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Community Standards and Respect

1. Definition/description: Civil discourse and decency, including respect for ideas (including divergent ideas?)
2. A comprehensive set of tools to demonstrate the meeting of common standards for professional conduct, broadly defined, and applied to students, faculty and staff. Included in this is the need for consistency, and repetition, of the integration and application of these standards to all groups in the community (i.e., individuals, groups and organization[s]). We did think that a common principle should be “resilience, flexibility and adaptability”, in that these principles inform how consistency and repetition is applied, over time.
3. Apply the universal code of contact by holding people, in our community, accountable (inclusive of students, faculty and staff). The need for university-wide standardization of processes such as implementation of accountability, investigation, and disciplinary actions.
4. Collecting codes of conducts from groups in our community, constructing a list of commonalities and developing a basic code of conduct for all members of our community.
5. Identify a diverse range of groups in the community who may nominate/identify individuals to work on this over the next 30 days.

Dealing with Frustrations About Workplace Behaviors

Summary of issue:
Workplace behavior issues may have been there all along, but they are coming to the forefront in the current climate. Managers may have had more tolerance in the past, have been complacent in responding to these issues, or not put in the effort to effectively deal with these behavioral issues. There are civility issues in the workplace amongst faculty, academic staff and support staff. In this environment of increased accountability, we need to get better at dealing with these issues.

Factors leading to these issues:
- Promotion/hiring of individuals into managerial/supervisory roles who are technically good at what they do, who may have the knowledge or expertise in their given area, but don’t have leadership skills
- If you are a person who reports this behavior, there is a worry of retaliation, or a fear of being viewed as a "problem."
- There is significant time involved in dealing with workplace behavior problems
- Existing cultural issues such as the power differential between employee groups (e.g., faculty vs. staff)

Recommendations:
1. Recalibrate the university's expectations and values of dealing with behaviors
   a. Communication from executive leadership
2. Give managers tools they need to be effective
   a. Make training sessions for leaders around this topic MANDATORY
   b. Need to get better at promoting people with leadership skills, better selection - provide tools and resources about selecting those with skills appropriate for dealing with managers
3. Culture Change
a. Break down barriers of invisible AND visible power
b. Each unit needs to take responsibility and be accountable for their staff, train those who are on the ground, the first level manager needs to be accountable for dealing with workplace behaviors

Who should we involve?
- Representatives from different types of structures (e.g., college, IPF, departments) and cross section of different types of employees
- Chairpersons, Deans, first-level supervisors
- HR and Academic HR
- Faculty from the department of HRLR / organizational psychology

Diversity and Inclusion

Definition is difficult and often feels isolated from other priorities but generally we felt that diversity described the quantitative features of representation in our community while inclusion is how the members of our community are feeling (perhaps as measured by climate). We don’t see an apparent set of goals for diversity and inclusion at MSU.

An end state would be an intentional and critical integration of diversity and inclusion in each of the strategic discussions happening this morning.

Key issues discussed:

I. Problematic structure:
   a. We need a cross-institutional effort that brings leaders out of silos to work across student, faculty, staff roles to craft a strategic vision and goals for DEI (for example: intercultural pillar, Student Affairs/OCAT/MOSAIC center, IDEA coordinators, and RDI group need to be communicating—or better yet forming a new structure for 1) action 2) communication and 3) to advise the Provost and other leaders)
   b. Create a better pipeline for faculty of color for faculty and academic leadership positions
      i. Develop programs/systems which support faculty and staff of color in order to increase retention

II. Climate for our students of color and other minoritized groups:
   a. Students need to feel care from faculty in the classroom and outside the classroom and that they are being heard by all levels of faculty and staff

We propose in the next 30 days:
- Convene a new University-wide work group to reimagine our structure with regards to diversity, equity, and inclusion
- Unify around a pre-emptive response to the Richard Spencer visit to let students know our values
- Share the events that have been planned in response to the Spencer visit:
  o On March 5th the group “Stop Spencer at MSU” is organizing a protest near to where Richard Spencer is speaking. They are organizing this demonstration to take a stand against fascists organizing in our community. They are calling for people from all backgrounds to show up on March 5th and fill up the area around the pavilion. They are
meeting at noon on that day in the commuter lot on the corner of Farm Lane and Mount Hope.
  o The second event on March 5th is hosted by the Interfaith Clergy Association of Greater Lansing and East Lansing City Councilperson Aaron Stephens. They are organizing a “Celebration of Diversity Festival”. Several community groups have decided to come together to celebrate our diverse populace through food, music, speakers and performances. The event will take place at All Saints Episcopal Church-East Lansing, 800 Abbot Rd, East Lansing, Michigan 48823

**Meeting diversity and inclusion goals**
- We are not as diverse a place as we could be at MSU
- Excellence requires diversity, equity and inclusion

**Define or describe diversity and inclusion goals**
Need a university definition of:
- Diversity (does not necessarily imply or effect inclusion)
- Equity
- Inclusion (requires fundamental respect
- Underrepresentation - where/how does this concept fit with above?
  o Do our faculty and staff mirror our students?
  o Do we mirror our community? The State of Michigan?
  o Do we force that model, or ...?
  o Do we set a trend?

