess the referral, talk about or identify risks, and how the BTAT can intervene, in order to be proactive to try to mitigate those risks that are presented. She noted that the BTAT has an online referral form: BTAT.MSU.EDU, and that meetings with individuals are conducted in confidential settings.

She noted that the BTAT can talk with the student about different concerns, such as medical withdrawal, or how can student stress loads be reduced, or how a safety plan can be created. If the situation also warrants, while the BTAT is talking with the person, they may take them directly to the hospital, or have them talk directly with a doctor on certain cases.

Officer Ray concluded her remarks by providing a quick summary, stating that the BTAT exists to mitigate the risk of threat or violence, and to provide a safe and productive learning and working environment at MSU.

8. Comments from the floor

None
9. ADJOURNMENT
A motion was made to adjourn and was first and seconded. The motion carried.
4:11 pm.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Award Type</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>Children's and Young Adult Literature</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary STEM Education</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborative Piano</td>
<td>D.M.A.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Science</td>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Science and Policy Dual Major</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biomedical Laboratory Diagnostics Program</td>
<td>Biomedical Laboratory Science</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medical Laboratory Science</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C = Change     D=Deletion     N=New

Totals New: 11 Change: 5 Deletion: 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Changes</th>
<th>Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Natural Resources</td>
<td>Agricultural Technology Institute</td>
<td>AT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Animal Science</td>
<td>ANS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food Science &amp; Human Nutrition</td>
<td>FSC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horticulture</td>
<td>HRT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Packaging</td>
<td>PKG</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plant Soil and Microbial Sciences</td>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PLP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Letters</td>
<td>Linguistic, Germ, Slavic, Asian &amp; Afr Lg</td>
<td>AFR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Business Dean</td>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>Advertising and Public Relations</td>
<td>ADV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Counseling, Ed Psych &amp; Special Ed</td>
<td>CEP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kinesiology</td>
<td>KIN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>TE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Medicine</td>
<td>Department of Family Medicine</td>
<td>FM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Medicine Dean</td>
<td>HM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>MED</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obstetrics, Gynecol &amp; Repro Biology</td>
<td>OGR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pediatrics &amp; Human Development</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surgery</td>
<td>SUR</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>MUS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Science</td>
<td>Plant Biology</td>
<td>PLB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biomedical Laboratory Diagnostics Program</td>
<td>BLD</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Microbiology &amp; Molecular Genetics</td>
<td>MMG</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neuroscience Program</td>
<td>NEU</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>NUR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>ANP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Development &amp; Family Studies</td>
<td>HDFS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resources and Labor Relations</td>
<td>HRLR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>Pharmacology &amp; Toxicology</td>
<td>PHM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physiology</td>
<td>PSL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Veterinary Medicine Dean</td>
<td>VM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>95</strong></td>
<td><strong>87</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INFORMATION ITEMS
January 16, 2018

Moratorium –
Moratorium in Athletic Training, Bachelor of Science, UCUE consultation 11/16/17; Provost approved 11/22/17 – Effective Spring 2020 through Fall 2021.

Discontinuation –

Other –
None.
Proposed Changes to *Student Rights and Responsibilities* Document

**SRR Article 5, I.H**

**Current Language:** “Sanctions for Personal Misconduct. Disciplinary sanctions imposed should be based on a consideration of all circumstances in a particular case, including a student’s prior record of misconduct, if any.”

**Proposed Language:** “Sanctions for Personal Misconduct. Disciplinary sanctions imposed should be based on a consideration of all circumstances in a particular case, including a student’s prior record of misconduct, if any. Failure to comply with a sanction or any conditions of a sanction imposed may form the basis for additional conduct charges and the imposition of more severe disciplinary sanctions.”

**SRR Article 5, I.H.7**

**Current Language:** “Suspension: A suspension is temporary removal from the University for a particular period of time, at the conclusion of which the student is eligible to apply for readmission. A suspension may also be a conditional suspension, in which case the student must demonstrate that he/she has fulfilled stated conditions prior to applying for readmission. Only the Vice President may impose the sanction of suspension from the University.”

**Proposed Language:** “Suspension: A suspension is temporary removal from the University for a particular period of time, at the conclusion of which the student is eligible to apply for readmission. A suspension may also be a conditional suspension, in which case the student must demonstrate that he/she has fulfilled stated conditions prior to applying for readmission. Only the Vice President may impose the sanction of suspension from the University. A suspended student may not attend or otherwise participate in any University-sponsored or student group-sponsored (student governing groups and registered student organizations) events or activities, whether on or off-campus.”

**SRR Article 10.1**

**Current language:** “The President shall appoint a senior faculty member or executive manager with the title of University Ombudsperson. The Ombudsperson shall respect the sensitive and confidential nature of the position and the privacy of all persons soliciting assistance from the Office of the Ombudsperson, thereby protecting them against retaliation. The Ombudsperson’s functions shall include the following charges: [charges omitted].”

**Proposed language:** “The President shall appoint a senior faculty member, executive manager, or other qualified person with the title of University Ombudsperson. The Ombudsperson shall respect the sensitive and confidential nature of the position and the privacy of all persons soliciting assistance from the Office of the Ombudsperson, thereby protecting them against retaliation. The Ombudsperson’s functions shall include the following charges: [charges omitted].”

**SRR Article 11: Definitions and Acronyms – “Ombudsperson”**

**Current language:** “The University Ombudsperson, a senior faculty member or executive manager who assists members of the MSU community in resolving complaints or concerns confidentially, informally, impartially, and independently.”
Proposed language: “The University Ombudsperson, a senior faculty member, executive manager, or other qualified person who assists members of the MSU community in resolving complaints or concerns confidentially, informally, impartially, and independently.”

SRR Article 11: Definitions and Acronyms – “Student”

Current language: “An individual is considered a student from the Semester Start Date of the first term for which the individual has enrolled until graduation, recess, dismissal, or withdrawal from the University or he/she fails to register for more than one consecutive semester.”

Proposed language: “An individual is considered a student from 1) the date a student first attends a University course or academic program, or 2) the Semester Start Date of the first term for which the individual has enrolled, whichever comes first, until graduation, recess, dismissal, or withdrawal from the University or he/she fails to register for more than one consecutive semester.”
Article 5: Adjudication of Non-Academic Cases

I. Personal Misconduct Cases

The following procedures shall govern cases involving alleged acts of personal misconduct. The procedures contained in this Article apply to all students at Michigan State University. These procedures do not govern cases involving academic misconduct, which are governed by Article 7. The Vice President and the Provost will determine whether a case involving allegations of both personal misconduct and academic misconduct will be heard pursuant to Article 5 or Article 7 (or both).

