President McPherson convened the meeting at 5:40 p.m. with a quorum of 570 faculty present out of 2001 total faculty. Quorum is 10% of the tenure system faculty and continuing librarians.

The agenda for the meeting was amended to shorten the amount of time for items on the agenda, namely the item on the College of Human Medicine Expansion Assessment to 5 minutes, the referrals from Faculty Council to 20 minutes discussion for each referral, unless the Senate votes to extend the time on the referral item. A motion was passed to amend the motion.

The minutes of November 15, 1989 were approved as distributed.

Academic Senate Procedures:
Professor Silverman questioned the Faculty Council’s action on April 21, 2004 establishing protocols for the Senate meeting, noting the University Bylaws establish that Robert’s Rules of Order are the rules for all academic bodies. Professor Silverman did not feel it was necessary to adopt the protocols and that Robert’s Rules were sufficient.

Professor Sticklen, Chairperson of the Executive Committee of Academic Council, reported that the protocols were developed in Faculty Council at its meeting on April 21, 2004. Professor Sticklen explained the proposed protocols came to Faculty Council from ECAC and then to Faculty Senate for acceptance or rejection. The following motion was presented:

- The Academic Senate will last no longer than two hours unless the majority of the body votes to extend the session.
- All framed items on referral from Faculty Council will receive precedent for Senate time over any other items.
- Referred items will be introduced by one proponent of the proposed Senate action for a period not to exceed 5 minutes. Following will be a position statement by one individual opposing the proposed Senate action, for a period not to exceed 5 minutes and then further discussion and debate. At that time when either the time is exceeded or the number of people wishing to speak has been exhausted a vote of the Senate will be taken on the particular proposal. The Chairperson of ECAC will give voice to those non-tenured stream faculty in the College of Human Medicine, and it is clear as to why it is in the proposal. These protocols will be followed unless changed by the Senate itself.

The motion was seconded and with no further discussion, the motion was passed.

President McPherson requested members to identify themselves by name and University unit when coming to the microphone.
The College of Human Medicine Expansion Assessment:
Professor Bowersox, Chairperson of the CHM Expansion Assessment Team, acknowledged the request to shorten his report. Professor Bowersox recognized the individuals on the assessment team, Professors Beckman, Dimond, Holmes, Rappley and Terry. The team’s assignment was to conduct an assessment. Bowersox went on to define that an assessment was to evaluate an opportunity to determine whether or not appropriate action should go forward or whether there was not sufficient potential to begin the process of evaluating whether or not the course of action being considered was something the University indeed should do. Professor Bowersox reported that the assessment was done rapidly in approximately 83 days and in those 83 days the team had to establish if there was truly an opportunity. It was discovered that the opportunity being looked at was really quite perishable and had been under some form of discussion longer than two years. Bowersox noted that Grand Rapids would indeed have a medical college of one form or another. It became obvious very rapidly that it was broader than Grand Rapids and the team needed to simultaneously address multiple issues evolving in the Lansing and greater Mid-Michigan area. The assessment was presented to the College during the first two weeks of April for vigorous discussions in order to provide the Trustees with appropriate facts to decide whether to move or not move forward with the work to go to the next level. A decision is a long way ahead and the process put in place at this meeting will guide that appropriately through governance. It will take much work on the part of the College to decide whether it is the right thing to do. Professor Bowersox explained that there were no numbers in the report as it was the leadership’s opinion that it was in our best interest not to lay numbers out at this time because discussions were in process. It is expected that in due time the numbers will be presented for thorough evaluation. The assessment is the first step and the proposal to be discussed at this meeting would put in place appropriate oversight.

Referrals from Faculty Council:
Professor Sticklen noted the next items were the Referred Items from Faculty Council. The items were discussed and modified in Faculty Council and referred to the Senate for consideration and vote.

Referred Item # 1: College of Human Medicine’s expansion in Grand Rapids:
CHM Dean Resolution to Academic Council/Faculty Council

Professor Schnuth, CHM Associate Professor, proposed the resolution which was accepted by the CHM Advisory Council and the CHM Executive Committee. Professor Schnuth then presented the resolution as a motion and it was seconded. (Attachment A)

Professor Sousa spoke in favor of the motion indicating the faculty of CHM must insure that any plan to move the College is viable. Professor Turner was in support noting the need to have faculty oversight and to consider what it means to expand to Grand Rapids and the Western part of the State. Professor Brody also spoke in favor of the motion noting the motion calls for active faculty participation in the process from this point on and faculty must play a key role in making this move if it is going to succeed.

