

Steering 2021-01-12

OK, are there any let's call it approved? Are there any objections or changes to the draft minutes from November 3rd?

All right, we'll call it approved. So we are to president's remarks.

So thank you, Jennifer, and good afternoon, everybody. I think my bye bye usually have talking points in front of me in the first one begins with Happy New Year. And I think that is an appropriate thing to tell everybody. Happy New Year, although we certainly are and in a very, very difficult time, I think, for our country. But I still want to wish everybody and I feel very good about getting out of twenty twenty. I felt as though that was one of the longer trips around the sun that I've ever experienced. It really was was pretty amazing and I think probably for all of us. But I have to say the twenty twenty one is not acquitted itself particularly well either. And I think like everyone else, I still very much have one foot working at MSU and another, you know, when I may be on MSU in another. I'm watching what's happening in the world around us and we'll continue, I think, all of us to be doing that over the next few days. And I think it is challenging for everyone to come back and to both work and for our students to focus with the kind of events that are taking place worldwide. And, of course, in our country primarily. And I think we all need to be sensitive to that. And we'll continue to be so.

Just so you know, I've had conversations with Doug Monette, our chief of police. He's been in contact with the FBI because of these threats around the demonstrations or protests, riots, whatever they may be. And so I think we're keeping track of what's happening in Lansing and what the intelligence is there. And again, I have no immediate concerns about safety on campus, but I just want you to know that no one is neglecting that. And we are on top of this to the best of our ability and doing so.

And again, I think, you know, as an institution of higher education, we have a responsibility and will continue the responsibility to do this mission in education to help people understand, because I think there is a fundamental issue around education, some of the things we're seeing. So I think the kinds of discussions we can have on our campus are important, but also just our fundamental mission of educating informed citizens, I think looks all the more important than it's ever been. So one of the issues that people have been concerned about is it's vaccinations.

And like everyone else, you know, I've been very interested in that particular topic because I think it does make a huge difference in terms of our fight against covid-19. I hope what we said last week was really clear. I know there's people have there's been some confusion about at this point in time, MSU is not a vaccine distributor. We have applied to the state for the possibility of doing that, but we have not been accepted yet. So we're not in the position to buy vaccines to people. But we have been working really hard, I think, of county to provide support. So as you know, we've opened up the pavilion, set up something that allows for large numbers of vaccinations to take place, and we'll continue to cooperate with the state in doing it. And I think we advocated for it but didn't come to pass it. We advocated for higher education being incorporated into the K through 12 one B classification, if you will, for vaccination. That has not been accepted, as you know. But we also advocated and tier four over 65, which the state did do, which I think is helpful to us again, for our vulnerable populations and MSU to get them on an accelerated thing. Because, you know, Ingham County has put that back up to 70 for our region from the immediate time being. But my hope is they'll report it back. And I understand that

nationwide there's a plan under the Biden administration may have seen this to accelerate the distribution of vaccines and open up to everyone 65 and over for vaccinations in terms of priority. So we'll see how that happens, what happens with that as we go forward. So we're going to continue to be on top of this. Obviously, it's important everybody to understand. We're going to continue to work very hard to get vaccine distributed to the people of MSU and our communities as fast as we can. But it's one of those things right now. I would say it's not certainly not in my control in terms of how that's done.

But I'll continue to advocate for one way or the other tomorrow. We have in the morning we have a board meeting. This is a special meeting for broad leadership. So there'll be a vote to elect a new chairman of the board and there'll be an opportunity for public comment as well. So we will welcome two new trustees, Dr. Rhema Vasseur and Mr. Patrick Kiefel will be joining the board. And I again, everybody's welcome, of course, to attend that meeting. One of the things that you've asked me for and is the task force on racial equity recommendations. We will release those this week. They'll be released later in the week, along with some responses that I put together with the help from others to respond to some of the things have been put forward. There's some great recommendations there. And then at the end of January, we'll have three different webinars where we'll all meet with each of the leaders of those task forces, members of the task force to talk about. Their findings and go through some of the findings they had in some of the responses working on together going forward, and that'll take place at the last week in January, and I think we'll have that scheduled. So I think that's going to be, I think, important for the institution. Many of the things we're talking about in line with the work the government has been doing that you've been doing and some of the initiatives you put forward. I think they are very much in line with some of the things that were brought up by the task force. So I think there's common cause and all of us can make on this. But I look forward to the discussions of these critical issues. And I think, you know, I'll probably stop there. I'll give a more full report at Senator University Council of things that are happening. But again, I want to thank everybody. I hope you had a very restful and peaceful, to the extent possible holiday break. I know I did so, you know, so I wish that from you as well. And we've got lots of work to do every semester to particularly challenging this one will be different. But I think, again, there's the opportunity. And the other thing is just that we're starting our testing program. We already testing people and that program is already initiated. We're getting everybody who's come back to campus essentially will be tested. We have some students who are off campus who entered the program as well, and we've been increasing our capacity. I do want to let everybody know that we'll we'll work to be transparent and put those numbers up, protest. What numbers are we do anticipate will detect cases when people come back. Right. I want people to be aware of that. That's the whole point of the testing, obviously, is to allow us to detect people who may be positive and may need to go into isolation. We have single rooms available for everybody who is coming back to campus so they won't be with roommates so we can quarantine or isolate them as needed. But the number of positive will get will depend on what that is in the population, the people coming back. So you can kind of look at them right now and see what the prevalence is in the population. Twenty to twenty nine and get a feel for that. So let's just make up the number that was five percent. We tested a thousand people. We're going to have seven positive feedback from that test that we anticipate. So I just want people to not be shocked and feel like there's an outbreak going on. When we're doing return testing, we're getting numbers. So just be prepared to think about that and I'll try and communicate that more broadly to people as we get ready. But I just want people to be prepared for that and overwhelmed by those numbers. So. So I think I'll stop there and turn it back to you, Jim.

Thanks so much.

Thank you very much. It's really also a delight to see everyone of our faculty and our student leaders and my fellow colleagues from the provost office and certainly President Stanley and Norm Beauchamp and I. I am also delighted to be in twenty, twenty one. But it holds its own interesting challenges. But one of the things that's really been consistent has been the messaging from President Stanley. And I think that's that's been something we can all count on. And even though things are changing really radically, really quickly, that's been something that I think we can really be grateful for, Sam. And certainly it's helping guide all of us, even through times when we don't quite know what's coming next. So we are really delighted to have everyone back. And I hope many of you read the letter I sent to faculty and academic staff yesterday on the first day of our study start to this academic semester, I tried to provide some important information on university policy. And I know that this organization has been very helpful. And in helping steer many of these towards the committees and then helping to mobilize decisions through those committees. My email included an attachment that reminds faculty and academic staff of the policies and I hope they see saw those is relevant to their daily lives and work as MSU employees, as well as academics as well as leaders. And that letter also addressed the broader context in which we find ourselves as a university and as a community scholars and those. That duality is something that I know many of you in the context of these meetings have brought up. And so this is a challenging time, as President Stanley mentioned. And I think I'm going to echo and amplify one of the things he said, which is that we really must continue to work on the essential nature of truth and knowing of discussion and dissent and really have the respect and the value of all people. And that really fundamentally is what we do in the academy. And certainly the clarion call that I feel is Provo's to make sure that we inculcate that across all that we do in curriculum and in our scholarly work, much like our curriculum, an academic program, work that we talk about a great deal and your to help us navigate our policies also require vigilant and thoughtful attention. And I think when that attention strays, even for a little period of time, the policies themselves are at risk for becoming lax. And that, of course, to me can cause negative and in fact even dangerous impact to our community. So we have done a great deal of work and we are moving, I think, in the right direction and coordination. And I'm grateful for the common work and path that we are all on. And so I believe it is time to really devote considerable and deliberative attention to the review of all of our policies and looking at this with consistency, equity and justice. I started this work in the first office, as you know, with the partnership with Susanne Lange, who stepped in as our interim associate vice president for academic human resources. And I hope many of you know just how honorable and exceptional she is. And we're working diligently and nearly constantly on many of these matters. And she is someone that I'm very delighted to be in partnership with. I have asked Suzanne and the leadership within academic human resources, who are our faculty and academic staff affairs unit in the office of the Provost to assemble a task force to review all of the policies. As I mentioned, that note language matters, something you've seen me really try to be very precise with. And there's utilitarian nature, obviously, but there is precision that's necessary. And that's the fundamental starting point for this task force to really start by eliminating the use of binary pronouns and all of the policies. This will take a deliberative time, but not infinite time. And we will seek input from faculty and academic staff via the established Academic Governance committees and faculty senators.