A. Complaints. A complaint is defined as an allegation filed under Section I.B of this Article that a student has violated a University regulation, ordinance, or policy. Any member of the University community may file a complaint against a student. Where appropriate, the involved parties are encouraged to consider a variety of dispute resolution options, including but not limited to restorative justice, mediation, and/or conflict coaching, prior to the filing of a formal complaint.

B. Filing a Complaint. To file a complaint, a member of the faculty, staff, or student body must submit a written statement to the Department of Student Life through its established protocol. The statement must contain the following information:

1. The specific policy, ordinance, or regulation that has allegedly been violated;

2. The time, place, and specific description of the alleged violation;

3. The name of the student against whom the complaint is filed (the “respondent”); and

4. The name of the individual who is filing the complaint (the “complainant”).

C. Notice of Complaint. Upon receipt of a properly formatted complaint, a designee of the Vice President shall notify the respondent in writing within five class days that he or she has been accused of violating a University regulation, ordinance, or policy. The respondent shall be required to meet with an individual designated by the Department of Student Life (“administrator”) for the purposes described in Section D below. The notice of complaint to the respondent shall include the following:

1. The specific policy, ordinance, or regulation that has allegedly been violated;

2. The time, place, and specific description of the alleged violation;

3. The name of the individual who is filing the complaint;
4. Notice of the opportunity to review the complaint in person;

5. A list of conflict resolution options and campus resources available to both parties; and

6. The deadline by which the respondent is required to meet with the administrator.

D. Administrative Meeting.

1. The respondent will meet with the administrator, who will advise the respondent of his/her rights and responsibilities under this document, review the complaint, and discuss possible resolution options. At that time, the respondent will be provided with a copy of the complaint and may admit or deny the alleged violation.

2. If the respondent fails to meet with the administrator or fails to admit or deny the alleged violation within five class days of meeting with the administrator, the administrator may take one of the following actions:

   a. Place a hold on the respondent’s registration until the respondent meets with the administrator.

   b. Refer the case to the appropriate hearing board for a formal hearing.

   c. Render a decision on the complaint. If the decision of the administrator does not include a suspension or dismissal, the respondent may appeal pursuant to Section F below. If the decision of the administrator includes a suspension or dismissal, the respondent shall have five class days from the date of the decision to request a formal hearing before the Student-Faculty-Staff Hearing Board. Such a request must be consistent with the directions in the decision letter and will void the administrator’s decision, which will not be shared with the hearing board that hears the complaint. In the absence of a properly submitted appeal or hearing request, the administrator’s original decision will be final, pending any necessary approval and implementation by the Vice President.

3. A respondent who admits his/her violation waives his or her right to a hearing on the matter of responsibility. In such a situation, the respondent may request that the administrator determine the sanction for the violation or request that the appropriate hearing board determine the sanction. Where appropriate, the respondent may also express a desire to participate in another dispute resolution process, either in lieu of or in addition to the adjudication process outlined in this Article. If the respondent asks to participate in another dispute resolution process, the Vice President must approve that request and the complainant must agree to participate before that process may be initiated.

4. If the respondent denies the violation, the respondent shall choose to have the matter heard by an administrator or a hearing body. The hearing should follow in a timely manner.

E. Hearing Procedures.
1. At least five class days prior to a hearing, both the complainant and respondent shall receive written notification of the hearing from the appropriate hearing body. This notice of hearing shall include:

a. A sufficiently detailed description of the alleged misconduct;

b. The date, time, and location of the hearing;

c. The name(s) of the individual(s) who will conduct the hearing;

d. The names of the complainant’s witnesses and advisor (if known).

2. The hearing body shall take necessary precautions to avoid any conflict of interest. The complainant and the respondent shall have two class days from receiving the hearing notice to challenge any hearing board member or hearing administrator for cause. The standard the chair of the hearing body shall follow in ruling on challenges for cause is whether, in light of the challenged person’s knowledge of the case or personal or professional relationships with the complainant, respondent, or a witness, the challenged person would be able to hear the case fairly and impartially. If the challenge is to the chair of the hearing body or hearing administrator, the challenge shall be decided by the Vice President.

3. The complainant and respondent shall have two class days from receiving the hearing notice to provide the hearing body with the names of his/her witnesses or advisors, if such names are not already listed on the hearing notice. The complainant and respondent will receive a second notice containing this information not less than one class day prior to the hearing.

4. Either the complainant or respondent may request, for good cause, that the hearing be postponed. The hearing body may grant or deny such a request.

5. Hearings under Section I (personal misconduct) of this Article shall be closed unless both the respondent and complainant agree to an open hearing. Hearings under Section II (non-academic student grievances) of this Article shall be closed, unless the complainant requests an open hearing. In either circumstance, the hearing body may close an open hearing at any time to maintain order or protect the confidentiality of information. An open hearing is open to any member of the University community.

6. The complainant and respondent are expected to appear at the hearing to present their cases. If appearance in person is not feasible, the hearing body may permit either party to present his/her case through other communication channels (phone, webcam, video conference, etc.). If the complainant fails to appear, the hearing body may either postpone the hearing or dismiss the case. If the respondent fails to appear, the hearing body may either postpone the hearing or hear the case in the respondent’s absence. The respondent’s failure to appear shall not mean the respondent is presumed to have committed the violation in the complaint.

---

3 The hearing bodies described in this document should refer to University policies and applicable laws regarding confidentiality of information.
7. The complainant and respondent shall be entitled to:

a. Receive a timely hearing.

b. Call witnesses on their behalf. Witnesses must be members of the University community, unless the hearing body determines that the witness has direct knowledge of the facts pertaining to the matter at issue. Witnesses may be present in the hearing only when testifying. Witnesses may submit written statements to the hearing body in lieu of testifying only with the express permission of the hearing body. Expert or character witnesses are not allowed, except as deemed necessary by the hearing body. The hearing body may limit the number of witnesses.

c. Submit information in support of their positions.

d. Be accompanied to the hearing by an advisor, who must be a member of the University community. If criminal charges related to the alleged violation are pending, the respondent may have an attorney who is not a member of the University community at the hearing as his/her advisor. If the respondent is criminally charged with a sex offense related to the alleged violation when the hearing occurs, the complainant may also have an attorney present at the hearing as his/her advisor.

The advisor or attorney may be present throughout the hearing but has no voice in the hearing unless the chair of the hearing body grants the attorney or advisor permission to have a limited voice.  

e. Question any witness who appears at the hearing.