Professor Paneth added his support for the resolution indicating his optimism if faculty participate and commented he would also add student participation. There was no further discussion and the motion passed.
President McPherson reminded everyone that a public hearing would be held on April 29, 2004 at the Kellogg Center from 9 a.m. to 12 noon which is open to all.

**Referred Item # 2: Establishment of Ad Hoc University Committee on Faculty Voice:**

Professor Sticklen presented the resolution as a motion for the record. (Attachment B) This resolution has to do with the structural issues within academic governance and application of those structural rules to better establish the voice of the faculty on this campus. The motion was seconded and discussion ensued. Professor Sticklen commented that one of the issues is what can we do, or can we do anything, to the structure of our governance Bylaws that would better enable an effective voice of the faculty. The second issue is how can we as faculty effectively form consensus and speak to the important issues that are extremely time critical. Professor Michaelsen shared that he was a member of an ad hoc committee on faculty voice that was formed in the spring. There are 35 faculty members from across campus in this group and all support this resolution. It was suggested that the Secretary for Academic Governance (SAG) provide a list of nominees to the Faculty Council so that members can suggest amendments to the list of ten if necessary to make it more representative. President McPherson noted he understood that these were comments of advice on the motion. Professor Thomashow indicated overall support for the motion but questioned the make-up of the committee and that all of the members have to have had broad experience in Academic Governance. Professor Thomashow acknowledged that people with expertise should be on the committee but not necessarily the broad experience in Academic Governance. Professor Wright clarified that a motion referred by either Council to Senate could not be amended in the Senate meeting but noted what had been said. Professor Hudson noted if the motion passed there would be a committee that will hopefully look at the language related to the Faculty Senate and address the vagueness in the wording.

There being no further discussion on the motion, the question was called and the motion passed.

**Referred Item # 3: Reorganization of Programs in the Liberal Arts:**

Professor Peterson introduced the item for referral and read it for the record as a motion and it was seconded. (Attachment C) Professor Peterson explained that at the beginning of Fall Semester Faculty Council should discuss a way to monitor faculty participation in the Liberal Arts and Sciences. The process could involve direct interaction with the committee that has been appointed by the Provost. By the end of the semester, or November Faculty Council meeting, there would be some assessment of whether faculty participation is consistent with the spirit of this proposal. Professor Peterson went on to give rationale for supporting the referred item. Professor Pollak spoke in favor of the motion to give Faculty Council the responsibility for ensuring the full participation of faculty and developing and implementing any plans for reorganization of the Liberal Arts at MSU. Professor Harrow acknowledged support for the spirit of the resolution and noted that the wording was more ambiguous. The second clause in the resolution states “it is crucial that this reorganization be carried out with the full participation of the Liberal Arts and Sciences faculty”. Professor Harrow noted that we do not yet have full participation. It is important that the faculty become full participants and not merely outsiders to processes that affect our own teaching and our University. Professor Esquith spoke in favor of
the resolution and also supported the sentiments that had been expressed by other faculty members. He noted that the charge to the Committee on College Reorganization in the Liberal Arts and Sciences from the Provost is to begin a variety of different conversations and discussions on the reorganization of the Liberal Arts and Sciences both to strengthen them within the disciplines that exist now and to explore the ways in which those programs in the Liberal Arts and Sciences broadly defined can be strengthened through interdisciplinary and cross unit collaboration. There being no further discussion the question was called and the motion passed.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jacqueline Wright
Secretary for Academic Governance

Attachments:

1. **Attachment A**: Referred Item #1: College of Human Medicine’s Expansion in Grand Rapids: CHM Dean Resolution to Academic Council/Faculty Council
2. **Attachment B**: Referred Item #2: Establishment of Ad Hoc Committee on the Faculty Voice
3. **Attachment C**: Referred Item #3: Reorganization of the Programs in the Liberal Arts