And I really appreciate and on behalf of Dr. Lang, appreciate all of your input. As we move forward, we must move somewhat expeditiously from deliberation to adoption to implementation. And so you've also seen in the work that we've done, we've provided a discursive way of describing the thought processes, the rationale and in fact, the philosophy. We then move to adoption and then we also work on that good process of

implementation and sometimes things. Leave to the side and think that there will be implementation needs just as careful attention, so that requires all of us to continue to work on the much needed changes or in fact, the reaffirmation of where we are. Both are equally valid. And this, I think, will help protect all members of our campus community, the intellectual nature of what we do and to really ensure justice when behaviors do inflict harm on others. The second point I wanted to bring to you, of course, is we're at the beginning of the academic year and I'm here with also I think Mark Glargine is here. I'm not sure. I don't see he's on there. He is. When you move, I guess you move boxes. So Mark is here. And at my request, he sent out an email to faculty academic staff on Friday, reminding him, reminding all of us of the messaging we provided as we were moving into the winter break days. And this note provided practical information about the stutter start of the spring semester, especially in light of the reading, reviewing a reflection week, which we're currently in before the online instruction begins next Tuesday on January 19th. And the scheduled in-person instruction then begins on January 15th, January twenty fifth. I think all of you are aware of the stutter. Start of our semester is based on the best wisdom we had during our progressive planning operations based on federal limitations to on limitations to federal financial aid. Our State Executive Order, which president at Stanley and our government affairs were we're attuned to, and then the limits. Therefore, on our move and dates. Dr. Lajon also sent an email to our undergraduate students to provide them with information on the starts of the semester and about the programs that we have in place that are continuing to support their success. I was really delighted to meet with and talk with our undergraduate leaders and graduate leaders who are here with us today before the winter break to make sure that I understood their input to to these decisions. And we continue to work in partnership as we continue in this remote environment. In the messages that Mark sent to our educators and to our students, he reminded them of a number of important documents and ways in which we're working. That includes reminding our students of the MSU Community Compact, which explains their responsibilities for helping keep in keeping MSU a community that is safe and ask them to quarantine for ten days upon arrival. Back in the East Lansing area, he shared a workshop and seminar and training activities they're being offered to our students. He also shared the Martin Luther King Jr. commemorative celebration schedule, which I ask everyone to embrace as a critical part of our academic reflection as we begin the semester and then to ask our undergraduate students to complete the student experience survey if they haven't done so already, as well as many other items that were germane to that community. So, again, welcome back to everyone. Best wishes you best wishes as you begin your work this semester academically and teaching and scholarship. And thank you for your ongoing commitment to Academic Governance, to MSU and to the partnership with this provost and and our office.

Thank you so much for that.

Yeah, thank you. Thank you, Jennifer. And my wish for the New Year is more peace and more grace for all peace and grace. But I'm very enthusiastic. I'll comment in light of partnership to see how much I've enjoyed working with our new provost as we are figuring out how to navigate and support of all the efforts. It's been it's been wonderful. My my comments, I think, would be one of the things you reached out to me, Jennifer, was to talk about the reopening and not for this week, but for next. And I think what you're seeing and we wanted to share is what you're starting to see now is kind of how do we move from reflection to decision to implementation. And one of the things that we've pivoted from and hopefully you're seeing that as communications are now coming out from the chief diversity officer or from Mark Lajon in the Provos office or Thomas Jasco or Vanney Gore is try to move to where the individuals who are charged with those roles who develop

communications are also taking point and helping to cascade and make those decisions and implement. And so we refer to that as progressive planning. And I think it's allowing us to take out some of the confusion and increase the pace. And then at the same time, these individuals are still they take ownership of reaching out to stakeholders. And so it's meetings like this, right, with the steering committee. Right, where we also make sure that the shared governance pieces are being mapped in. And so I think it's it helps it's helping us move at a pace. And I'm really glad about that pivot.

A lot of our work has been supporting testing and vaccinations. And if there was an ask of the of the steering committee is to really Kaskade the information and president of Stanley letter from last week, you know, we can't over communicate. And it's so complex if you just go to the link about the phasing of vaccines. Right, with two phases, then three sub phases in each sub phase has three or two sub phases within that.

It's really complex. And so I just think the way that the comms group sent the message, a lot of work went in to make sure that that would give clarity about what we'll be doing and what we won't be doing beyond that.

Just updating that, I had a great meeting with the CRC for the College of Nursing, and we're doing Dean Rash's review and we are getting very close and part of shared governance as you sit in the room long enough to figure out what's the best way to go forward.

And so I think that that's also going well in terms of the interim dean and what we will do going forward. So that's my update. Thank you, Jennifer.

Fantastic. Thank you so much. Is, first of all, happy New Year. I wanted to thank you all for your service to Academic Governance. It's always work, but I think with this better start weekend, things have been going on in the world this week. It's especially work. So thank you. I my thoughts right now are sort of for us to think about what do we want to accomplish by the end of the year. We have after this meeting, we have February, March and April. So if there are things we want to move this year, we need to move them because we have three more meetings and hopefully we'll have time to go through the issue. Checker sheets. You can see the outstanding issues for the year in this meeting. You know, I had been thinking about that. I wanted to know the Faculty Senate was better and trying to figure out how to do that in the world of Zoome. And then our wonderful Secretary for Academic Governance independently proposed something that we are going to do, which is two different things. One is to set up Academic Governance office hours that will be attended by various of that large members. So anyone on the faculty or anyone can come and meet with us. And then also this coming in next month or so, try to meet just briefly, maybe for 15 minutes with all the standing committee chairs and every member of the Faculty Senate to talk about what led them to serve on the Faculty Senate or an Academic Governance what they'd like to see happen, how we can help. And this is an effort to know everyone in the group and and to close the distance a little bit, given that we've been in Somalia.

So Tither will be reaching out with time for that. Of course, you can say no, you don't have to meet with us, but we would appreciate it if you did.

So, you know, we've been working on I think I think of them as pillars of better Academic Governance workflow to try to make that structure work better for a while, several months now, the issue tracker and better report back mechanisms have been in place. We are

working on the manual of operating procedures. This is not Bylaws, but it's who does what, when and how. The new website, I guess the university is between Web platforms. We actually can't work on it right now, but we've been told that maybe by March we can. So hopefully by the end of the year we'll have a website that's more user friendly. We've been working on trying to help meetings be more action oriented and efficient. And I think there's always room for progress, but I think they're better than they have been. So I'm happy with how that's going. We've reorganized our filing system and we're working to socialize everyone in the university to how to interact with Academic Governance effectively, including us. We will be sending out to Faculty Senate probably a very brief diversity equity and inclusion survey. We were asked to be able to report on what does it look like in Academic Governance academic HRR said they could in theory give us the identified information except they'd have to pull it by hand and it wasn't efficient. So we're probably just going to pull people ourselves. So when that comes about that and I think I will stop there. Well, one other thing. You know, last month we discussed this false OCI reports, got some suggestions and ideas from faculty, and they're being made into motions like we did with the DIMOS.

So hopefully those will come in the next month or two. So those are my comments.

All right, so why don't we go to the reports and was there any burning questions on anything the four of us have said? OK, so let's go to city students of Matthew and Matthew.

Hi, everybody, happy new year. Like everybody said, I hope you had a restful break. I don't know you were all working during the break, but I hope it was at least restful as it was for me. So it was you. We're just we just opened up the offices yesterday of virtual offices yesterday, and we have not had a chance to do much. Our first committee meeting is this Thursday. But I could go through some of the things that we had before we went for the break. And so before we went for the break, we passed a couple of bills.