8. The hearing body shall determine whether each allegation has been supported by a preponderance of the evidence. If an allegation is not supported by a preponderance of the evidence, the respondent shall be found “not responsible” for that allegation. If the allegation is supported by a preponderance of the evidence, the hearing body may impose one or more of the sanctions listed in Section H of this Article.

9. The hearing body shall prepare and deliver a written decision within five class days of the hearing. The report shall include the rationale for the decision and notification of the right to appeal. A copy of the report shall be provided to the complaint and respondent, who will be required to maintain the confidentiality of the document to the extent permitted by law.

F. Appeals.

1. The University Student Appeals Board has jurisdiction over all appeals of decisions made by a hearing body under this Article.

---

4 The chair or hearing administrator shall normally grant permission for a student representative from the Student Rights Advocates program to have voice in the hearing.
2. A respondent may appeal an adverse decision on the basis that the information presented does not support the decision reached by the hearing body or that the sanction recommended is incommensurate with the seriousness of the offense.

3. Either the complainant or respondent may appeal on the basis that applicable procedures were not followed or there was a conflict of interest involving a member of the hearing body.

4. A written appeal must be filed as directed in the decision letter within five class days after the date on which the decision was sent to the complainant and respondent. Any sanctions imposed will be held in abeyance while the appeal is pending.

5. The University Student Appeals Board shall take necessary precautions to avoid any conflict of interest on the part of its members. Upon receipt of the appeal, the complainant and respondent shall be provided with the names of the members of the University Student Appeals Board. Both the complainant and respondent shall have two class days from receiving such notice to challenge any member for cause.

6. The University Student Appeals Board shall review the case and the procedures used, request additional information if needed, and then do one of the following:

   a. Reject the appeal for lack of jurisdiction.

   b. Affirm or reverse the original decision.

   c. Direct the original hearing body to rehear the case or to reconsider or clarify its decision.

   d. Conduct a hearing of its own from which the University Student Appeals Board may affirm, reverse, or modify the original decision.

7. The University Student Appeals Board shall issue a written decision, including the rationale for its decision, within ten class days of convening to consider the appeal or conducting a hearing. A copy of the decision shall be provided to the complainant and respondent, who will be required to maintain the confidentiality of the document to the extent permitted by law. Except in cases where a suspension or dismissal is recommended, the decision of the University Student Appeals Board is final and shall be effective immediately.

8. Decisions of the University Student Appeals Board resulting in a suspension or dismissal may be appealed by either the complainant or respondent to the Vice President on the basis that a finding of responsibility is not supported by the information presented or that the penalty is incommensurate with the seriousness of the offense.

9. Decisions resulting in a suspension or dismissal that are not appealed will be forwarded to the Vice President for approval and implementation.

**G. Requests for Reconsideration.** Each hearing body shall allow a complainant or respondent to request reconsideration of a case within 30 calendar days of its decision, if either party can
demonstrate that new information has arisen. An exception to the 30-day time limit may be granted by the appropriate hearing body only upon a showing of good cause.

**H. Sanctions for Personal Misconduct.** Disciplinary sanctions imposed should be based on a consideration of all circumstances in a particular case, including a student’s prior record of misconduct, if any. **Failure to comply with a sanction or any conditions of a sanction imposed may form the basis for additional conduct charges and the imposition of more severe disciplinary sanctions.**

Such sanctions may include any one or more of the following:

1. **Warning:** An official written statement expressing disapproval of the behavior and notifying the student it must not occur again.

2. **Probation:** An official written statement establishing a period of time for observing and evaluating a student’s conduct and indicating that any additional violations may result in more severe disciplinary action. This period may be accompanied by stipulations, including but not limited to restitution, participation in an educational program, or loss of specified University privileges.

3. **Restitution:** A requirement that a student pay for property damages or losses resulting from acts committed by the student, with the date by which the restitution must be completed.

4. **Change of residence:** The student shall be required to move from his or her current on-campus residence, either to an off-campus location or to another location within the University housing system.

5. **Other:** The student may be required to complete an educational program or activity or comply with the reasonable conditions of a behavioral contract.

6. **Disenrollment from a course:** If the complaint is based on disruptive behavior in a specific class, the hearing body may recommend to the Provost that the student be disenrolled from that course.

7. **Suspension:** A suspension is temporary removal from the University for a particular period of time, at the conclusion of which the student is eligible to apply for readmission. A suspension may also be a conditional suspension, in which case the student must demonstrate that he/she has fulfilled stated conditions prior to applying for readmission. Only the Vice President may impose the sanction of suspension from the University. **A suspended student may not attend or otherwise participate in any University-sponsored or student group-sponsored (student governing groups and registered student organizations) events or activities, whether on or off-campus.**

8. **Dismissal:** A dismissal is a permanent removal from the University. Only the Vice President or Provost may impose the sanction of dismissal from the University.
I. Urgent Disciplinary Cases. If the Vice President is presented with credible information that a student’s continued presence at the University poses a clear and present danger to the health or safety of persons or property, the Vice President may temporarily suspend a student from the University. Before temporarily suspending a student, the Vice President will make a reasonable attempt to notify the student of the potential interim suspension and offer the student an opportunity to present information that he/she does not pose a threat to persons or property.

The interim suspension shall not preclude, render irrelevant, or predetermine the outcome of subsequent disciplinary action relating to conduct on which the interim suspension is based. Nor shall an interim suspension create a presumption that the respondent violated University policy. Students placed on interim suspension may petition for reinstatement at any time, with the following guidelines.

1. Such petitions will be considered by either the Vice President or the Provost as requested by the petitioner.

2. Within five class days after receipt of a student’s petition, the Vice President or the Provost shall meet with the student for the sole purpose of deciding whether to continue the interim suspension or grant reinstatement.

3. The outcome of the meeting shall not preclude, render irrelevant, or predetermine the outcome of subsequent disciplinary action.

Students placed on interim suspension shall face disciplinary action for the underlying conduct pursuant to this Article, regardless of where the conduct occurred.

II. Non-Academic Student Grievances.

Any student may file a grievance against a registered student organization, student governing group, or University employee alleging a violation of this document or a violation of the student group’s constitution, bylaws, or policies. Any student may also file a grievance pursuant to this section to challenge a University policy or regulation as being inconsistent with the guidelines established in this document. Such grievances should be filed in writing with the Vice President pursuant to the established procedure.

A. Informal Resolution. Prior to filing a student grievance, the grievant should first attempt to resolve the grievance informally. Informal resolutions may include involvement of the student organization’s advisor or another University employee, or alternative forms of dispute resolution (e.g., restorative justice, mediation).