- Include a range of stakeholders in determining these definitions
- Have college-level and unit groups that talk about this in their contexts
  o In every unit
- Identify the issues faced by marginalized groups - invisibility of various groups
- How to bring everybody to the table? Some groups are only at the table in a token way, not really seen or heard, even if input is present
  o Civility, respect, authenticity,
- Build capacity to listen, to deeply hear, and to disagree respectfully
- Build trust, experiment,
- Like the Advance Grant momentum carried women forward, a similar initiative could advance goals of equity, diversity and inclusion

**Develop a framework for defining, setting and meeting goals**
- Include all stakeholders
- Take the framework to the unit level
- Develop metrics
- Embed in strategic planning
- Monitor and hold accountable for goal achievement
- Etc.
Diversity and Inclusion

Describe the end state -

- Diversity and inclusion and equity are a priority.
- We have a strong and visible capacity to listen, to deeply hear, and to disagree respectfully; there is trust and support for experimentation/exploration

Next 30 days?

- Convene a working group/task force to lay out a plan for building a framework for embedding DEI in MSU’s infrastructure, starting with defining terms, identifying issues of marginalized groups
- Address:
  - Leadership
  - Access, retention and advancement
  - Climate
  - Curriculum
  - External engagement
  - Research

Who should we involve? (See above)

Effective Governance

- Transparent Communication
- How leaders lead
- Standardize Models
- MSU Code of Conduct
- Use existing structures
- *Clear reporting channels
- Leadership Training
- Bring campus expertise together
- Advisory Network ➔ grassroots effort
- Open Communication
- *Top down
- Consensus building

Effective Governance

- MSU's weak faculty role in university governance. What are the ends and outcomes that faculty want?
- How do AAU peer institutions perceive MSU, including shared governance?
- How do we re-shape the governance process?
  - Establish a culture where faculty voice is valued
  - Deans have made decisions in the colleges with no confidence within their colleges
- Governance: from “shared” to “chain of command”
- What area? Curriculum—but real decision-making authority
• What is the consultative role?

Thoughts (from this same group) on Presidential Search
• Next president should value and have a record of working with faculty in a truly consultative way
• Study and make recommendations based on what’s been done elsewhere?
• Talent
• Sufficient resources
• Share governance
• Diversity

Financial Transparency
Define or describe; end state
• In the short term, clarity about what the impact of Nassar will be. We recognize the uncertainty, but it would be helpful to have ideas about likely scenarios, at varying levels of costs.
• In the long term, better understanding by administrators, faculty and staff about how budget decisions are made.

Recommendations for getting there
• For the short term, a statement from central administration about possible scenarios. Saying that no one has decided on a 7% cut was a good first step.
• For the longer term: shift toward earlier budget decisions, more feedback from central administration about why proposals for additional funds were or were not granted. Some suggested getting input from a committee (deans? Faculty? Others?), rather than having primarily bi-lateral discussions between central administrators and individual unit leaders.

Next steps
• In short term – draft statement describing uncertainty and possible scenarios.
• In long term – engage with administrators and faculty to make changes in budget process

Who should be involved?
  o Administrators (central, deans, chairs, etc.) and some faculty.

Below is a rough transcript of comments:
• How does the public see it?
• Bill Beekman’s [financial] response not satisfying
• What are we not doing?
• Concern about the implications would be;
• What do we expect? What will be the various costs?
  o Costs for fixed term and specialists?
• Budget process for the university seem opaque.
• Larger issue of transparency.
• Might be good to do the planning for various levels of cuts;
• What will happen with OCCI funding?
- Lack of shared governance around financial issues; difference between shared information, and collective ownership.
- “Transparency” speaks for itself.
- Not just transparency, because things haven’t been determined yet.
- Confusing information about how budget is decided.
- Description of budget process
- Like option of hearing “don’t ask again”
- What’s keeping us from moving the budget process earlier?
- There’s a disconnect between timeline for renewal and knowing budget.
- Issues about transparency aren’t new. Can we take advantage of this crisis to move forward in increasing transparency?
- Never waste a good crisis. Engler might take advantage of this.
- For decades, MSU has been relatively flush with cash. Engler comes from realm where carry forward is swept every year.
- In past, have had equal cuts. Probably different if Nassar has substantial costs.
- At other universities, there are budget committees that look across the university.

**Internal & External Communications**
- Coordination of official communications (e.g. emails)
  - Too many solo authors of MSU emails
- Better archiving of alumni information
- Inform stakeholders of positive actions on a regular basis
- Messages guided by a specific set of articulated values
  - Establish mechanism for bottom-up communications.