One was one of them was about the definition of a student and just giving UCC permission to go ahead and approve the changes that have been made. And I think the UCC chair will talk about that more when it's his turn. But we also talked about we also passed a bill about the leave on two year legal requirement that essentially gave a list of suggestions that could be used instead of that two yearly requirement.

Over the break, I was in the talks with VP Gore and Dr. Largent, and they would be coming to our meeting next week to talk more about it.

And then we also passed a few bills of around sustainability, including advocating for a student to be a part of the University Investment Committee and also for MSU to have a declaration of climate emergency. I met with President Stanley over the break and we have been also in the talks with that. Apart from that, students have been really enjoying all undergraduate students have been really enjoying their reading, reviewing and reflection, period. It's been interesting. People have been asking questions and we've not received any negative feedback so far from would you have graciously asked for input before this went out and went public. And so we were grateful for that. To a lot of students that I've spoken to have been going through the VIP training, just reading through the axilla by taking the surveys that the professors have sent to them and also just engaging with MLK Weekend and Black History Month that is upcoming. And so people have been seeing it as a restful weekend. It's been very much appreciated. Apart from that, most students very recently have been distraught with the events that happened at the Capitol. And so we have been planning events for next week that have to do with engaging in civil

discourse and making sure that students participate in those events. And also with the upcoming inauguration of President President elect Biden. We also have a couple of events coming up for those for the for that as well. And we would have students engage with those.

But apart from that, that that that is pretty much what we've been up to this and this year. Thank you.

Thank you so much. That sounds like you guys have been doing a lot. We have Council of Graduate Students.

Hello, everyone. I hope everyone again had a restful break. We are just wrapping up for the semester. So the one thing I just wanted to remind everyone of is I so I as well as butat.

And then I think maybe someone else on this call sit on the search committee for the new chief of chief of police for MSU, and we are bringing three finalists virtually to campus. So the fourteenth, the fifteenth and the 19th of this month, there are going to be Meagan's also on the committee. That's what I was forgetting. Sorry, Meggan. We are going to have some public forums, some public, I don't know, Q&A with the finalists. They're all at noon on those dates. And so I would really encourage all of y'all to.

Come to let your folks know about these events, because they're a really great opportunity to come learn about the finalists and then you'll have an opportunity to submit feedback. So I'll post a link to the page with those dates. But just wanted to make you aware that those are coming up. And welcome back to the start of the semester. I'm a little rusty, but we're all going to get back into it. So.

Fantastic. Thank you.

We have University Committee on Academic Governance.

Hello, so we did meet in December, which is not our usual sort of special meeting. It was nice to have that extra time because we actually got into some pretty heavy discussions. So we discussed extensively the interest in committee service form that goes out to our faculty. Historically, this forum has only given us information following the person's name and what colleges are from. This is a great amount of information for putting together slates of proposed candidates for different committees, and it's been a bit of a point of frustration to try and come up with slates, that minimal amount of information. And so we are extending that for this year. Thank you, Tyler. And the office of Academic Governance said, we discussed what we want to do to expand that. And one of the things is collecting some demographic information. But we may not use that demographic information to actually select slates. We thought it was important to start getting that information to understand who is applying for this, who is who is expressing interest in other ways. We could expand that pool. And also we discussed a little bit on the statement that people wanted included in the. And we so there was a lot of discussion around what what information can we use to expand the way we create these proposed. But I'm very excited to just have a requirement that people write something that you have to have written, a reason why you want to be on a committee that would just that would be a thrill to actually have at least that. So in addition to that, we review to track and progress of the college Bylaws review rubric. Again, thank you, Tyler. We're finally putting together kind of a formal rubric which we never had before on how to review college Bylaws to hopefully

keep things smooth and consistent. I don't think it's going to save time because this is a very extensive. A complicated thing, so it may not be less time consuming, but it will be smooth and consistent, which is valuable. So we reviewed that and kind of gave input on that a little bit. And we also discussed some possible communication strategies because we understand that people are kind of concerned about not understanding what we do and not understanding how we can put together of proposed candidates for Academic Governance committees and so forth. And so we did have a little bit of a discussion around how we improve communications, what we might do. And I think that's something that's going to be ongoing because we didn't exactly come to a firm conclusion about action items on that front, but we at least open discussion on it. So so that's what we were up to. December meeting.

Fantastic. Thank you so much. We have University Committee on curriculum.

Hello and happy New Year, everyone. As always, the curriculum committee has been busy. Our last meeting was in November and at that time for programs, we approved three new programs effective summer. Twenty twenty one is a foreign language teaching graduate certificate and an effective fall. Twenty twenty one is a business minor and alignment brings data science coordinate major because as you know, we already have a data science major. So this is one through Lyman Briggs. Additionally, we had nineteen program changes with no deletions. And then with this we also process twenty seven new courses, fifty course changes and five deletions and then moratorium's to report they're all effective. Fall twenty twenty to spring. Twenty, twenty two. You see gas or the University Committee and Graduate Studies was consulted and approved by the provost and they include hospitality business management, master of Science Degree Hospitality Business Graduate Specialization in food service, business management, master of science. And that's my report.

Thanks. All right. Thank you. So McFarlan emailed me right before the meeting. He is busy as a veterinarian and could not get away, but he sent me an update that said that his health committee has been working on the Subcommittee for the Code for Professional Standards, sent the revised document to give me a list of about 12 different groups and people, and they've been soliciting comments from other people.

The goal is to get it before the Faculty Senate in February for ideas. More suggested revisions with the full Faculty Senate vote in March. And he said there's been many perspectives, a lot of discussion, a lot of input. So if your personal suggestion isn't in there, don't take it personally and don't have your point. But they are busy working on it and there is much discussion. OK, University Committee on Faculty Tenure.

So we haven't had any meetings yet. Our meeting is tomorrow, our first meeting of the year tomorrow. An item that we've been dealing with for a while now is the impact of covid on annual reviews and on promotion and tenure and working out some documents to help faculty get through this system. So I don't really have anything to add, but I just like to make a comment. Dr. Stanley mentioned that MSU had opened up a pavilion for the covid for the coveted vaccine and two people independent. They're not associated with MSU. They both went there and they said it is incredibly efficient. And they said MSU should be a role model for across the country to how we give the covid vaccine. And so I'm signed up for February 2nd for my first shot. So I'm looking forward to.

Catholic University Committee on Graduate Studies.

Hi, everybody. Ben Van Dike, vice chair of UCGS. I'm sitting in for Denise Hirshey today. Real quick, we we met yesterday was our January meeting. We approved 12 program requests. Five were requests for changes in requirements. Five were requests for moratorium's. Three of those were moratorium's just for one year to adjust. Support for current students affected by covid to new program requests came to us from the newly formed Department of African and African-American Studies in May and a PhD program. Those were approved unanimously and with applause.

The programs are incredibly dynamic and very, very exciting. I would highly encourage all of you to check them out. It's a big it feels big.

Next, we had a discussion regarding the GRC. We had our committee realized and we had known this. But over time, in the past year and especially last semester, we're seeing more and more requests to eliminate the GRE as part of the admissions process. Since it was just kind of coming at us quite a bit, we realize that maybe it's a good idea for us to have a discussion on why this was happening. Why did this pattern emerge? Because as a committee, we didn't have a really great grasp on on its motivation or if there was any kind of consistency across units and colleges. And so we had a great discussion and we decided that the discussion should continue, but would be best served all of the different departments and units who either have or are planning to or even discussing the group and its role in admissions as it.

As a way of kind of. Steering those discussions, we decided that we're going to sit down and come up with a with a much more useful kind of example of what information should be included when the request is made. And so then it'll be easier for.

For us to kind of observe, absorb and then and respond, but some more of those conversations, which I find really interesting, especially about standardized testing, will come in the future and likely through the graduate school. And one last thing, there's a follow up on the process for the research integrity officer evaluation process with the now being a five year appointment and reviewed.

I'd like to ask about the timing of the of the of the review for UCGS. We would like to know and I guess I'm speaking to a previous Woodroffe, should this report from us be a part of the five year process? Should it come in a year or two and three or kind of midway or specifically at the end or both? Those were questions that came up in our committee. And then and then the other question is, should we set up a meeting with you or would you like to come to one of our meetings and discuss this further?

