1. CALL TO ORDER
2. Approval of Agenda for March 13, 2018
3. Approval of Draft Minutes for February 20, 2018 (Appendix A)
4. President’s Remarks: Interim John Engler
5. Provost’s Remarks: Dr. June Youatt
6. Chairperson’s Remarks: Dr. Laura McCabe
7. Committee Reports
8. NEW BUSINESS
   8.1. Faculty Health Care Council Slate of Nominees, for Selection, Dr. Laura McCabe, (Action Item) (Appendix B)
   8.2. UCC Letter Regarding Difficult Topics, Marci Mechtel, University Committee on Curriculum (UCC) Chairperson (Appendix C)
   8.3. Formation of an Ad Hoc Committee to Review and Recommend Changes on Board of Trustee and University Bylaws, Gayle Lourens, University Committee on Academic Governance Chairperson (Action Item) (Appendix D)
   8.4. Report on Input for President Search, Dr. Laura McCabe (Appendix E & F)
   8.5. Application Based Sexual Assault Reporting System, Sara Bijani, Graduate Employees Union President. (Attachment soon)
   8.6. Discussion of MSU’s Legal Defense, Kristine Zayko, General Counsel
9. Draft Agenda for Faculty Senate for March 20, 2018
   9.2. UCC Letter Regarding Difficulty Topics, Marci Mechtel, University Committee on Curriculum (UCC) Chairperson (Information Item) (Appendix)
   9.3. Report on Input for President Search, Dr. Laura McCabe (Information Item) (Appendices)
9.4. Formation of an Ad Hoc Committee to Review and Recommend Changes on Board of Trustee and University Bylaws (Action Item) (Appendix)

9.5. Faculty Discussion – Bylaws?

10. Draft Agenda for University Council for March 27, 2018

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. Discussion of Responsibility of MSU’s Legal Defense (Information Item), Dr. Laura McCabe

10.3. Report on Input for President Search, Dr. Laura McCabe (Information Item) (Appendix and Breslin letter)??

10.4. Application Based Sexual Assault Reporting System, Sara Bijani, Graduate Employees Union, President (Information Item)

10.5. Discussion????

11. ADJOURNMENT
Approved:
2017-2018: Meeting # 5

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
THE STEERING COMMITTEE DRAFT MINUTES
FEBRUARY 20, 2018 3:15 PM
302 INTERNATIONAL CENTER


Absent: E. Appiagyei-Dankah, R. LaDuca, L. Luna-Gagnon,

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. Approval of Agenda for February 20, 2018
   The agenda was amended to allow guest speakers to address the Steering Committee. A motion was made and seconded. The motion passed.

3. Approval of Draft Minutes for January 9, 2018

4. President’s Remarks: Interim John Engler (out of town)

5. Provost’s Remarks: Dr. June Youatt

6. Chairperson’s Remarks: Dr. Laura McCabe
   Because of consideration of time limits of the emergency Steering Committee meeting, Dr. McCabe did not offer any remarks.

7. Committee Reports

   University Committee on Curriculum (UCC) – Professor Marci Mechtel
   Professor Mechtel reported that the UCC approved four new programs, programs highlighting a Minor in Broadcast Journalism, and a Master of Arts and Clinical Medicine. In addition, a Master’s degree in Legal Studies, and a Minor in Sports Journalism were approved. Thirteen program changes approved, as were three program deletions. Nineteen new courses were approved, as were 111 course changes, and nine course deletions. Moratoriums were approved for the Quantitative Biology dual major Ph.D., effective spring of 2018 through spring of 2019. A moratorium was approved for the Latin Disciplinary Teaching Minor for spring of 2018 through fall of 2018. And a moratorium was approved for the Italian Disciplinary Teaching Minor for spring of 2018 through fall of 2018. A discontinuation of a Ph.D. in American Studies was approved, as was the Russian Disciplinary Teaching Minor, effective summer of 2018, and the History Disciplinary Teaching Minor, effective spring of 2018.