B. Jurisdictional Findings. The Vice President shall review the grievance and forward it to the appropriate hearing board to determine whether it has jurisdiction to hear the case. The hearing board shall then forward a copy of the grievance to the respondent and invite a written response. After considering all submitted information, the hearing board may:

1. Schedule a hearing.
2. Reject the request for lack of jurisdiction and provide a written explanation for that decision.

3. Invite all parties to meet with the hearing board for an informal discussion of the issues. Such a discussion shall not preclude a subsequent hearing.

C. Hearing Procedures.

1. At least five class days prior to a hearing, the parties shall receive written notification of the hearing from the appropriate hearing board. This notice of hearing shall include:

a. The date, time, and location of the hearing;

b. The names of the hearing board members; and

c. The names of the parties’ witnesses and advisors (if known).

2. Both the respondent and grievant shall have two class days from receiving the hearing notice to challenge any hearing board members for cause. The standard the chair of the hearing body shall follow in ruling on challenges for cause is whether, in light of the challenged person’s knowledge of the case or professional relationships with the complainant, respondent, or a witness, the challenged person would be able to hear the case fairly and impartially. If the challenge is to the chair of the hearing body, the challenge shall be decided by the Vice President.

3. The parties shall have two class days from receiving the hearing notice to provide the chair of the hearing body with the names of their witnesses and advisors, if such names are not already listed on the hearing notice. Both parties will receive a second notice containing this information no less than one class day prior to the hearing.

4. Either party may request, for good cause, that the hearing be postponed. The chair of the hearing body may grant or deny such a request.

5. The hearing shall be open unless the hearing body determines that the hearing should be closed to protect the confidentiality of information. An open hearing is open to any member of the University community. The hearing body may close an open hearing at any time to maintain order or protect the confidentiality of information.

6. Both parties are expected to appear at the hearing to present their cases. If appearance in person is not feasible, the hearing body may permit either party to present its case through other communication channels (phone, webcam, video conference, etc.). If the grievant fails to appear, the hearing body may either postpone the hearing or dismiss the case. If the respondent fails to appear, the hearing body may either postpone the hearing or hear the case in the respondent’s absence. The respondent’s failure to appear shall not result in any presumption favoring the grievant.

7. Both parties shall be entitled to:
a. Receive a timely hearing.

b. Call witnesses on their behalf. Witnesses must be members of the University community, unless the hearing board determines that non-members have direct knowledge of the matter at issue. Witnesses may be present in the hearing only when testifying. Witnesses may submit written statements to the hearing body in lieu of testifying only with the written permission of the chair of the hearing body. Expert witnesses are generally not allowed. The hearing body may limit the number of witnesses.

c. Submit information in support of their positions.

d. Be accompanied by an advisor, who must be a member of the University community. The advisor may be present throughout the hearing but has no voice in the hearing unless the chair of the hearing body grants the advisor permission to have a limited voice in the hearing.5

e. Question any witness who appears at the hearing.

8. The hearing body shall determine whether the allegation has been supported by a preponderance of the evidence. If the allegation is not supported by a preponderance of the evidence, the grievance shall be decided in favor of the respondent. If the allegation is supported by a preponderance of the evidence, the hearing body may impose one or more of the sanctions listed in Section D below.

9. The hearing body shall prepare a written report within five class days of the hearing. The report shall include the rationale for the hearing body’s decision and notification of the right to appeal. The hearing body will send a copy of its report to both parties, who will be required to maintain the confidentiality of the document to the extent permissible by law.

D. Sanctions and Other Actions.

1. With respect to a registered student organization or student governing group:

a. Warning: An official written statement expressing disapproval of the behavior and notifying the respondent it must not recur.

b. Probation: An official written statement establishing a period of time for observing and evaluating a student group’s conduct and indicating that further violations may result in more severe consequences. This probation may be accompanied by conditions.

c. Revocation of privileges for a registered student organization or student governing group.

d. Revocation of registration of a student organization.

e. Completion of an educational program or an activity.

5 The chair shall normally grant permission for a student representative from the Student Rights Advocates program to have voice in the hearing.
f. A formal recommendation to the organization or group to correct the action, policy, or regulation in question.

2. With respect to an employee: A formal recommendation to the appropriate administrator to address the employee’s action.

3. With respect to a University policy or regulation: A formal recommendation to the appropriate administrator to correct or revise the policy or regulation in question.

E. Appeals. Either party may appeal the decision of the hearing board on the basis that (i) the information presented does not support the decision reached by the hearing board, (ii) the information presented does not support the sanction imposed or recommended by the hearing board, or (iii) the procedures described above for adjudicating the case were not followed. A written appeal must be filed with the chair of the University Student Appeals Board within five class days after the hearing board’s report has been sent to the parties. Any sanctions imposed will be held in abeyance while the appeal is pending.

F. Temporary Restraining Actions.

1. The codes of operation for student judiciaries described in Article 4 of this document shall include provisions for expedited consideration of urgent cases in which a restraining action is sought because (i) a group action allegedly threatens immediate and irreparable harm through action contrary to the constitution of any undergraduate or graduate student governing group within the judiciary’s jurisdiction; or (ii) a regulation or administrative decision allegedly threatens immediate and irreparable harm through infringement of rights defined by this document.

2. Upon receipt of such a request, the relevant hearing board shall conduct a preliminary review to determine whether a temporary restraining action is appropriate. This review should include opportunity for both the grievant and the respondent to present information, either in writing or in person at the discretion of the hearing board. The purpose of the review is to consider the nature and potential extent of irreparable harm and other alternatives to remedy the situation. The review shall not preclude, render irrelevant, or predetermine the outcome of the ultimate decision of the hearing board on the grievance in question.

3. If the hearing board decides to take a temporary restraining action, the appropriate individual, group, or administrative unit shall be required to postpone or withdraw the action in question pending a hearing on the merits of the grievance by the appropriate hearing board.

4. The hearing board shall make every reasonable effort to meet whatever exigencies of time may exist in such a case. If necessary, the hearing board may announce its decision regarding a temporary action without a written statement of its reasons, provided that such a statement of its reasons shall be made available to the parties as soon as is reasonably possible.
Article 10: Office of the Ombudsperson

I. The President shall appoint a senior faculty member, or executive manager, or other qualified person with the title of University Ombudsperson. The Ombudsperson shall respect the sensitive and confidential nature of the position and the privacy of all persons soliciting assistance from the Office of the Ombudsperson, thereby protecting them against retaliation. The Ombudsperson’s functions shall include the following charges:

A. The Ombudsperson shall establish simple, orderly procedures for receiving requests, complaints, and grievances from students.