So, Ben, what I think coming to your meetings and maybe thinking through this with you a little bit more detailed would be a good idea. So let's make sure that happens. And I can meet with you or the chair before the committee or or just come to the committee. I'm happy to do both or either.

Greg, I appreciate that. Yeah, I'll be in touch then with scheduling things. Sounds good. And and that's it. Thank you. I'm good.

Thank you all for context. Faculty Senate voted to endorse the motion that would make the grade not required. I don't think it eliminates that. It doesn't require it. And for the context on that, if you want to email me, if you don't have that context, I could give you that context.

Yeah, I'd appreciate it.

I mean, you know, what also came up yesterday is that somebody pointed out that the university itself doesn't require the degree. And so maybe our discussions are sort of moved. Right. But but it certainly was a great it was certainly great. Right. And we couldn't really quite put our finger on what our role was, but also where we're we're kind of where does the committee stand on the issue?

So it was just kind of all coming at us a little bit from every direction. So, yes, I'd really appreciate it.

Thanks, Jennifer Ludden. And Ben, if you don't mind me adding to that, just because I was at the meeting that I was getting was really that so much of UCGS that function as ministerial saying, well, that's your department's choice. We're not going to put ourselves in your place. But putting out sort of guidance for people requesting saying this is what you should include in your request so that we know you've thought it through. Right. And and that, I think, reflects something that I know you've been doing, helping put out guidance to people, requesting things of it as something that really I think helps clean up standing committees when the committees themselves have procedures that would be requesters can can look at and figure out, well, is this going to be processed expeditiously?

Am I allowed to jump in here? All right, go ahead.

And I'm I'm on the committee. I'm not the chair at all, but making able colleagues, I would just add that.

I think so these these GRV removal requests have been coming in for the last year or two. And I think one of the things that we've this also ties with, with CBS is just wanting to find some uniformity and in programs are taking this process seriously.

We see a lot of variability in the amount of rigor or detail that we get in the materials. And so it's really saying that we can't just get a piece of paper with one line that says we're removing the GRE and not saying, oh, OK, so what's the plan then? And I think that was a lot. I think Tyler put it very well.

But but saying that, you know, if we're going to have this process, we need folks to be deliberative and and a little bit more explanatory that we can't just check the box on a piece of paper that has a sentence on it that that maybe it's a little bit too too easy.

So. Yeah.

All right, thanks so much, Megan.

All right, and then I think you can follow up with any of us after just email.

Will do. Thank you.

OK. University Committee on Student Affairs.

So are UCC chair texted me doing Catalana and want me to tell you I don't have a report at this time, I dropped my hot chocolate onto my laptop this morning, so I'm only able to listen in this meeting.

But he does not have a report. That's terrible.

I will say that Coggs also endorsed the change, the definition of a student that is in the Student Rights and Responsibilities. So I think the next place that would go is somewhere in Academic Governance.

Send it to Tyler, Megan, and we'll figure out where it goes.

Yeah, well, it's supposed to come from UCC, but and still was not able to help out. It's been endorsed by UCFA Hogg's and ACSU. So the next step is somewhere is Steering, presumably to get routed somewhere, Yagiz for that to occur.

And we'll take care of it.

All right, so University Committee on Undergraduate Education.

Good afternoon, everyone. Andrew Corner, representing the UCU attached to the email that went out today, is item to the UK report from fall semester. Twenty twenty for all of you to that for full details on what you've been up to. We have met once for spring semester already. On July 7th, we recommended approval of three curriculum items that you'll hear about from Marsi when they're finally approved. But one of them was the Bachelor of Arts degree in African-American and African studies that was unanimously endorsed with applause, just like it was at graduate studies. And that's my report.

Thank you very much. All right, so let's go on to our new business. The first is this five point one faculty role in budget decision. So there were a lot of emails and questions about this in particular. One person wrote in what strategic, financial or budget proposals or actions are underway?

What's the role of the Faculty Senate and receiving and communicating strategic budgetary changes to our constituencies?

What's the role of the faculty regarding involvement and strategic budgetary decisions?

So when I talked with this person, I asked them what they wanted to have happen and they decided to wait and see the update on the university budget at the January Faculty Senate sort of hear what's going on in the meantime.

And Gordon looked at sort of best practices in terms of university budgeting and shared governance kind of structures.

And there's a couple of thoughts there, you know, about reporting and committee structure and whatnot. But there's not a proposal this month. But I wanted to put it out there because it is something the faculty are very interested in. And there is a little bit of well, you see them in state and get their salaries cut. Why did we make the comparison? That happens? But I wanted to put it out there because I think folks are waiting to hear, you know, from our budget presenters at Faculty Senate in January before they bring a motion. But the ideas are sort of floating around of anyone either has answers or is interested in making any of this into a motion. Please let us know. So this is more of an by. Anything on that before we move on?

OK, you know, as always, it's really interesting. We'll see if we get to the Turkish people have a lot of ideas, but it takes time and effort to actually make them into motion. So if anyone ever is willing to volunteer your time and effort to make something into a motion, we'll always take it. Five point two. We wanted to follow up with this issue that was raised in March. Twenty twenty. We had a professor and a chair come in over a disagreement about if they could use racial slurs in their syllabus.

And it got sent to UCFT and we wanted to follow up and see where it's at and what needs to happen is not here. Did anyone else know or should we call him enough? Go ahead, Tyler.

So after he e-mailed us today and said he wasn't going to make it, I called him and he let me know that essentially what happened was he so big asterisk. This is second hand.

But you let me know that essentially he tried to schedule a meeting between sort of the parties involved and that was starting to happen.

And then sort of the submitter, the person who brought this up said, well, I want to have a lawyer at this meeting. And he was like, OK, it's kind of weird, but you can do that. And he said, you know, of course, I am going to let the department chair sort of tell his version of it, too. And she decided she did not want to take part in that and withdrew the request to do anything about it. And so it just sort of petered out.

So is it close that I mean, obviously from an air perspective, this isn't our business anyway? I mean, we're not in an hour, but that's not our job. But I think it it sort of brought up this bigger issue about the use of racial slurs in classroom teaching in general. And was there anything else you think we need to follow up with or should we just close it out?

Sorry, did you say Anna?

Yes, that Anna, the one that sort of brought this back?

Yeah, no, it seems to me like that. I mean, it was brought to Steering. We referred it to UCFA. And there's no movement forward. That's fine. I think the specific issue was not the right to use racial slurs, but whether or not a recommended syllabus statement against using racial slurs was an impermissible restraint on academic freedom. And that that was the kind of, you know, was it a sort of silence saying a faculty who didn't want to put that statement on their syllabi? So but yeah, it sounds like it's closed.

OK, all right, so nobody sees that we need to do anything else with this, right?

All right. OK, Tyler, if you could close it for us. OK, thank you.

All right, so the terms of health care, so I know you sent this in last spring, but we are still not listed as signatories on their page. Do you have any idea what that's about?

I don't, but I know how to find out. So I appreciate you telling me about that, Jennifer, and I'll find out. I had I Azzedine to reach out. They they had said that they had and sometimes things get lost.

But it's easy enough for me to check the way I kept looking and we still haven't shown up.

So the principals are all ones that we are supportive of. So thank you.

All right. Yeah. And I think we already added this to the tracker to make sure to follow till this happens. But if it's not there, could you put it there?

All right, thank you.

OK, so credit monitoring and fraudulent unemployment claims, again, this is something someone sent to us, they didn't feel like making a particular motion, but this was a concern because I guess there has been a lot of identity theft in universities related to fraudulent unemployment claims.

I think the person who brought it was concerned that, you know, is this particularly commented on, Matthew? Do we have credit protection or anything like that? And. This is an to everyone, if anyone asks, it's not specific to MSU, it's happening everywhere and I think we don't want to do anything in particular about it. Just no. And how we responded to the bringer of this right, and just said, OK, so do we need to do anything else with this or can we close it?