   University Committee on Faculty Affairs (UCFA) – Professor Thomas Tomlinson
Professor Tomlinson reported that UCFA approved a motion requesting that the Provost instruct the Director of the Office of Institutional Equity to attend an UCFA meeting once each semester, and deliver an account of incidents that have been reported to the OIE, including the nature of those incidents, and how these incidents have been addressed. The provost has agreed to this request.

University Committee on Academic Governance (UCAG)—Professor Gayle Lourens

Professor Lourens reported that UCAG has developed a slate of faculty candidates for committee elections. Additionally, UCAG has received a number of requests from University Colleges to take an opportunity to review their own Bylaws. As a result, UCAG has suspended the College Bylaw reviews for this semester, thus allowing the Colleges to examine their own processes and procedures, in order to evaluate if they want to change their Bylaws before they are reviewed UCAG. And lastly, UCAG will be bringing new Bylaw language forward on the agenda today regarding Academic Specialists.

University Committee on Undergraduate Education (UCUE) – Professor Richard Miksicek

Professor Miksicek reported that UCUE has developed a survey to collect information about teaching surveys. It was noted that the Office of IT Services is going to be putting out a RFA for potential platforms to use for teaching evaluation, and UCUE will gather some input that will help review in that process.

University Committee on Faculty Affairs (UCFT) – Professor Michael Dease

Professor Dease reported that UCFT reviewed and approved two tenure extension requests.

University Committee on Student Affairs (UCSA) – Lorenzo Santavicca

Lorenzo Santavicca reported that UCSA has been discussing campus challenges and the campus landscape. It was noted that their discussion about campus mobility, which includes mopeds and bicycles, was tabled to their next meeting. The general sentiment of the group was a desire to review the University Bylaws process.

8. NEW BUSINESS

8.1. Faculty Health Care Council Slate of Nominees, for Selection, Dr. Laura McCabe

Dr. McCabe reported that the approval of the slate will be delayed until the next Steering Committee meeting.

8.2. Academic Specialists Bylaw Amendments, Dr. Gayle Lourens, University Committee on Academic Governance (UCAG) Chairperson

Dr. Lourens reported that for the University Bylaws Amendments that would allow Academic Specialists voice and vote on a University committee, because Fixed-Term Faculty are required to have three years of consistent service before they can sit on a University committee, it was decided that Fixed-Term Faculty would be held to the same requirement. Discussion ensued regarding what constituted full-time employment at MSU. It was agreed that the University Bylaws should be amended to state that 90% employment constitutes full-time employment at MSU. It was agreed that UCAG would revisit the language of the Bylaws amendment and return them at a later time for
approval.

8.3. Next Steps Following the Vote of No Confidence in the Board of Trustees – Discussion, University Committee on Academic Governance (UCAG) and Faculty Comments

Professor Shawnee Vickery made the following statement and request regarding the Vote of No Confidence in the MSU Board of Trustees:

“I appreciate this opportunity to appear before this August group. And I'm here again with a request that we work to amend the proposal, the motion, concerning the confidence that was made last week at the Board of Trustees, to contain language that specifically states what happened in terms of the Board's failure to stop the criminal behavior of Larry Nassar. And then, to provide adequate support for the survivors.

…and I will share with you that after I spoke last week, I did get an email from the mother of a survivor, who thanked me for speaking up. And she included a quote of what I said in M-Live. She said basically that these were her sentiments exactly as the mother of a survivor. And she thanked me for saying it out loud.

…I just really think we need to keep the focus, if we're doing a vote of no confidence in the Board, on what happened with respect to Larry Nassar and the horrific abuse he subjected the women to. It is very unusual in a university system to do a vote of no confidence in the Board of Trustees. It's not so unusual to do it in a president, but it is very unusual for a Board of Trustees.