B. The Ombudsperson shall assist students in accomplishing the expeditious settlement of their problems and may advise a student that the student’s request, complaint, or grievance lacks merit, or that the student should seek a remedy elsewhere in the University. The Ombudsperson may also assist the student in obtaining an informal settlement of the student’s problem.

II. The Ombudsperson shall have broad investigatory powers and direct and ready access to all University officials, including the President.

III. When necessary, the Ombudsperson shall report directly to the President valid complaints for which no remedy has been found. The Ombudsperson shall also report any recommendations regarding such complaints.

IV. The Ombudsperson shall make periodic reports to the President regarding the operation of the Office of the Ombudsperson.
Article 11: Definitions and Acronyms

For the purposes of this document, the following definitions shall apply:

Academic Disciplinary Case: A case brought against a student accused of academic misconduct involving sanctions other than or in addition to a penalty grade.

Academic Misconduct: Instances of academic dishonesty, violations of professional standards, and falsification of academic records or records for admission to a department, school, or college. See also General Student Regulation 1.00, Scholarship and Grades; Integrity of Scholarships and Grades Policy.

Administrators: University employees who manage University budgets, direct work units, or formulate, evaluate, and/or administer University policy.

Advisor: A member of the student body, faculty, or staff of the University chosen by a party to assist in the preparation of a case.

ASMSU/Associated Students of Michigan State University: All-University undergraduate student governing body.

Associate Provost: Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education of Michigan State University or the Associate Provost’s designee.

Class Day: A day on which classes are held, including the days of Final Exam Week but excluding weekends.

Clear and Present Danger: An immediate and significant danger to the health or safety of persons or property.

COGS/Council of Graduate Students: All-University graduate student governing body.

Complainant: A member of the University community who initiates a proceeding against a student under this document.

Complaint: An allegation of a violation of University regulation, ordinance, or policy filed by a member of the University community against a student.

Dean of Graduate Studies: Dean of Graduate Studies of Michigan State University or the Graduate Dean’s designee.

Dean of Undergraduate Studies: Dean of Undergraduate Studies of Michigan State University or the Undergraduate Dean’s designee.

Direct discussion: Conversation in person, by phone, email, or other communication medium.
Faculty: All persons appointed by the University to the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, or instructor, all persons appointed by the University as librarians, and all other University employees with approved titles in the academic personnel system whose duties involve instructional activities.

Falsification of Admission or Academic Records: Falsification of any record submitted for admission to the University or an academic unit of the University. Falsification of any record created, used, and/or maintained by the Office of the Registrar, the Office of Admissions, or academic units (e.g. colleges, departments, and schools).

Good Cause: Reasons including, but not limited to, circumstances outside of a party’s control, such as illness, death in the family, or a class conflict.

Graduate Student: A student enrolled in a master’s, doctoral, or educational specialist program or in a graduate non-degree program, including Lifelong Education.

Grievance: An allegation of rights violation, filed by a student, against a member of the University community.

Grievant: A student who initiates a proceeding against a member of the University community under this document.

Hearing Body: A hearing administrator or duly constituted judiciary as described in this document.

Jurisdiction: Official authority to make decisions and judgments under conditions specified herein (e.g., permissible bases for appeal, adherence to stated deadlines).

Living Group: A campus residence hall or residential complex, or a floor in such a residence hall or complex.

Major Governing Groups: The Greek Governing Boards, Student Housing Cooperative, Owen Graduate Association, RHA, and UACOR.

New Information: Relevant information or documents previously unavailable to a party although the party acted with due diligence to obtain such information.

Non-Academic Disciplinary Case: A case brought against a student accused of violating a General Student Regulation, University ordinance, or University policy.

Office of the Provost: The Provost of Michigan State University or the Provost’s designee.

Ombudsperson: The University Ombudsperson, a senior faculty member, executive manager, or other qualified person who assists members of the MSU community in resolving complaints or concerns confidentially, informally, impartially, and independently.

Penalty Grade: A grade assigned to a student by a faculty member based on a charge of academic misconduct.
**Preponderance of the Evidence**: Evidence that is more convincing, more credible, and of greater weight.

**President**: The President of Michigan State University or the President’s designee.

**Professional Standards**: Codes of expected professional conduct, sometimes referred to as honor codes.

**Provost**: The Provost of Michigan State University, the Office of the Provost, or a designee of the Provost.

**Respondent**: An individual or group against whom or which a complaint or grievance is filed.

**RHA/Residence Halls Association**: The residence halls governing body.

**Semester Start Date**: The first date in the semester on which the University opens its residence halls to student residents.

**Staff**: Employees of the University other than administrators or faculty.

**Student**: An individual is considered a student from (1) the date a student first attends a University course or academic program, or (2) the Semester Start Date of the first term for which the individual has enrolled, whichever comes first, until graduation, recess, dismissal, or withdrawal from the University or he/she fails to register\(^1\) for more than one consecutive semester.

**UACOR/University Apartments Council of Residents**.

**UCSA/University Committee on Student Affairs**.

**Undergraduate**: A student enrolled in a program leading to a bachelor’s degree or in an undergraduate non-degree program, including Lifelong Education.

**University Community**: All University students, Trustees, administrators, faculty, and staff.

**Voice (limited voice)**: Authority to speak (authority to speak if and when granted by a hearing-body).

**Vice President**: Vice President for Student Affairs and Services of Michigan State University or the Vice President’s designee.

**Written/in writing**: In paper or electronic form.

---

\(^1\) A student is considered to have failed to register for a semester after the drop/add period has ended (typically during the second week of classes).
Key general points of the mid-semester review, as discussed by the Steering Committee:

- Feedback will be de-identified from students
- Feedback will only be seen by the faculty or the TA (whoever is teaching)
- The report will NOT be used for rating of instructors
- The report is not required but suggested
- AAN will assist with moving this forward and will post templates of mid-semester reports (ie: questions for students) on their website for faculty to access
Executive Summary; Mid-Semester Feedback Pilot
Lyman Briggs College, Spring Semester 2016
Lorenzo Santavicca, President, ASMSU

Since the 51st session, the Associated Students of Michigan State University (ASMSU) has advocated for all colleges at MSU to mandate a mid-semester feedback process. As the idea was introduced, a highly encouraged mid-semester feedback process by faculty peers and the Academic Advancement Network would allow for students to evaluate course content and the instructor’s pedagogical methods prior to semester end SIRS forms. This would potentially increase student and instructor understanding of roles and course content attainment, as well as increased participation as a result of positive affirmations or changes suggested. An ideal process would be accessible and anonymous to all students, but also kept confidential from the Dean’s units or other tenure and promotion mechanisms for faculty.