Tapes of complete meetings of the Academic Senate are available for review in the office of the Secretary for Academic Governance, 308 Olds Hall, 355-2337.
Referred Item #1: College of Human Medicine’s Expansion in Grand Rapids:
CHM Dean Resolution to Academic Council/Faculty Council

Whereas, the recently released “Assessment Report of CHM Expansion in Grand Rapids” outlines an opportunity for growth, and increased financial viability for CHM; and

Whereas, the expansion creates an opportunity to build a world class teaching facility to support CHM’s current excellence in curriculum and future innovation; and

Whereas, West Michigan community investment in research can create new opportunities that bring increased intellectual stature and recognition; and

Whereas, the assessment report reaffirms the CHM culture, mission, values, and community campus structure; and

Whereas, the faculty has had limited time to review the assessment report, and the report is a very high level of review, not intended to serve as an implementation plan; and

Whereas, the expansion of the College to Grand Rapids represents both an opportunity and a threat to the educational, clinical and research missions of the College; and

Whereas, there is concern about funding commitments, and the sufficiency of sustainable funding necessary for the operations of a world class medical school; and

Whereas, there is concern as to whether the expansion will impact future accreditation of the school; and

Be it resolved that the President in consultation with the Provost appoint an Oversight Assessment Committee to evaluate the expansion proposal based on a due diligence process that considers:

- Adequacy of finance
- Accreditation
- Faculty support
- Programmatic quality and impact
- The impact on MSU and the community in East Lansing and Mid Michigan

Be it resolved that this committee consist of 7 faculty members appointed by the President with the following composition:

- 4 CHM faculty members recommended by the Dean, Department Chairs, and CHM CAC (8 names to be recommended for 4 slots)
- CNS faculty member recommended by the Dean, Department Chairs and CNS CAC (2 names to be recommended for 1 slot)
- COM faculty member recommended by the Dean, Departments Chairs and COM CAC (2 names to be recommended for 1 slot)
- A faculty member designated by the Executive Committee of the Academic Council (2 names to be recommended for 1 slot)
Be it resolved that CHM will create the following implementation committees which will work concurrently with the Oversight Assessment Committee:

- Academic Affairs
- Clinical Practice
- Research
- Community Campus Network; and

Be it resolved that implementation of expansion of CHM’s current activities in Grand Rapids will be done by all CHM standing committees, after being satisfied and assured that available resources are sufficient to establish first class programs in medical education, research, and clinical care; and that the proposed plan has built in safeguards to maintain the College’s longstanding commitment to humanism, diversity, educational innovation, and commitment to medically-underserved populations.
Referred Item #2: Establishment of Ad Hoc University Committee on Faculty Voice

Whereas, the faculty of Michigan State University wish to better form consensus and express the collective voice of the Faculty; and

Be it resolved that the Academic Senate commissions the establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Voice whose purpose shall be to examine and recommend remedies as appropriate for (a) the mechanisms of academic governance which enable effective development of faculty views and the effective expression of a voice of the faculty on important issues facing the University community and (b) effective, collective input of the voice of the faculty especially on items that are very time critical; and

Be it resolved that the make up of the committee shall be five tenure stream faculty who shall be drawn from those, including at most one emeritus faculty, with broad experience in academic governance, and that the Secretary for Academic Governance shall openly solicit nominations for the committee. Ten nominations will be submitted to Faculty Council from the Secretary for Academic Governance for the selection of five; and

Be it resolved that the duly constituted Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Voice shall report directly to the Faculty Council with specific recommendations by the beginning of Spring Semester, 2005.
Referred Item #3: Reorganization of the Programs in the Liberal Arts

*Whereas*, since the reorganization of the liberal arts is a matter of great intellectual and pedagogical importance for the future of MSU; and

*Whereas*, it is crucial that this reorganization be carried out with the full participation of the liberal arts and sciences faculty; and

*Be it resolved* the Faculty Council shall by the end of Fall Semester 2004 review and assess the faculty role in developing and carrying out reorganization; and

*Be it resolved* this review shall include but not be restricted to an assessment of the faculty role in reorganization as developed by the Committee on College Reorganization in the Liberal Arts and Sciences, whose report is due October 1, 2004.