…and it seems to me, that this situation with Larry Nassar, and what occurred on this campus, rises to the level where it makes sense to do a vote of no confidence on the Board of Trustees. And it's the only thing that makes sense for us to do a vote of no confidence in the Board.

…and so I would respectfully request that we amend that motion to provide a clear distinct reason. And the reason is solely focused on the failure to stop, prevent the behavior of Larry Nassar, and then support the women, as they should have been supported after his abuses became known.”

Discussion ensued. It was agreed that there were two issues regarding the Vote of No Confidence in the Board of Trustees. The first involved an institutional failure to listen to faculty and students. The second involved a specific No Confidence Vote based on Larry Nassar’s criminal behavior and the Board of Trustees failure to respond to this specific situation in a timely and ethical manner. It was decided to allow the Faculty Senate an opportunity for a separate (and second) vote of No Confidence in the Board of Trustees, with specific language that addresses the Board of Trustees’ failure to deal with Nassar’s criminally abusive behavior.

8.4. It was reported that the Athletic Council met on Friday and that interest was expressed to form a group within the Athletic Council to examine the Bylaws. It was moved and seconded that the Bylaws review should be conducted by the Athletic Council, in conjunction with UCAG. The motion carried.
9. Draft Agenda for Faculty Senate for February 20, 2018
   • Slate of Nominees for The Steering Committee At-Large, for Endorsement, Dr. Laura McCabe, (Action Item) (Appendix)

   • Slate of Nominees for the Athletic Council, for Endorsement, Dr. Laura McCabe, (Action Item)

   • University Committee on Curriculum (UCC) Report, Professor Marci Mechtel, UCC Chairperson (Action Item) (Appendix Short Report) (Long Report, click on Link)

   • Next Steps Following the Vote of No Confidence in the Board of Trustees – Discussion (Appendix, University Committee on Academic Governance (UCAG) and Faculty Comments)

10. Draft Agenda for University Council for February 27, 2018
    • University Committee on Curriculum (UCC) Report, Professor Marci Mechtel, UCC Chairperson (Information Item) (Appendix Short Report) (Long Report, click on Link)

    • Next Steps Following the Vote of No Confidence in the Board of Trustees Continued

11. ADJOURNMENT
    A motion to adjourn was made and first and seconded. The motion carried. 3:45pm.
Faculty Health Care Council Slate of Nominees – 2018

*Incumbent

Katherine Dontje*, Nursing
John Kosciulek*, Education
Deborah Moriarty*, Music
John Goddeeris*, Social Science
Lynne Zelenski*, Business
Rebecca Larson*, Education,
Dave Weismantel*, Human Medicine
James Dudziak*, Lyman Briggs
Carla Carleton, Veterinary Medicine
Nicolas Gisholt, Social Science
Tomas Hult, Business
Benjamin Oberdick, Libraries
Dawn Opel, Arts & Letters
Nancy Rhodes, Communication Arts & Sciences
Kara Schrader, Nursing
Elizabeth Spence, Arts & Letters
Faculty Members Presently Serving on the Faculty Health Care Council
(all are Eligible for Re-Election except R. Malouin who declined reappointment)

Rebecca Malouin, 2018
Katherine Dontje, Nursing, 2018
John Kosciulek, Education, 2018
Deborah Moriarty, Music, 2018
John Goddeeris, Social Science, 2018
Lynne Zelenski, Business, 2018
Rebecca Larson, Education, 2018
Dave Weismantel, Human Medicine, 2018
James Dudziak, Lyman Briggs, 2018
Hello Colleagues,

As members of the University Curriculum Committee, we wanted to reach out to you as you think about establishing and maintaining relationships with your students this semester. Over the last few weeks, many MSU students have expressed concerns about unfolding events at MSU. While we recognize that we, as faculty, may have few answers for our students, we can make our courses places where students can connect with each other, raise questions and concerns, and, through faculty, bring these issues to the attention of the administration. We the committee believe that personal integrity, human values, and ethical conduct constitute the unifying foundation of our entire curriculum, on which individual disciplines grow and branch off. Therefore, courteous and honest exchange of opinions on the matter is appropriate and can be a part of any class curriculum. It is also understood, as faculty, we are responsible for the curriculum, and the ultimate decision on whether and how to address these questions rests with individual instructors.