I mean, I think it's close unless somebody else's is modest in that way, I guess that I guess there is identity theft happening, but no more here than anywhere else to just be vigilant, as usual.

OK, so we actually have time today. I'm so excited to go through the internal tracking system, I wanted to show you guys the issues we have remaining, which ones are open and which ones are closed, what we want to try to do before the end of the year. I'm going to have Tyler screens here for us. This is this is in our Academic Governance Steering committee teams, by the way, and we are at large members and Tyler and I review this weekly just to make sure there's nothing to follow up on.

So if you can look. So item two here was amendment to an Ad hoc committee statement, which was closed and done, so we actually let's not even bother with the closed ones. Let's just bother with the open ones. OK, so open. And by the way, on our sheet we have who submitted their contact information, et cetera, but we just hid those columns for this is to protect people. We didn't ask their permission to put their names and e-mails up on the screen today. So propose Standing Committee on Race and Ethnicity. So this came to Steering in October. It was referred back to the introducers to develop a proposal. So, again, like I said, we can have issues that we really need to work on specific motions. And you considered it, but really it's sent back to the people who brought it to say, can you come up with something a little more concrete that we can make a motion about? So this is sitting back with the Bringers to formulate it into something that we can bring into motion, saying that the proposed standing committee on women that referred back to the Bringers to to formulate it into a motion percept participation in Academic Governance again.

And really good idea. We've talked to a lot of people again, agot, we talked to you, we talked to us, got referred back to the Behringer to try to make it into some proposal that we could weigh and try to act on. The person who brought it is a busy post. Doc has not brought something forward and so it's been a while. Our thought on this was to. To take it to the the committee for whatever committee represents the post and see if they want to bring it forward, and if they don't, then just close it because nobody's bringing us emotion motion. But if like I said, if you see anything on here, you want to write a motion for, let us

know, because all of these some of these issues are just waiting for someone to propose something. So that's post-box. If we go down to nine, we already talked about professional responsibility. That's with UCFT academic specialists in Academic Governance is with Yucatec and it says you can plan to address in January the previous webcam guidance. I just like this. Is that interesting? So we discussed it at the Faculty Senate we table that. I mean, effectively the policy went into place. UCU is going to has a subcommittee seeing if we want to propose anything as refinements to it or not. So that's why that is UCU is considering if we should propose refinements. Replacement of this is a done deal. That's number 12, 13. Ten months versus 12 months salary.

October steering committee, basically, the president owns this one. And I don't know Tyler or President Stanley, if you. Have any updates on this particular issue?

Let me be vocal. Yeah, I don't have any direct updates on it, I know it's being worked on.

I don't know where they are. And again, and I think that I think we've talked about the issues in terms of is there one policy is there are two policies, is there are jobs for people. And I think that's still being worked out. What's the cost and what's the benefits, essentially. But but I think there's I think it's moving forward.

And I think anybody added join the effort. I think we had put out a request of other faculty, wanted to get engaged. And I don't think anybody signed on for that particular effort that I'm aware of.

So I can we put that out to the faculty. So we put it out to the whole faculty or just the senators, because I'm about to send another email to the whole faculty if we want volunteers.

Yeah, let me let me talk to the let me talk to Brian and find out where they are and whether they feel they need to do or are making adequate progress.

Well, if you need volunteers, we'll get you back in. Yeah, I think I have 14 Code of academic advising responsibility university.

All right. So UCU has it. That's that's a shot. I don't know, Andrew, if you want to say anything more about that.

We have a subcommittee that's looking into the whole thing and their work is begun in the sense that they formed the subcommittee, but nothing more has been done.

OK, all right, Fatheaded, can you go up a little bit so I can see the bottom? OK, great.

Academic advice. OK, we just did that faculty involved curricular materials, this is with UCFA Progress Reviewing Research Integrity Officer, we discussed Ad hoc committee on administrator review. This is we we do. We have our full committee now, Tyler, for this.

No. No, and Will. Yeah, I'll talk to the workplace bullying on talk to you in COGS about getting there, folks, and then work with that UC, OK.

So did I mention are passed and sent out.

We're also meeting at large members with the new chief diversity officer later this month about how we can support diversity efforts.

And I think the reason this isn't closed out is I want to continue to think about how to actually follow up to get some of these implemented. So they're Pasteur's circulated that we want to follow up to implement them. Policing is we're waiting for the policing report, which is supposed to come out later this month. And then Stephanie, Anthony will make motions, you know, based on what in their. Of with a group, the metrics I'm leading that group, we had, like I said, we met, we hoped that we were going to be able to just pull things from academic HRR. We can't. So we're going to do a survey of workplace bullying. Again, we talked about that. We're getting representatives ad hoc committee and education are of honors and awards. Anna is has a group and is. Is actually we'll hear about this this month, they're coming very close, OCR employee review of Nascence Sample. We already talked about a little bit. We had a discussion last month, lots of ideas, someone to make them into motion. The process for reversing salary cuts is just we're continuing to talk about what would be the. I don't I don't want to call them benchmarks, but what when we look at the university finances and see what what we know that it might be time and then following up the times of health care pledge. So I guess there's a couple of things here. The first is we're working to tackle these issues. We check in with them every week. The second is.

It's an interesting phenomenon and probably makes total sense, right, that people have a lot more ideas than people have time of ways to form them into concrete proposals, which makes sense. But the other, I think, take home is, is if you or anyone you know, on any of these open issues, especially the ones that are waiting for proposals, have energy interests to make a proposal to bring it forward in the next month or two is the time because after April sort of a crisis we don't typically meet in the summer.

So I don't know if people have thoughts or questions on any of that, but I wanted to show it to you. So you guys had a sense of the big picture.

OK.

And and I guess the other thing I would say about that is that Academic Governance is work and bringing things forward as work and doing things is work. And I it's it's an interesting task to find the right balance.

I don't know if the words balance, but it's a lot easier to complain about something that it is to propose something better. So we but we both take the complaints and ask for help in proposing something better.

All right, so communication from university administrators on social media, this was more of an FBI and a quick discussion and actually our poster child for this at least, was here to leave.

It's the way this came up is that we got feedback from students that they really loved that Mark Lajon is on Reddit and they are very, very active with him on Reddit and in the world of covid and social media.

It was sort of this larger question about, you know, for looking for different ways to communicate. To what extent should administrators think about social media? When we

were discussing this, one person said, you know, if my university president is spending all their time on Reddit, I would think go back to running the university.

But we just wanted to put it out there and get get get perspectives from students or anyone else about the value of having university administrators on social media interacting with faculty and. So any thoughts about that at all?

I think that I haven't I'm not on Reddit myself, so.

So just to just to just to say that nothing anybody cares necessarily. But I certainly know what Reddit is. And I think that, you know, we are searching for ways to better communicate with students. So if you look at the opening rates on email, you know, 40 percent is a is a miraculous opening read for us, for a student email if we get to 40 percent or that's a big deal. And that's happened a few times in this environment, but not that often. And so I think we are looking for better ways to communicate and to meet students halfway. And I think, you know, the the challenges that, you know, to make sure that whatever we're communicating is consistent across these platforms and is consistent, I think, you know, for general for us with universities messages and that people are clear that, you know, if Mark is clear on this Reddit account that he's speaking as Mark Glargine the associate provost, then I'm pretty comfortable with it. I think the challenge is we can get into and we've had examples that this university is where people are using these platforms and then saying things that may be completely inconsistent with the values of the university. And so that creates problems for me, for administrators.

So I think I'm very comfortable with people having personal accounts. I'm very comfortable with people deciding that this may be a good way to communicate with students through this kind of account, recognizing that, you know, you're not going to give the control, the kinds of responses you get or other things. And those are all going to be public. But I think if you're comfortable in that environment, answering questions and you're reaching a group of students that you or faculty, whoever it is you might know otherwise, I think be useful.

It's just making sure that, you know, it's clear not that not from my perspective, that the administrators understand that if they're saying I'm answering as heroes more questions than their representative university at that time. Markland, you as an individual could do other things on there.