In the Spring Semester of 2016, Lyman Briggs College (a residential learning community devoted to studying the natural sciences and their impact on society) piloted a mid-semester feedback program. The Dean’s Advisory Committee asked faculty to participate in a mid-semester feedback pilot per the request of the Provost and the Dean. The committee convened and discussed standardized questions to be used on the feedback form for the pilot initiative. The suggested feedback questions were compiled by members of the Dean’s Advisory Committee, and were submitted to all faculty at the college. The pilot process was conducted prior to Spring Break. Instructors were given the freedom to conduct the survey before, during, or after class.

After Spring Break and near the end of the semester, ASMSU conducted feedback surveys following the piloted initiative to both Lyman Briggs faculty and students. The surveys were sent via email to all students in the college, as well as faculty members, and advertised to be completed by individuals who participated in, or administrated an LBC mid-semester feedback survey within the Spring semester. The surveys were designed to gauge the process and overall reactions from the college that participated in the pilot initiative. A total of 15 faculty members participated (1 full professor in the tenure system, 3 associate professors in the tenure system, 5 assistant professors in the tenure system, 2 academic specialists, and 1 fixed term instructor). A total of 42 students participated (22 freshmen, 6 sophomores, 8 juniors, and 5 seniors).

From the responses and feedback on the LBC piloted initiative, ASMSU can conclude that students have indicated a strong desire to see through to the efforts across the university in encouraging a mid-semester feedback process. Encouragement can be solicited through leaders of the colleges (i.e. Deans), Governance (Faculty Senate, COGS) and the Academic Advancement Network. Students believe that their comments related to the pedagogical structure of the class is valued at a higher level, the instructor demonstrates a concerted interest in student feedback, and a collaborative learning structure based on student input is fostered. Similarly, faculty believe this is an opportunity to affirm the current teaching style or structure of their class, and understand differences in learning strategies envisioned by the instructor versus the current strategies pursued by the students. ASMSU recommends a continued implementation with the remaining residential colleges, and then expansion into the larger core and professional colleges.
STUDENT RESPONSES
How did your instructor administer the mid-semester feedback survey?

- Survey Monkey: 61%
- Paper: 29%
- Google Forms: 3%
- Desire2Learn: 5%
- Other: 2%

When did your instructor conduct the mid-semester feedback survey?

- During class: 12%
- At the end of class: 61%
- At the beginning of class: 27%
- Outside of class: 0%
- Other: 0%
How much impact did your and your classmates’ responses on the mid-semester feedback survey have on maintaining or improving your course in the second half of the semester?

- Much impact: 8%
- No impact: 17%
- Only a little impact: 10%
- Moderate impact: 40%
- Some impact: 25%

Student Response

To what extent do you think your instructor valued your and your classmates’ responses on the mid-semester feedback survey?

- Not at all valued: 2%
- Only a little valued: 2%
- Somewhat valued: 18%
- Moderately valued: 20%
- Highly valued: 58%

Student Response
**STUDENT RESPONSE:** What sort of changes, if any, did you see in the second half of your course as a result of the mid-semester feedback survey process?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Description</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None/satisfied with course prior to survey so no recognizable changes made</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of pace/teaching style; better presentation of the material</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putting PowerPoints up earlier; more visual aids</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking people to engage in class discussions that haven’t previously to speak up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More practice problems; problems at the end of PowerPoints to prepare for exams</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More extra credit offered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due dates of homework were made clearer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STUDENT RESPONSE:** How, if at all, did the mid-semester feedback survey help you better understand your role as a student?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Help Description</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helped me realize I had a voice in future improvement of the class</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor cares about student input</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can help the Professor improve the course, as much as the Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped me realize what I can be doing better, rather than placing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blame only on the instructor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It didn’t</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STUDENT RESPONSE:** How could LBC improve the content and/or administration process of the mid-semester feedback survey?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Suggestion</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actually implement what students suggest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibly do it earlier in the semester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was great.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do it for labs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasize the importance of student debrief</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a before and after survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send out reminders until the professor has had the class do the survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a follow up to the form explaining what will change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think asking more detailed, specific questions would help. Also,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>telling students weeks or more in advance that they’ll eventually be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>filling out the mid semester feedback survey would help - this would</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>give them time to reflect on what changes they would like to see as</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>class is happening; it was hard for me to think up answers to questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because I wasn’t really attending to class in that way in the first half</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the semester, if that makes sense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow room for additional comments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask questions that are better catered to the class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe send it earlier or closer to when the survey was done</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**STUDENT RESPONSE:** How would you suggest the larger MSU community implement a mid-semester feedback survey process?

- Require them online like with SIRS; most efficient this way (9 responses)
- Every class should do this (4 responses)
- Have all classes do this
- Stressing it is not an evaluation of the professor, but suggestions for how to improve the course for the current students.
- Promote it as a way to help professors understand their student’s needs.
- Through surveys online, I suppose. It would be hard to encourage people to participate in them, but I am not sure how else MSU could implement mid semester feedback.
- Have them complete it in class or give a deadline
- The same way that we did here. Just take the survey and review it so you can make the second half of the semester better
- Remind the students it's coming in advance, so they have more time to reflect on the semester so far before they have to write something. I know I blank a lot when it's sprung on me, so I feel others might too.

**STUDENT RESPONSE:** Do you have any other comments at this time about the mid-semester feedback survey process?

- I found them useless because no one will change their class halfway through.
- One thing that is done in labs is a mid-semester CATME and I think that is very beneficial especially for group work.
- It could potentially be a very helpful tool if used correctly
- It was very worthwhile.
FACULTY RESPONSES
How did you administer the mid-semester feedback survey?

- Paper: 46%
- Survey Monkey: 31%
- Desire2Learn: 15%
- Google Forms: 8%
- Other: 0%

Faculty Response

When did you administer the mid-semester feedback survey?

- At the end of class: 46%
- During class: 31%
- At the beginning of class: 23%
- Outside of class: 0%
- Other: 0%

Faculty Response
In past semesters, have you administered some sort of mid-semester feedback survey?

- Yes, I do this in every class I teach: 23%
- Yes, but only once or twice: 23%
- Yes, several times: 46%
- No, this was my first teaching experience: 0%
- No, I've taught before but not done this: 8%

Faculty Response

How unlikely or likely are you to administer this type of standardized mid-semester feedback survey in your LBC classes in upcoming semesters?