Many faculty members have already begun to have conversations with their students about MSU’s response to victims of sexual harassment and abuse, about the recent changes in leadership, and about MSU’s reputation in the wider world. We want to commend these efforts and encourage others to think about ways to create spaces for your students to speak. Students may have wide-ranging concerns from worry over whom to safely approach if they feel endangered on campus to concerns about how to answer questions about the university while interviewing for jobs and internships. We encourage faculty members to make space for these conversations in ways that feel comfortable for them and our students.

Some strategies that have worked for colleagues include:

- Engaging in informal conversations before or after class;
- Inviting students to visit during office hours for extended conversations;
- Opening up conversations in class about current events -- either in small groups or as a class;
- Asking students if they would like to talk about or make announcements for various campus events, such as marches or town halls;
- Providing opportunities for students to talk about how events at MSU (and beyond) are impacting their lives.

We recognize that some faculty will be more comfortable with these conversations than others and that some disciplines may lend themselves more to these sorts of conversations, but we hope that all faculty members will think broadly about how to provide an educative and supportive environment for our students.
February 26, 2018

Dear Faculty Liaisons to the Board of Trustees,

We are following up on our conversation prior to the most recent Board of Trustees meeting. The Board welcomes your thoughts as we begin the process of selecting MSU's next President. We join President Engler in inviting you to provide the Board with examples of recent Presidential searches that might serve as a model for our search, with component parts, which will work well for MSU.

Additionally, we welcome your thoughts on the characteristics you believe will be important in our next President.

We are at the very initial stages of this most important decision. There will be numerous opportunities for faculty input throughout the process. And other stakeholders will have ideas and input as well. We are intentionally asking for your feedback on these questions very early in the process, as they will help us formulate the next steps of this search that is so critical to the success of our University.

We look forward to continued discussion with the faculty as we move forward together.

Sincerely,

MSU Board of Trustees
PRESIDENT QUALITIES:

Background:

1) Academic leadership not corporate leadership
2) If outside of academia, leadership in a nonprofit, not corporation
3) Someone who has run an R1 institution successfully before (Presidents or Provosts preferably) — including experience managing large budgets
4) Leadership experience in higher education at a recognized CIC institution (700 colleges and universities) or Association of American Universities and Colleges (1400 member institutions)
5) Successful track record of managing a large university -- a sitting president or provost. No retired politicians.
6) The president should be an academic with a record of teaching and research
7) Someone whose record qualifies them for appointment as a full professor at MSU
8) Is a scholar-teacher
9) Ideally someone who has actually done research.
10) A track record of interests in and support of the arts and humanities
11) Demonstrated experience and familiarity with extramurally funded research programs
12) Vision:
13) Has a compelling vision for what MSU can attain in the future
14) Has a vision for and understanding of higher education
15) Ideally, someone with connections in Washington D.C. or funding agencies, and a history of fundraising.
16) The applicants need to engage with faculty and students in the process and demonstrate that they can bring people together
17) Cares for and invests international students and faculty. No “sink or swim” attitude.
18) Ability to tolerate and effectively respond to controversy, and to speak with empathy grace and courage, but also willing to make difficult decisions
19) An individual open to receiving input, and able to communicate effectively
20) LISTENS
21) Well spoken, a good public ambassador
22) Open to shared governance
23) Consensus builder, good with people
24) Ability to articulate a plan for effective implementation of and experiences with the mechanisms for academic governances
25) Someone who understands business models and experiences garnering and administering resources and finances
26) Outside candidate should be given the highest consideration
27) Comes to us from another university with new perspectives (Not currently at MSU)