That would be his own personal things. But I think if you're building yourself that way, it's important for people to recognize that we'll consider speaking for the university. Having said that, I think it's I don't think it's a bad thing at all. And I think any ways we can communicate better with groups I think is wonderful. And, you know, whether it's Instagram or whatever, whatever the mechanism is.

Including things, you know. Yeah, so I'll just stop there.

A Megan, if you have any thoughts about the.

Yeah, I do, I mean, I lurk on that on there because it's one of the places where you can find, you know, you're looking at some MSU students. And I would just say one thing that I think really resonates with students from the way that Mark engages.

And also there's a couple of faculty members who engage on that that really resonate well is is just being really upfront and frank with students and speaking in a really just like,

colloquial tone and being willing when when a student is maybe posting that they're upset about a decision or don't understand why something happened, being willing to say, like, let me explain to you what went behind this decision or let me explain to you this thing that maybe you don't understand or let me give you this insight we may still disagree about. You may still disagree with me about why this thing happened.

You may still not like it, but let me at least let you know what what let us what sort of thinking led us to get here? Again, a faculty member, someone will complain about another faculty member and their certain faculty members will who jump in and say, listen, let me try to give you what I think that faculty member was going through their head. Let me try to put you in their shoes and let you know why they might have made the decision that they made or, you know, try to help you think through this process and give you some of the inner workings of how this what the perspective is. And I think it really just when I watch some of these interactions, there are some people who are just like continue to be upset, but there are others who say, oh, well, I didn't know this piece of information or I never considered this. Or, you know, maybe this means that I'll go to the for example, the faculty member and, you know, have the conversation that you suggested I have or ask the question that you suggested that I ask. And so it's just this very personable way of talking that I've seen that you don't get perhaps in a formal email. And again, there's just some some administrators and faculty members who's really taken advantage of this this space to have more frank discussions with with students. So.

Yeah, I'm sorry. My mom was about to call me just right now, so but I totally agree with Meghan.

I think for us at MSU we have actually had this conversation, that board, just whether we should create a Reddit account to engage with students. There was a time when we were being dragged by students because of a rumor that we were the ones who said that spring break should be canceled. And we wanted to engage with students to tell them that we were actually not the people who made that decision, because Reddit was really mad at us and our board decided that it could be very risky just because, you know, things could be misinterpreted, especially when you're talking to students on social media. But I do think that the way that Dr. Lajon has been using Reddit has been really impressive. I think he has been using it as and he probably can speak for himself better, but he's been using it as a finger on the pulse of students when things go on and using it as a listening tool and not necessarily a primary responding tool. And so it's been great for me because when I get to engage with him and I and I'm like, OK, students are really angry at administration about this issue. He knows what I'm talking about because he has just read 500 comments from angry students on Reddit, as I have as well on Facebook. And so I think I think administrators could engage with students in that sense if they are going to use those tools to listen and feel students policies rather than, you know, use it as the primary tool for responses. So I think that's my opinion on this.

And I think we've mostly decided to get to bottom. I don't know what the right answer here, but getting a lot of appreciation on Reddit and the company that is working for some time and you do have additional things you wanted to up on just really briefly.

So when I left present Stanley the email response rate, because the comment I saw that made me sort of bring this up or was saying, you know, I read Largent's emails because I know that guy. Right. And he doesn't know that. It's just he's on Reddit, but the student saying, you know, I read his emails don't necessarily read Stanley, you know, and it's funny how personable, how much that's a one to one interaction. The students can make a

difference. And the other thing I noticed is that the finger on the pulse element of it is used just an hour before this meeting.

And I'm literally the person tracking these things, this faculty involved curricular material that we've sort of discussed a little while ago. And then it's somewhere I was reminded of it an hour ago, reading about several students saying this is a major issue that I'm paying one hundred sixty six dollars for this book that this professor wrote four years ago. And it just that ability to sort of remind us that, oh, these are real people facing real problems outside of our Zoom calls, that it's easy, I think, for some of us especially to see it as sort of a cell on a spreadsheet and forget that there are people and it's and it's just such a good sort of medium to to not that specifically the social media generally to to remind us sort of the humanity of.

Yeah, me, Megan had a comment here, lurking can be informative. So, again, no specific suggestion, just sort of a thought, put it out there as a huh? I love that we have associate provost that's really active on Reddit. I mean, it makes us feel accessible.

I told my go ahead, I was just going to say, I think the one thing to caution, though, and that I always try to remind myself, is that there are particular cultures and particular people who choose to engage on these platforms and that we can't assume that they are representative in any way of the entire body. So there are there is a certain culture around, for example, ready. And there are certain personalities and types of people who will choose to engage on that. There are certain types of people and demographics. You choose to engage, for example, on Facebook and make things public. And so I think it's at our peril that you look at that and assume that that is a true random sample of our university students. So, yes, it can be a really good way to it's a good way to get a pulse of the most vocal students on campus, I would say. But but I think you have to be wary, too. You have to be careful to not get so sucked in and to think that that is what everybody thinks. So and I always say that because I have to stop myself sometimes to remind myself that this is a self selected cultural community. This is not every student on campus. And there are many others who I have no idea about who do not engage here, who probably think very differently. So.

I told my 20 something daughter this week that one of the platforms she pulled me into, I said I feel so hip and young. And she said, as soon as you say hip and young, you're by definition not happen.

So.

All right, after the release of policing reports, President Obama, I think you update it as though I wasn't what we really wanted to know is the timing. And I wasn't clear if these reports were the ones that are coming at the end of the month are the ones that are coming next week.

So so the reports will come out, the written reports that will come out next week. This week will come out this week. And then two weeks from now, right at the last week of the month, we will do three different seminars. So each co-chair of the task force will present and I will join them and we'll talk about the issues and have a chance in the webinar to talk about them so people can listen.

I think your subcommittee should have the written report by the end of the week. OK, fantastic. Do you know where to find them when they come out?

I will make sure that you get it right away as we must so follow.

All right, so in our effort to ever improve Academic Governance meetings, the idea came and it was less a suggestion or an idea of should we move the remarks like the president proposed in my remarks to the end? And the reason the part of the reason this came up is.

And the last thing I want to have time for questions and answers, but the last time I opened it up for questions about the comments, we got questions about things that didn't have anything to do with the comments, which was a little bit not what was the plan.

So I don't I don't know that anyone has a strong opinion about this one way or another. But we just wanted to bring it before the group and say, should we keep these at the beginning? Should we try moving them to the end and see what happened so we can discuss?

Or not.

Maybe they will. I do think one logistics region that it is helpful to have them at the front and I say this is the kindest way possible is that is now on Zoome. But even more so when we're in person, it helps with the stragglers so that by the time we get to voting, we definitively have quorum. Not saying that anyone should be late and everyone should be paying attention to the remarks, but it does. It can be a little dangerous to start to move immediately to action items at the start of a meeting because you do have people who wander in 15, 20 minutes late and you might not get a quorum right at the start of a meeting. So sometimes it is nice to have some in fluffs time. Now, it's not fluff, it's important, but the built in remarks so that you do have time to make sure you have a quorum. So I do think there's a very helpful logistical. But I do know there are some times where either President Stanley or I anticipate in the future the Probus have to duck out at the end of the UC or Faculty Senate because they have other commitments. I don't know if maybe the schedule would change if they knew their remarks were toward the end, but also wondering if that would pose a scheduling problem, given that sometimes their schedules are very packed.

And no real appetite to try moving this meeting with leaders. Does anyone think we should experiment with it the other way around?

Go ahead and I guess I would just say what I don't like is having the comments at the beginning and then the only opportunity to respond to the comments is at the end because or asked questions, because then if and I can see, I mean, that there would be a problem because I'm well, lately we've been so active that we've always gone to five o'clock. But in the earlier periods we had actually ended early.

And then if your comments just sort of scheduled before 30, you say and you're in another meeting and we actually move it up earlier, I can see that logistically there would be a lot of problems there in the way that Megan was talking about.

But I don't like the idea that you sort of get to respond to the comments perhaps after the president and provost have left or want to ask questions and they're not there. So I think if we keep the comments off the front, we should also keep the response to the comments in that location.