- Very unlikely: 0%
- Very likely: 46%
- Somewhat likely: 39%
- Somewhat unlikely: 15%
- I'm not sure: 0%

Faculty Response
How beneficial were the students’ responses on the mid-semester feedback survey for maintaining or improving your course in the second half of the semester?

- Very beneficial: 23%
- Moderately beneficial: 31%
- Somewhat beneficial: 31%
- Only a little beneficial: 15%
- Not at all beneficial: 0%

Faculty Response

To what extent do you think your students valued the opportunity to complete the mid-semester feedback survey?

- Highly valued: 8%
- Moderately valued: 38%
- Somewhat valued: 46%
- Only a little valued: 8%
- Not at all valued: 0%

Faculty Response
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACULTY RESPONSE: How, if at all, did the mid-semester feedback survey help you better understand the needs of your students? What sort of changes did you implement in your class as a result of the students’ responses on the mid-semester feedback survey?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I retained some experimental methods and class structures, which I had previously been skeptical about, because of strong positive feedback. After the feedback, we had a nice class conversation about participation and there was a more balanced distribution of participation as a result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is principally useful as a retrospective tool, indicating which resources did or didn't work effectively. In one class, it served to identify problematic group dynamics that I as able to ameliorate through the way I designed course activities in the second half.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I altered the discussion format for the class a bit, and I also made a point of making more connections between the course material and current events and news items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I took the feedback to be very affirming of what I was doing. There were no real surprises, and I did not make any changes. The REAL value, for me, was A) getting the students to do metacognition on their own learning habits and B) having a forum to show them that I care about their feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Their feedback was extremely valuable. In particular, I discovered that many of them felt they couldn’t keep up with the discussion and didn't have enough opportunities to participate. I doubled my efforts to curb the overachievers and ensure full participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They provided a few examples of things that I could easily address. It also gave me the opportunity to explain why some things were not able to be changed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It didn’t. The students were extremely pleased with the course structure (they helped design it), so there were no substantive suggestions as we had been adjusting throughout the course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I started using only black markers on the white board. This was the only real constructive feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The students’ feedback was very positive in this spring 2016 class. It is the second time that I taught the course, and I made several changes based in large part on student feedback (mid-semester and end-of-semester) from the first time I taught the course. From the mid-semester feedback I received this time through the pilot LBC/ASMSU survey, it appears those changes had a positive effect on students’ learning and satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It helped me to understand that the students didn’t necessarily have the same strategies for studying for the course that I thought they did. Therefore, I added in information about how students in the course studied for the exam 2 and what it meant for their exam 2 grade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was also useful to know what this particular group liked vs didn’t like. I wasn't able to make too many changes here because it was a hectic semester, but I did try to give students more choice throughout. For example, polling them to ask if the course should be moving faster or slower for specific topics, etc. They seemed to appreciate that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I typically use mid-semester feedback to gauge the balance between effort and learning gains for the readings, activities, and assignments completed to date. I found the standardized forms did not support this kind of assessment well because it did not prompt students to evaluate each activity separately but instead required students to recall the elements of the class they wanted to evaluate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was too general to be of much help. Mine are much more specific.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**FACULTY RESPONSE:** How could LBC improve the content and/or administration process of the mid-semester feedback survey?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have no complaints/it was done very well</td>
<td>(2 responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This survey was somewhat less useful than the survey I normally give around mid-term. The vague, generic questions that initiated the survey meant that by the time my students got to my customized questions, which could have actually helped me address the specific needs of the specific class, they had run out of steam and had little to say. LBC students are over-surveyed, and so these tools need to be short, to the point, and precisely targeted. This survey cut down on the flexibility I previously enjoyed to use a survey that was targeted to the particular content of the course and the particular students in it. I didn't find the questions about the students' study skills to be particularly enlightening. Most of them said &quot;do the readings before class&quot; and &quot;take notes during class.&quot; I think we should either remove these questions OR prime them in some way a few weeks beforehand. I understand the desire to have this not be used in annual evaluations, however, it would be good if there were some way to identify if a course is completely going off the rails (there was an example of this in Fall 2015, which would have been good to be able to catch earlier). If there is no oversight mechanism, this approach will provide small benefit to most classes (which is highly valuable) but would still miss catastrophes if the instructor just doesn't care. I'm not sure. It seems like a good process thus far.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>standardized using Survey Monkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I wasn't sure how to best present the mid-semester feedback back to the class. Most students had the same answers, but I never found the time to put all their responses into bar chart format. Instead I polled them again periodically with the clickers to ask what they wanted me to fix in class. Lack of structure is great in an eval so it fits both big lectures and small discussion classes, but I need to learn how to condense this information to be able to a) use it effectively and b) report this information more effectively to students. I appreciate the guidance LBC gives in presenting the evaluations to students, but I think that guidance on creating my own custom survey would be more useful than the standardized form. I think the questions are too vague, but each faculty member really needs to write their own questions, tailored to their own courses. Perhaps help or suggestions for this would be better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FACULTY RESPONSE:** How would you suggest the larger MSU community implement a mid-semester feedback survey process?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absolutely/Yes</td>
<td>(3 responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>However they want to; flexibility is good</td>
<td>(2 responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The notion that a one-size-fits-all tool would be appropriate for all of MSU is deeply problematic. The most effective way to implement midterm feedback surveys would be to make procedures and samples available to instructors and to ENCOURAGE instructors to modify them to fit the needs of their individual classes. At core, this is an issue of academic freedom. I'm thinking it might be useful to provide a website with a sample of the sort of mid-semester survey that faculty could do and some sample instructions for doing it. And perhaps the Provost's office could send out an email to all the faculty a little bit before the mid-point of the semester to let faculty know about the website with ideas for doing a mid-semester survey. That way faculty wouldn't feel that they had to do the survey, but it would be relatively easy to figure out how to do a survey if they wanted to. anonymous surveys through D2L seem to work well.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It might be better to have suggested mid semester feedback forms that faculty can choose from, but also allow instructors to create their own surveys as desired. For example, a small discussion class might use the form from this year, but a large lecture class could choose a form that has structured responses (i.e.,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
what are some strategies or techniques you used to help you learn. select as many as apply: a) hw, b) lecture notes, c) exams, d) book, e) tweak these for your course as you see fit, f) other ________). This way, in a large lecture class I can share the results with my students more easily without wasting time tallying results, but can still leave room for creativity in the "other" categories and open ended responses. It would be ideal to leave the process as flexible as possible.