28) Brave
29) Champions diversity and inclusion
30) Emphasizes teaching
31) Places much less emphasis on athletics
32) Financially progressive: Provides good support for student, faculty and staff health and well-being
33) Able to create a community of donors and alumni
34) Is led by values and integrity. Honest.
35) Cares about work-life balance
36) Can plan for a positive future for MSU given demographic realities
37) Is able to create community and communicates to all members well
38) Open to innovation
39) Committed to student success
40) Someone who doesn’t only listen to lawyers and insurance companies. Does the right thing. Again: BRAVE
41) Ensures that the university lives up to its values
42) Preserves our beautiful campus
43) Understands international engagement and global impact
44) Preserve and enhances research intensity. Maintain standing in the AAU.
45) Provides adequate support for faculty. A lack of support staff takes away from research and teaching endeavors.
46) Allows departments to manage funds and make more independent financial decisions. This will foster independent goal setting/innovation.
47) Move away from the “hub and spoke” form of management
48) Someone who understands their own weaknesses and has the ability bring in people to complement their skill set. Once these people are on board, TRUST THEM to do their jobs.
49) Work with the Board of Trustees so that they understand and embrace their oversight function. The Board needs to provide adequate checks and balances. There was also a discussion about how we can take action so that we have a Board that is qualified to provide oversight of a large university.
50) Need experience dealing with external community-stakeholders, alums, sponsors, legislators (state and federal), key agency heads, experience dealing with foundations, don’t want to put students in precarious positions in that arena.
51) Need to focus on culture. Working with university community to identify what our values are and what we want to reward and how we manage that reward system. Make sure our values are aligned with how we allocate resources.
52) Need to be deliberate but also need to make decisions
53) Transparent, good at crisis management, bring a team around themselves who can manage crisis. Culture if fear needs to be rid of. People should be comfortable to speak in a professional way.

54) people skills, personality, social and emotional intelligence to rebuild trust. Transparent and inclusive. Someone is not afraid to hear different points of view. Doesn't want to live in an echo chamber.

55) Given the time we are looking at a pool that could be someone who thinks they can't get the job otherwise. Or someone who’s career path is big on crisis management- would their term be short time in that case? Someone who fits these things may not be the right person. This is not a normal market.

56) We need someone who will focus more on campus than the norm would be. Emotional intelligence. Be able to talk about culture, values, reward system. Conversations have been metric focused and that’s not what the deans or the colleges need.

57) Put a team around the president who can help to manage and rebuild. Will be able to choose options that aren’t the most attractive today but will be the best in 5 years. Maybe Engler can address long term issues now

58) Long term pres needs to feel pulse of the university and respond with empathy and compassion. Admin response to Nassar has had an equal hand in cultural crisis than his crimes themselves did.

59) important to have someone who has walked in our shoes- been faculty, taught classes, etc

60) students want someone who they can connect to as a human. Someone who won’t make them feel like they’re being shooed off to the side. Someone who has the emotional intelligence to feel the pulse of the university. Can talk authentically and genuinely and really truly mean what they say and make students feel that. It’s important to have a person who will make students feel safe and like the University cares about them as an individual. Compassion and people management is important.

61) New pres has to be okay with hearing bad news and taking that on. Has to care about quality of education and not just sports. Students feel like athletics are a more important core component than education. We need someone who’s core mission is education driven.