Now, the talent, the talent I had in that one was lost for questions on the comments that some people had, another unrelated issue they really wanted to discuss. And so people were talking about this completely unrelated issue and it made it hard for the items that we had for the baby.

Is there any consideration, perhaps imposing like a procedural time limit on discussion after the remarks?

I mean, I've been in another body at my previous institution where we had it had a set time limit and the body could vote to extend that time. But it was just we just every every meeting we understood the understanding was we limit comment to X number of minutes. And if it was really important, we take a vote to extend it, but otherwise we cut it off. So, I mean, could that be a solution?

Is to everyone agree on no longer than X amount of time on discussion after the opening remarks?

I think that's a good idea. Go ahead, Anna.

I would also say that I think it's perfectly fine to let people know if their comment is unrelated to anything that the president proposed or someone else said that that belongs in and comments from the floor at the end of the meeting and say, great, thank you. Sounds like that's a comment from the floor. And we'll certainly get to that.

And I like this. I think I think that makes sense. I think that makes sense. And I think I tried to say that, but I think I could be clearer about if it doesn't have to do with us, please wait till then. So I think that's a good idea to tell. If you can just make a note of that and let's just sort of make that a procedural and Faculty Senate and see how that works. Thank you. All right, the next question is about live streaming Academic Governance meeting, so obviously people can join them on Zoome. We can and do post Zoome meeting recordings.

But we've been watching, for example, ACSU and how we can stream media space, Facebook or YouTube. And it is easier in the sense that people don't have to log in to them. They don't have to be visible. They it's easier to record it and watch it later. So it's a little bit of work. It's a little more anonymous. You can float in and out more easily than you can on Zoom.

Is this thing that people think is worth doing or make some.

Or are people totally indifferent?

And a bit, if you don't mind, would you mind sharing sort of why somebody who doesn't know it?

So last year, myself and my colleague, Representative Adam Green, actually wrote a Lifestream bill because we knew that students would not be able to attend many of our meetings due to class conflicts and things like that. So even before the coronaviruses we wrote that bill saying that we would lifestream on meetings and we finally got to implemented this year into what we pretty much use this Facebook. And that's because we have a Facebook account. I've never actually checked. If Academic Governance or Steering has a Facebook account that could, you know, that could do that. But it's very

easy. It's much easier than actually recording and posting because then you save space on your laptop and students like Jennifer said can float in and out anonymous more anonymously than you know than than this system. And so I I think that's why we do it. It's also easy because I think you can have closed captioning make that available on Facebook as well.

But apart from that, I, I don't know if anybody's funding the system, inconveniencing.

The one thing is, is I know well, right now, I'm sure Cher is using the zoo as a way to take attendance for the senators and for University Council. So I don't know about that ability, especially if you can kind of float in and out.

I don't know if that would be any consideration so that people who are supposed to attend would be required to attend by them. And the other is simultaneous for people who are lurking, I guess. And in a way, it makes it actually easier on Academic Governance.

First, because she saw fewer people into which pile those who are voting and those who are not voting, then in total in total agreement of that.

Does anyone object to doing so to a would go on good, would they have the ability to enter into the meeting and make comments so the people who are on Facebook alive or so on?

So I think my one concern would be about anonymity essentially, and people coming in and potentially disrupting meetings or doing other things. And what would the control be kind of on that right now?

On the right, you have essentially some knowledge of who is participating. So I think people need to keep their cameras on or anything, but at least there's some identity associated general with most people. So I guess my question is, how do you make sure that you don't have people who come in and just want to disrupt meetings? And so what's their ability kind of interface? And again, in that system, if you're lifestream to this one way?

OK, OK, it's all broadcast. Yeah.

That then I don't have any issue with that.

But again. And I just go ahead. Oh Megan.

I have a question that's sort of the same as President Stanley, but going in a different direction, which is that if someone is watching on live stream and they have a comment that they want to make that is not disruptive but is productive and as adept at an open meeting, they would be able to ask for voice. And so I think that it would be possible for them still to do that in this situation. But I just want to sort of flag that, that they could leave the watching if they really felt so moved and then asked to come into the meeting to ask for.

I think people could still, in theory, to invite them to just be another option. We got Megan in Menander.

Yeah, I was just going to suggest thinking about whatever platform you use, thinking about comments and either someone monitoring if there's either shutting down comments altogether or not allowing that or someone moderating monitoring them live, because we've seen some things happen with live commenting.

And you don't want something affiliated with the university or with us to someone posting some nasty, nasty things in the comments. So I just want to pose that as a potential challenge that I don't know you would have, that you we've encountered with Zoom as much because everyone sort of has their name and it's a little bit more of a closed system. So I don't know how we handle that.

I think if you picked up what I was concerned about, obviously what I experienced essentially an earlier meeting that I had not not not Academic Governance meeting with a different view. So.

So, Tyler, I mean, should we just sort of sit with that for now? Should we try it once and turn off comments? What what should we do with this?

I don't know whatever folks want to do, but turning off comments is definitely possible. I mean.

What we can say is, look, this Facebook or whatever is one way it's broadcast, not comment. If you want to comment or interact, come to zoom.

Yeah, noting, of course, that sort of there isn't a public right to for sort of nonmembers to come in and talk to these bodies, there's for the board that's a legal thing here. It's it's a.. Right. That you could get a senator to make a motion to give you a voice. But that sort of happens on the back end. Even in regular in-person meetings, a pedestrian can just sort of raise their hand and decide they want to talk. And so.

So you you can stream it to YouTube in terms of comments on YouTube? My caution would be I would not post on that YouTube page the link to the zoom information because then you're going to get zoom bombed if you just posted. If you go out on the open web and post on YouTube at assumingly, you are going to get zoom bombed. So if that's not a good way, a good way to do, I think the zoom link can be sent to like fax numbers over the internal email server.

But I don't think that you can put on that livestream link any notice of, like, how to access the actual zoom thing because you don't know who's going to wander onto that live stream, do YouTube page, for example.

All right. And it's worth noting that right now meetings like this, the new information is publicly accessible because they are open meetings. This would sort of be a way of not necessarily posting that publicly for everybody you can post a link to to watch it rather than to join the meeting. And then that that information can be internal to join me.

Right. Right now, we sort of rely on the fact that nobody, the Academic Governance is uninteresting enough that unless someone digs and they really want to come, they're not going to see.

All right, so so what's ponder this. Did you have anything you wanted to say about it before we move on?

By your hand, Megan expressed what I was going to express. I also agree with the uninteresting comment you made. I'm not sure that this is going to expose us to a great deal of additional interest.

I have been to much less interesting meetings like Gosule Bond Fair.

OK, so what we'll think about that. Like I said, we're just trying to think about ways to make this accessible and efficient. All right. So five point ten is Faculty Senate agenda for January 19. If you could look at this, I think we're going to do this by consent unless there's someone who has an issue. Objection or change.

The one thing we wanted to ask, you know, the student groups is this issue.

So last spring when there was the survey for extra credit and the students to respond to racial slur, racial racially loaded comments, we had asked the IRB to come to Faculty Senate to sort of talk about, OK, so what is going to be a response to this? We wanted to ask them back to give us an update. Are you interested in that? Are the student groups interested in that, in which case we can move it to University Council? Or if not, we'll just leave it on Faculty Senate.

That was actually why Megan Wilcox, when I had my hand raised, was wondering if we could move the IRB report to UC because graduate students are do while they go through a faculty sponsor of do go before the Arabs have been affected by some of the IRB slowdowns after all of this happened. And I think would appreciate an update. I also think that it's likely that some of the deans or other individuals represented at University Council academic staff might be interested in what changes have happened, because they are also might might be plugged into that process of getting information put in all of managing compliance, all of that, all of that good stuff.

So I think it'd be very helpful that unless they specifically asked to come to Faculty Senate to to have that update at UC.

So assuming removing number six, the IRB University Council that any other suggested changes? Additions, deletions from the Faculty Senate agenda.

Heather can go back up to it in a minute. It was also attached. There we go. Anything else here?

I did have one, but I think it's important to note, so these standing items, I think the problem is probably looking at this and going, what am I doing? And that's fair. These are these are the standing items that we had on the schedule that came from some ad hoc committee of Faculty Senate and said, well, this is who we'd like to have on these issues.

