MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY COUNCIL

DRAFT MINUTES

Tuesday, October 9, 2007
3:15 p.m., Radiology Building Auditorium

Present: President Simon, Provost Wilcox, Aviyente, Barnhizer, Bauer, Good (for Bice), Bolin, Chivukula, Cognato, Corby, Crawford, Dawson, Dimitrova, Dobson, Domer, Dougherty, Fay, Floyd, Fraker, Fu, Hughes, Jacobs, Kaguni, Keller, Kendall, Lacy, Largent, McCormick, Moch, Morash, Noel, Owen, Potchen, Powell, Propst, Rautman, Rodriguez, Rosser, St. Arnault, Selanders, Sleeper-Smith, Sticklen, Stone, Thornburg, Tims, Vargas, Wright, Yansa, Youngs


The meeting began at 3:25 p.m. with full quorum.

Approval of Agenda:
The agenda was approved as distributed.

Public Comments (2 minute time limit per speaker; 10 minutes total):
The President introduced the public comments period and noted the time limit for speaking.

- Eric Hinojosa, Chairperson of Academic Assembly of ASMSU, spoke and acknowledged the distribution of material to members and apologized for distributing early. Eric voiced concern regarding the motion on the proposed Steering Committee (TSC) to be discussed by members. The proposed TSC would reduce the student representation from three students to one student. If the motion to implement the TSC is passed a student bringing an issue to TSC may not be able to discuss if there is no second. The second issue voiced was that there are a number of issues that would be deemed as faculty matters that students have had voice on in the past with success, i.e. academic minors, Gender Identity in the MSU ADP. The new TSC structure would hamper communication within governance by eliminating the Standing Committee chairpersons who are in the loop and replacing with ex-officio members.

- Professor Teahan spoke indicating a comment and a question to be made. Professor Teahan questioned if the ECAC proposal for discussion process at Faculty Council seeks to prevent non-members from participating in Faculty Council or seeks to limit them to the public comment forum on today’s agenda? What problem is this solving? Professor Teahan noted she had attended many Faculty Council meetings and has never observed a problem with non-members monopolizing discussion. This proposal goes in exactly the wrong direction. There were approximately 700 faculty that came to the Academic Senate meeting in April, 2004 because they were dissatisfied with the state of faculty governance and faculty voice. Professor Teahan noted that this proposal seeks to further restrict faculty voice and urged members to vote it down.

There were no additional public comments.
Approval of Minutes:
The minutes of September 18, 2007 were approved as distributed.

President’s Remarks:
The President requested the ECAC Chairperson to address Professor Teahan’s question during his remarks. President Simon reported on the celebration and success of the Capital Campaign and noted great pride at the comments from faculty and students about the meaning of the various gifts received to them as individuals, to their Departments and Programs and MSU. There was $85 million dollars collected in this Capital Campaign from faculty, staff and retirees. This was the highest amount collected in a campaign in the Big Ten and across the country. On behalf of the University community the President thanked everyone for their generosity.

President Simon reported an update on the budget. It is unclear about the long term prognosis for the State but in the short term the payment due MSU on October 16 has been authorized by the legislature. Overall, the higher education area was given a 1% target off a reduced base of minus 1.85. The best scenario for Higher Education is about half the reduction already encountered for this year would be replaced. It is not clear how the 1% will be allocated across all of the factors in the Higher Education budget. The University budget was based on the minus 1.85 so from a unit perspective the budget is intact. The commitment is to return any increase received in the form of reduced tuition for spring semester.

Provost’s Remarks:
Provost Wilcox announced that a web site has been developed on work life issues at MSU. The address is worklife.msu.edu. The site is envisioned as a one stop to a set of resources to families that are moving to the area. The Provost encouraged faculty to visit the web site and send comments and advice to Professor Curry.

The Provost noted this year is the Year of Arts and Culture at MSU and a number of events have occurred and will continue. This coming week end is the twenty-fifth anniversary of the opening of the Wharton Center. Currently there is discussion and preparation for the creation of the new Art Museum on campus and the new Residential College in Arts and Humanities. The entire year will highlight the arts and humanities on the campus.