62) someone who can surround themselves with big personalities as VPs. VPs and surrounding people need to be strong enough to bring president bad news. Also, why do they want this job?? Need to make sure they can stay the course. Need to make sure they aren’t using this as a way to catapult their career. Number 1 question: given what we’ve been through, why do you want this job?
PROCESS FOR CHOOSING A PRESIDENT

1) We feel that we should identify the major stakeholder groups and have each choose one person to represent them for the search committee
2) Consider Alumni who have been university Presidents
3) Make sure that those stakeholders (i.e., each of the search committee members) have a VOTE that the Board of Trustees listens to for electing the President. This is especially true for the final decision. This will increase inclusivity and participation.
4) Regarding transparency, we need to bring the finalists to campus publicly and gather feedback from the entire campus in order to inform the committee’s recommendation to the Board, and also their final decision. This might decrease the quality of candidates who apply (because they won’t want to be “outed” in their current positions if they are not selected), but this risk is worth it because it will be most transparent.
5) It is most effective just to focus on process
6) The search must include faculty, undergraduate students, graduate students, representative of the administration, larger MSU community, one member of the Board of Trustees (to discuss fiduciary responsibilities)
7) BOT bylaws must change to include broad input in search for President
8) It is key that we have full transparency
9) Decisions at each stage should be communicated asap
10) Appropriate to consult with other universities about their experiences, including other universities that have experienced major crises such as Penn State
11) Recommend large open community forums to establish the qualities and qualifications needed in a President
12) Prioritization of diversity in the hiring
13) Public presentations of the candidates for the Presidency
14) Support the creation of a mechanism for 2/3 of Academic Governance to be able to veto the choice of the presidential search committee prior to BOT election
15) There was some disagreement among members of the group. There is a desire for as much openness as possible with public forums, etc., but the group also realized that this could reduce the pool of current university presidents and provosts because of a desire for confidentiality.
16) There needs to be a process where all members of the university community feel that their voices are heard. How do you create this feeling if there is some need for confidentiality? The university should inquire about and study recent presidential job searches across and find out what worked well and what didn’t.
17) The committee should be widely representative and include faculty, staff and students
18) Perhaps University Council could serve as a search committee though we would need to add support staff members. Then there would need to be a smaller “steering committee” take make this very large group more manageable.
19) BoT need to hold listening sessions with individual colleges and major stakeholder groups; campus-wide listening sessions; careful thought needs to be given to venue and mechanisms for providing input
20) Opportunities for formal and informal input (suggestion website, town halls, etc.); student input is important, but faculty and staff input is crucial
21) We need a very engaged search committee that has a clear mechanism to voice their input and opinions.
22) Recommended timeline: a thoughtful search will require sufficient time to gather input and permit reflective consideration and evaluation of candidates.
23) Suggest to BoT to seek out and invite Faculty Senate approval of the plan launched for the Presidential Search.
24) Better mechanism to encourage a culture of involvement in university affairs.
25) Understanding from Board of their thoughts on the search process - Will our input be valued and taken into consideration or are we not going to be taken into account as has happened in the past?
26) Gathering input from all parties, students, faculty, and staff and use of input in decision making.
27) Use of a search firm to properly vet candidates.
28) Search committee has students, staff, and faculty members to provide input. Balance between representation and efficiency - Not all Board members are on the search committee (2-3), more representation from stakeholders since full Board has the ability to choose.
29) Committee sends 3 candidates to the Board for final confirmation - Board chooses between the options provided.
30) Diversity of thought and background in the committee will benefit our search - Athletics, colleges, students, student groups, alumni etc.
31) Search committee looks like the University essentially.
32) Future President's success will be maximized if many stakeholders back option!

Additional input:
1) Hopefully have changes in governance structure eventually. Organized staff voice has been missing from conversation lately. Wide diversity of steps: multiple unions, technical, etc. Cohesive governance structure for staff voices to be heard.
2) Biddy Martin - She was chancellor at Wisconsin and left when Governor Scott started taking the university apart. She is now President of Amherst and was very proactive when they had a sexual abuse scandal.
3) A mechanism needs to be found for formalized interactions between BoT and Faculty Liaison Group.
4) We (faculty senate) should proceed with work groups to update and revise both the Bylaws for Academic Governance, and well as the Bylaws for the Board of Trustees.
5) Strategically, we need to identify and focus on an important first step, for example ByLaws changes.