So I think before we approve an agenda, it's probably prudent to sort of ask Provo's Woodroffe, are these things that that you feel comfortable at at this meeting next week? Sort of. Going over what your office is doing in these areas and posing questions to to the senators and I'll say I've confirmed that Bennett can make the last 20 minutes of the meeting.

And I'm sorry if I could give just a little more background. These are issues we were trying to get out of. Last year, two years ago, there was a committee because we had a lot of

people coming and giving reports and Faculty Senate was sort of underwhelmed with just the one way flow of information.

So these are really meant as a discussion like this for you in your if you have decisions that are coming up in the next few months to get some faculty input about these issues and anything you deem fit in these general areas, it's really meant to be interactive and sort of asking faculty if they have suggestions or ideas.

Good. Well, Vice President Bennett and I talked about the item number seven and we're happy to come. And I think in that spirit, it's good to talk with the Faculty Senate because many of these things really reside within the unit and within the department and within the college. And so faculty largely are driving these initiatives. And so really a thoughtful engagement with VP Bennett. I think it would be good. And I'm very happy to talk further about this. And as President Stanley indicated, his letter will be coming out shortly on on this topic. And so we're happy to come and pose the questions to faculty and help faculty be as introspective on their roles in these matters as possible. On the latter one promotion and tenure. I think many of you are aware that I've been moving through a ad hoc committee to the provost on this topic and have in fact circulated. I think Suzanne Lange has circulated to a number of groups new philosophy on tenure and promotion and and that will be completed on this Thursday when the final drafts from our thoughts from Deans. That's the final deadline we have. And that then will go to UCFT. I'd be happy to come and bring the overarching intellectual themes from that document. The president has seen it, and I think it is something that would be a valuable dialog as part of your committee meeting.

Thank you. That sounds fantastic. And, you know, if that document is more or less finalized, it could even be questions like, so how do we implement this or how do we implement it in a non painful way or whatever it is? I think the faculty would really appreciate the conversation and the chance to I think.

Yeah, sorry not to cut you off, Jennifer. Yes. So it is the implementation. It is the ordinary document that the institution puts out on an annualized basis, actually, before last year was put out twice a year by this institution, which is not traditional to other and any other institutions, usually an annualized document if it's put out at all. And so I would elect to send it out. And it is that philosophy as well as then the process by which these decisions are made, those that are centralized. But of course, there are those that are within, again, the unit department or or college. And those are contemplated separately by the by the deans.

Yeah, that would be fantastic, though, when it when you're ready for it to go out into the world and preferably before next Tuesday, if you could send it to Tyler and he'll make it an attachment.

You know, what I was going to suggest, though, is just to amend that given given the what else is on the docket? My sense is that might be better placed under the universe, could be under the University Council, it could be under Faculty Senate. Just looking at timing.

But, you know, either either place would be fine so we can absolutely move it to University Council. It was approved as a standing item for Faculty Senate specifically to get Faculty Senate dialog. And also when people aren't already going to be at the meeting and we move items, then Tyler has to make sure they can be there. But given that you're going to be at both meetings, I don't have a strong opinion so we can leave it here.

I think it's just fine. Jennifer, OK. All right.

Anything else?

Any other changes or sorry yet? And I had also received a request from faculty to put sort of as an information item the sort of question of caregiving and the sort of stresses on a particular faculty caregivers at this moment. I don't know if that would actually fit into also because I think one of the big concerns is about ensuring particularly that junior faculty can sort of continue their work toward promotion and tenure. But I think it really is a separate issue. So that was a request I received as an information item or not as an information item, as a sort of discussion item without necessarily a resolution. But I think a sense from a number of faculty that they really wanted to be able to have a forum for talking about this.

And as you know and others do, I put out the modification to the process in late November, early December. I then understood that the implementation was questioned by members of the DDC, the leadership of units and that and deans. And so I also provided produced a complementary implementation memo. Suzanne Lange has sent that around. I think it started being vetted the second week of December with Deans, went to FIA's that went to the Council of Diversity deans, if I recall, and it may have gone to one other, that document is largely ready for for it to be sent to the DDC, which I think Susanna's on our we try and schedule things out during the academic year. And so when it was ready, the second week of December was a very hectic time. So we've held it and I think it's slated to go out on Thursday or Friday of this week. So that is again, it's a statement of philosophy and implementation strategy. It tries to take away the binary. It tries to describe the fact of or the absence of information as as relevant data within the this context. So I'm happy to start with that perhaps and then move to the philosophy of tenure. And that would be those would both be longer frame dialog. But I'm happy to have both of those kinds of deep discussions.

Thank you, Anna, do you have a preference for Faculty Senate versus University Council?

I do believe this is more appropriate on Faculty Senate, and I think if we're I think I agree with Meghan on the IRP and the relevance to graduate students and also deans. And so I think if we can move that University Council, then it would make sense to have this discussion on Faculty Senate.

If we put it number eight, it'll follow promotion and tenure. I think it'll be a natural.

Percussion, thank you.

My only hesitance with that is VPE Bennett mentioned that he can only make sort of the last 20 we could put it before.

We put it between six and seven are actually before six. We'll put it on here.

Yeah, I also think that the promotion and tenure the previous Woodroffe was talking about and that new sort of implementation memo and the issue of caregiving and also frankly, the issue of, you know, promoting and continuing diversity, because I think the faculty caregivers who are most hard hit are probably, you know, first generation and other sort of groups that we really want to make sure get tenure and promotion.

And so in a way, I think that these fit together importantly. So I would put them after the IRP.

OK. Well, everybody's in a different mood after after budget where you have it, it's good to see other changes, concerns and anything with the Faculty Senate agenda.

Perfect. Let's call it a let's go to University Council.

Anything else? This is a pretty brief agenda, not necessarily bad students or anyone else.

Have other things they want here or should we have it as a mechanism?

Oh, thank you, Megan.

I just wanted to suggest it only if he would want to, inviting Dr. Bennett to come to University Council to introduce himself to everybody. I haven't gotten to meet him since he's been on campus.

I know this is a really weird time. And so he's not able to sort of like do some of the rounds and meet everybody. And it's been a minute since we did the interviews for this. So I thought this might be an interesting if he wants to take the opportunity, I don't want to put him on the spot. If he's not if he's still transitioning, but to come and introduce himself, reintroduce himself to some of us who were maybe at the presentation and speak a little bit about some of his immediate goals or who he, you know, just give him that opportunity to to come. Let us all let us all know he's here. He's excited, I assume.

And we've got this cool new position.

And is there any overlap? And you go, oh, actually know I can look myself. I'm trying to see if there's any overlap with what's on the Faculty Senate agenda. No, there really isn't, because this faculty recruitment and retention, I think there's not overlap. So yet if he's willing to come, that'd be great. And if he isn't, maybe we can get a maximum. Any other anything else for University Council?

Sorry, I, I feel like I've been talking a lot, but I just wanted to add that Meghan Abell is going to be presenting with me on the Ad hoc committee and was very active on that committee and that we do have an update to the proposed policy and process memo because we got a couple of additional comments.

So I will send that out just so that I think that that ideally, if we can send once I send you the final version for consideration, if we can send that out to give as you normally would do it the week before. But if we could have a couple of weeks and send it to University Council members so that they can discuss it with their constituents, that would be great. All right. Perfect.

Anything else for University Council?

All right, why don't all of the agenda is approved as we have four minutes left? Is there anything else for this group before we adjourn?

Sorry, I, too, am, you know, talking a lot, sorry, but I guess I'm a little unclear just because we're about to send an email to the faculty telling them when Faculty Senate is, whether we should be mentioning that they can join the Zun call or whether we should tell them to look elsewhere.

We're going to tell them for now.

OK, yes, but what we're going to think about it some more.

We're going to tell them anything else.

All right, well, thank you, everyone, for your active participation in the students, the faculty having a reading week and our administrators who always come and engage and you make our job easy to have conversations because you're here and you engage with us. So thank you to everyone.

Meeting is adjourned.