Executive Committee Chairperson’s Remarks:
Professor Potchen announced members will be discussing the recommendations from Faculty Voice Task Force I at this meeting. There will be some proposals made and some controversy concerning the proposals and Professor Potchen asked members to try to maintain a balanced perspective. In response to Professor Teahan’s question of what was the intent of the ECAC in limiting the discussion in open comments, Professor Potchen explained that at times the open discussions last year became an argument between faculty that were not members of Council. Under the current rules, those that wish to have a voice in Council can run for election as a Council representative. To have debate back and forth by faculty who are not Council members is not the most appropriate use of time as a Council. It is important for every one who is a member to have an opportunity to discuss and debate. Professor Potchen reiterated that all faculty have representatives in this body and all of us are willing to listen to the people representing the faculty.
Academic Program Review:
The Provost reported that one of the recommendations of the Faculty Voice Task Force III, Program Review, was the creation of a system for regular program review. This recommendation was reviewed and discussed last year by Academic and Faculty Councils and a recommendation was made to the Provost to implement the plan. Provost Wilcox presented a summary of the implementation process for completing and implementing the recommendation which was distributed to members. The plan conforms to the recommendations with a couple of changes. The plan suggests all academic units on campus will be reviewed at least once every 7 years. The recommendations called for only units that were departments and not units having regular accreditation. This plan goes beyond and includes all units. The recommendations suggested each review would include an external review. The plan calls for each review to begin with an intense unit self-study during the Fall Semester and at the end of this process include a discussion about the need for an external review between the Unit, Dean(s) and the Provost Office. The plan also includes a posting on the web of the schedule for Academic Program Review for the next several years. The schedule will be worked out and aligned with Accreditation time. The Faculty Council did endorse the recommendations last year. A Council member suggested that the time frame of 24 months of the self-study and action plan was rather a short time to submit a progress report. Another suggestion was made to consider revising the self-study questions to be more quantitative. The Provost acknowledged the suggestions and will consider.

Motions and Amendments According to Robert’s Rules of Order:
Professor Wright, Secretary for Academic Governance, summarized the materials distributed to members prior to the meeting on motions and amendments from Robert’s Rules of Order. A Rules Committee has been established and the following members were appointed by Professor Potchen at the last ECAC meeting. The members are Professor Hughes, Chairperson, Professors Powell and Corby, with Professor Wright as an ex-officio member.

Executive Committee Proposal for Discussion Process at Faculty Council:
Professor Potchen presented the following motion: The ECAC proposes that Faculty Council endorse limiting discussion in Faculty Council to members only for a three minute time period per speaker.

The motion was seconded. The motion was amended to read: The ECAC proposes that Faculty Council endorse limiting discussion in this Faculty Council meeting (October 9, 2007) to members only for a three minute time period per speaker for the discussion of Task Force I recommendations.

Several members argued against the main motion to restrict members to a three minute time to speak. Professor Powell noted the three minute time period was to get the members to decide what limit should be set. It was clarified that if the motion fails, the time limit would be 10 minutes according to Robert’s Rules of Order. The motion failed.

Faculty Voice Task Force 1 Report: Section III – Proposed Steering Committee:
Professor Morash moved to accept the recommendations of Task Force I as they pertain to the Steering Committee, pages 11 through 13 of the Task Force I Report. The motion was seconded. Professor Morash explained that ECAC did not want to reformulate the motion
in a simpler way and it was anticipated that there may be “substitute changes”. The document is presented to Faculty Council as received. The following amendment was made by a member to include: **increasing the undergraduate and graduate student representation to approximate the current number.** The motion was seconded. Professor Barnhizer noted that it seems like the tenure system faculty are losing ground in terms of representation. When fixed term faculty was given greater voice, the student representation was increased. Concern was expressed that a process was occurring that was decreasing faculty voice. Professor Moch reflected his understanding that the proposed Steering Committee was to be an executive function and not a deliberative function and as a consequence the deliberative activities would occur in Faculty Council so additional student representatives would be appropriate. The motion to amend failed.

The discussion went back to the main motion. Professor Hughes noted that there appears to be a concentration of power in a smaller number of people in the proposed Steering Committee. The proposed Steering Committee would be smaller than the current ECAC, which has 5 At-Large faculty, the Chairpersons of the Standing Committees and 2 Undergraduate and 2 Graduate students. Professor Hughes also noted the proposed suggestion in the recommendations that the Steering Committee should be set up right away so the rest of the changes could be expedited. Professor Hughes reminded members this could not be done until the process is completed to amend the **Bylaws.** Professor Sticklen pointed out this suggestion is in the summary of the Report on page 1. The early installment of the Proposed Steering Committee is not before the body at this time. The President clarified that the motion addresses pages 11 through 13 only.

Professor Crawford requested someone who had served on the Task Force to explain what the problem was with the current ECAC and the need to change. Professor Floyd explained the model of the Steering Committee was based on a review of what was considered as ideal governance by the Task Force. The idea of the Steering Committee was found to be very effective in the review. The Steering Committee would filter information from faculty about issues that should be addressed and channel the issues to appropriate committees. Professor Moch said the current ECAC at the time of the Faculty Voice discussions indicated the ECAC was too large and diffuse. Professor Sticklen was not on the Task Force but noted that the proposed Steering Committee is different in that it would integrate the whole picture.

Professor Potchen expressed concern regarding changing the nature of the ECAC by changing its representation and how people get elected. Currently the ECAC members are made up of elected at-large members from across the University and members elected by the respective standing committees as the chairperson. Professor Potchen noted there is a rich hybrid between those elected from the University pool and those elected by the standing committees. The current proposal would decrease the amount of representation on the steering committee and that runs counter to Faculty Voice.