I would suggest that it remain optional and that the standardized survey be considered a "template" or "example" rather than an unchangeable standard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACULTY RESPONSE: Do you have any other comments at this time about the mid-semester feedback survey process?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Find a way to make sure that everybody does every semester. It's important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every effort must be made to ensure that the data generated from these surveys are never collected, and are never seen by anyone other than the instructors administering them. If the data exist, someone WILL find a way to use them as a benchmark or evaluation tool, and at that point their utility to instructors will be lost. To be honest, I find this whole exercise troubling. I had a well thought-out system in place that allowed me to tailor short, effective surveys to the needs of particular courses--courses with very different content, assignments, readings, and, most importantly, classes composed of very different INDIVIDUALS. This standardization effort has watered that system down. Forcing a generic, tepid tool on the MSU community will mean that instructors will treat this only as another box they have to check to make nice with the bureaucracy, and mid-term evaluations should be an instructor resource, not a box-checking exercise. The recommended procedures and best practices are good, and should be distributed widely, but I'd hope ASMSU would do everything in its power to ensure instructors maintain MAXIMUM flexibility in the type of surveys they administer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think it was great. For whatever reason, though, I analyzed the results a lot later than I usually do. I'd like to administer it sooner (middle of February) and have fewer obligatory questions. (There's a lot that I'd like to know from them, as well, but the form can quickly be overwhelming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personally, I'd like to see a question on the final course evaluation that addresses the question of if the instructor addressed mid-semester student concerns. Note, that this would not inherently require changes by the faculty member per say, but could simply be that they pointed out why certain issue (pace of course for example) could not be changed during the semester. In some cases changes, may well happen in response to the student comments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMO

To: ASMSU
From: UCGS
Date: November 30, 2017

The Associated Students of Michigan State University (ASMSU) requested feedback from University Committee on Graduate Studies (UCGS) on their proposal to implement a mid-semester feedback process. The ASMSU proposal was reviewed and discussed by the UCGS Graduate Instruction, Employment and Mentoring Subcommittee and also by the full UCGS on two occasions (October 9, 2017 and November 6, 2017). The Subcommittee and UCGS also reviewed the survey instrument and the feedback from the Spring 2016 pilot test.

Based on discussions of the GIEM Subcommittee and the full UCGS committee, we have the following comments and suggestions.

- UCGS recognizes the potential usefulness of a process to gather mid-semester feedback
- UCGS does not support a mandated mid-semester feedback process.
- UCGS does support a recommended mid-semester feedback process in which guidance is provided by the Academic Advancement Network and/or the College of Education. Such guidance could include a discussion of best practices, a set of validated survey questions from which instructors could choose, and implementation guidance.
- UCGS recommends that ASMSU gather feedback from graduate students, including graduate student teaching assistants, to understand the implications of this proposal for graduate TAs.

Finally, UCGS recommends that mid-semester feedback surveys be considered as part of the overall discussion of the use of SIRS as a performance evaluation tool. The Ad Hoc committee evaluating the use of SIRS is tasked with considering the use of SIRS versus other evaluation tools, and as such, the recommendations of this Ad Hoc committee will be relevant in understanding the validity of tools such as mid-semester feedback surveys as compared to other methods of evaluation.
MEMORANDUM

To: The University Steering Committee
Copied: ASMSU, UCGS, UCFA, Academic Governance
From: University Committee on Undergraduate Education, Richard J. Miksicek (Ph.D.), Chair
Date: January 5, 2018

Feedback was requested from the ASMSU on their proposal to implement a mid-semester feedback process. The ASMSU proposal was reviewed and discussed by the full UCUE committee on November 17, 2017 after circulation of the ASMSU Executive Summary containing information about the survey instrument and feedback from the Spring 2016 pilot undertaken by Lyman Briggs College. A variety of issues were discussed:

- pros and cons of an additional, broader follow-up study, expand to include the other residential colleges (RCAH, James Madison) in addition to LBC
- recommended timeline for broader implementation
- preferred feedback platforms (D2L, Qualtrix, etc.)
- importance of anonymity and challenges to maintaining anonymity in certain course formats (e.g., small enrollment courses, recitation sessions, one-on-one instructional situations in music, performance, and studio arts).
- issues with pseudo-quantitative ratings based on use of Likert scales
- difficulty in crafting standardized questions applicable to different course formats, large vs small enrollment courses, lecture vs lab, etc
- inability to determine whether or not collecting mid-semester feedback actually improves course and teaching outcomes; should an additional pilot be run in which parallel sections (with and without mid-semester feedback) are compared using end-of semester SIRS results as an outcome measure
- formal or informal mid-semester feedback efforts already exist in some colleges, especially the professional colleges undergoing curricular revision
- potential value of using faculty liaisons within programs and departments to “champion” use of mid-semester feedback
Based on these discussions, UCUE voted to endorse the following consensus recommendations:

1) Mid-Semester Feedback represents a “best practice” that is already being utilized voluntarily by many units; adoption by other units should be encouraged, but not required.
2) Rather than imposing an institutionalized, one-size-fits-all solution to implement Mid-Semester Feedback for all types of instruction, this should be a voluntary practice, with specifics (including questions and platforms) that are left to the discretion of the individual instructor.
3) The institutional goal should be to build and foster a culture among MSU faculty for soliciting student feedback early in the semester when there remains sufficient time to implement corrective measures.
4) The best way to encourage broader adoption of this practice may be to develop one or two easy-to-adopt templates to anonymously solicit mid-semester feedback.
5) UCUE suggests scaling down the questions from five to two, and possibly to solicit only open-ended feedback and forgo a system for quantitatively or qualitatively rating courses and instructions. The focus should be on improving student learning:

- As a student, what could you do in the remainder of the semester to help you learn more effectively?
- As an instructor, what could I do in the remainder of the semester to help you learn more effectively?

The following motion was proposed, seconded, and endorsed by the full UCUE committee:

“UCUE has reviewed and supports the program that ASMSU is promoting and suggests that it be expanded University wide, with the creation of a sample template of feedback questions suitable for large and small class settings.”
UCFA Mid-semester feedback.

At its meeting of 10/17/2017, the UCFA heard a presentation of the report of Lyman Briggs College’s Mid-Semester Feedback project from Ewurama Appiagyei-Dankah, ASMSU Vice President for Academic Affairs.

At its meeting of January 9, 2017, the UCFA adopted the following motion:

1. The UCFA recognizes the value of mid-semester feedback for improving instructional methods, in both the short and long-term.
2. Since its usefulness depends in some part on the methods of instruction being used, and so may vary from course to course, its use should be encouraged by units as appropriate, rather than required.
3. The UCFA does not support the use of mid-semester feedback as a component for evaluating the teaching effectiveness of individual faculty by unit administrators for annual reviews, merit raises, or retention, promotion and tenure.