Professor Powell spoke against the motion. The key differences are that the TSC has 8 at-large members to serve a 3 year term with a second 3 year term possible and the current ECAC is a 2 year term with a second 2 year term possible. The TSC sits ex-officio on the Standing Committees and currently the Standing Committee chairpersons are members of ECAC with voice and vote. Professor Powell reported the UCFA members have concern about the ex-officio member going back to a private session to interpret or integrate and are not sure the committees findings would be represented in the way they were discussed. This recommendation provides
credit to be given to the TSC members for participation in governance. This is counter productive since all members in governance put in much time. Professor Powell concluded by supporting the addition of 3 elected At-Large Faculty to the current ECAC which would bring the total to 8 At-Large Faculty as proposed in the TSC. It would be more productive to have Academic Governance rework the Bylaws to enhance and promote the current ECAC into more of the liaison activities and communication rather than spend time creating a “golden delicious apple” instead of a “red delicious apple”, it is the same thing. We want more voice, more control and some mechanism to generate enthusiasm among colleagues to enhance our role in University governance.

President Simon clarified there were two ways to deal with the motion, one is to take the points and propose amendments and work through them or to have everyone hear concerns and try to deal with them. Professor Moch wanted to know what the next step was after the motion was dealt with. Will the motion(s) passed go to UCAG for specific recommendations for Bylaw amendments and then back to Faculty Council? The President noted that the other Task Force recommendations went to Academic Council as a report to be endorsed and then to UCAG for Bylaws.

Professor Bauer, speaking for the College of Communication Arts and Sciences, reported concern about the proposed TSC structure and composition and that it would not provide a balanced representation of the interests of all colleges. The smaller colleges will be disadvantaged relative to large colleges.

A member asked for clarification on what happens after the approved changes go to the UCAG. President Simon noted that there are things in the Task Force I Report that are Bylaw oriented, for example, there is a Bylaw on the composition of the TSC which would need to be rewritten. There are other aspects of the report, on page 13 for example, about University support for services that are not amendable to a Bylaw. One of the challenges with the original motion is that there are aspects that are Bylaw related and also aspects that are support related and some that are function related that would be in the Bylaws. The membership and election in terms of officers and part of the functions are clearly Bylaws. There is nothing currently in the Bylaws that would deal with support for services. The composition of the Board Liaison Committee is not a Bylaw issue, it is a Board policy.

President Simon noted all of the substantive pieces contained in pages 11 through 13 is the motion on the floor as proposed, so the motion included University support of the TSC. Each one of the sections has substantive pieces that you are endorsing or approving on pages 11 through 13. If changes are wanted in the substance of any of the recommendations embedded in pages 11 through 13, amendments must be made at this time. The President reminded members that they had created a process of conditional approval which has no definition in Robert’s Rules of Order. This was an action item on the agenda today so if there are specific changes to the motion this is a time to do so.

Professor Keller from Mathematics expressed the faculty opinions given, although limited, were in favor of supporting the recommendation for the TSC. Professor Sticklen offered an amendment as a substitute motion for restructuring of the ECAC and distributed to members. Professor Sticklen clarified the motion on the “yellow pages” as lines 11 through 91 to substitute
pages 1 through 13 in the Task Force 1 Report. The motion was seconded. Professor Potchen noted currently the Standing Committees elect their Chairpersons who then sit on ECAC which provides a rich resource to mix with the at-large faculty representatives. Professor Potchen proposed an amendment to the amended motion to increase the at-large faculty representatives to 8 at-large faculty plus the Standing Committee Chairpersons as the composition of the TSC. It was ruled that a second amendment was not possible. President Simon indicated a vote was needed on the amendment to substitute the motion on the floor.

Professor Sticklen was asked to identify the substantive differences between pages 11 through 13 of the Report and the substitute “yellow pages” lines 11 through 91. Professor Sticklen identified a change in how the Undergraduate student and Graduate student representatives would be selected. The second change is there is no mention of the early election of the TSC. Members have not had a chance to read the “yellow pages”. Professor Bolin indicated there were major differences specifically in the language used in the University support for members. This section is overly prescriptive and needs to be revised. The President asked which form of the motion, pages 11 through 13 of the Report or the “yellow pages” lines 11 through 91 is the best basis to use to recommend changes or amendments. There was a call for the motion to substitute the “yellow pages” for pages 11 through 13 of the Report. The motion passed. All further deliberation and changes will come from the “yellow pages”. Professor Keller moved to table definitely until the next meeting in order to have time to review the “yellow pages”. The motion was seconded and passed.

Other Business:
Professor Corby requested members who are considering amendments for consideration to forward these proposed amendments to the Governance office so they can be sent to members prior to the meeting.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jacqueline Wright
Secretary for Academic Governance

Tapes of complete meeting of the Faculty Council are available for review in the office of the Secretary for Academic Governance, Professor Jacqueline Wright, W32 Owen Graduate Hall, phone 355-2337.