**Next Steps**
- Clarify expectations for leader on “briefings”
- Communicate institutional values
  - Connect communications to values
  - Consistent over time

**Internal Communications**
- Department & Central Communications

**Suggestions for improvements of problems:**
- If one is not on the DDC listserv, you get excluded from important communications.
- Not all DDC members forward messages
- No follow up from CABS on media contact
- No notification about news articles

**Ideal End State:**
- a more informed MSU=better decisions, better collaboration, more knowledge of the student perspective
- Less trickle-down, more direct communications
More consolidated; succinct
Less repetition
Closed loop
Transparent
Talking points for staff

**Recommendations and Next Steps:**

- Internal daily briefing
  - Media Links
  - News on hires
- IM (Slack, Teams)
  - MSU channel
  - College channels
  - Department channel
- Subscription choices
  - Twitter?
  - Ability to opt in to consume as much/little as you want
- Leadership accountable for drawing attention to communication

- Why not use these recommendations
- Loss of authority, control
- Need a “rules of engagement”
- Does “internal” include students?

- Who: everyone
- Who delivers: IT
- Who for content?

**Leadership Development**

**Themes:**

- Org health depends on developing and empowering informal leaders,
- Break down categorization/silos by faculty, staff and students and organizational home
- Internal and external components?
- Needs to cross organizational and categorical lines (faculty, staff and students)
- Is leadership aligned with mission, priorities and values (orientation and ability)
- Empowered leaders lead in a bi-directional manner – listen, reflect, decide and act
- Metrics guide leadership decisions. Need to be consistent, transparent/apparent.
- Tools for making and evaluating decisions.
- Are mission, values, metrics and rewards aligned, and leaders held accountable to them?

**End State:**

Empowered, accountable leadership (for formal and informal) in all parts of organization; i.e crosses faculty, staff and student categories, and different parts of the organization, and has both internal and external elements

Expectation that, and ability to assess if, our metrics, decisions and reward systems align with stated mission and values.
Fostering Leadership

Defining and Describing Leadership among the staff, students, faculty

Fear of stepping up – can’t say anything or I will lose my job.

- People are afraid to fail
- Need to give people permission to fail
- Empower people to ask questions
- Those who have been here at MSU for a while are particularly afraid to speak up

Resources for staff and faculty to learn leadership

- Many doubt their capacity to lead.
- Need/want more opportunities for training (HR, Faculty)
- Professional development needs to be a priority for staff and others.

MSU has a limited capacity to redress implicit bias

- Growing capacity in this area is important.

How do we expand the sorts of leadership training that is needed?

- We need to be responsive to the needs of units, individuals.

Provide a way for anonymous feedback.

- How do I speak up?
- A place to go, an address to send feedback.
- Responding to the feedback that has been offered.

Training for supervisors to empower others to lead.

- Leadership succession
- Team development
  - Strengths Finder
- Move away from the hub and spoke model

Faculty incentives

- How do we redress the culture of self-interest?
- Need to build into the RPT process values of equity, collegiality, openness, and community building as part of the way we articulate excellence.

Dean leadership

- Trust building is vital
- Too much turnover is a problem
- Not enough turnover is a problem
Goal/End State

- Cultivate a culture of stepping up and taking responsibility
- People need to be respected
- People need to know where and how to engage
- People need to take ownership
- Interconnection of every level of the university
  - Empower others to lead in place, to run with it.
  - People need to be empowered to take initiative
  - Supervisors need to encourage and reward leadership and initiative

Develop rewards and incentives

- Recognition of the activities of others
  - Public recognition by those in power
  - Small thank yous
  - Show and celebrate accomplishments – build that into the project.
  - Awards
- Work with unions to develop incentives for performance in leadership, civility, collegiality
- Compensation programs
  - Tie compensation to project teams, lump sum bonuses or alternative financial incentives could be considered.
  - Framework for success is needed with values articulated
- Evaluation of how you are developing the success of your colleagues
  - Reward people for helping nurture the careers of junior colleagues, graduate students.
  - Importance of mentoring
  - Leadership as an important part of “scholarship”

Structures

- Build in time during the day or week for these leadership development and self-reflection.
- Make it an institutional priority
- Formalized and informal programs to foster leadership at all levels
  - Local levels

Respond to Millennials

- Adopt new technologies
- Be a constant learner
- Applause culture

Pool of candidates who desire to be leaders

- Habits of planning – pathways of leadership and advancement.

People will feel like they have access to the Dean or the leader
Recommendations

Rethink the incentive structures of annual evaluations to foster leadership, support the work of junior colleagues, graduate students, undergraduate students, and other colleagues.

- Consider new models for metrics of scholarship and success (see Mellon funded HuMetricsHSS initiative, for example: http://humetricshss.org/)

Support development of all individuals on campus.

- Draw on Strengths Finder and other tools to establish a holistic approach.
- Draw on faculty strengths in leadership scholarship, organizational well-being

University Council on Leadership

- What are our goals?
- What are our values?

Work intentionally with the unions

- To ensure that those who are leading and performing well are rewarded for that work
- To move in more humane ways to redress low performance,

Next Steps in the next 30 days

- Empower Deans to coordinate initiatives (Working Group/Task Force) around fostering a culture of leadership; encourage and support them in their efforts to nurture connections across colleges to foster a culture of leadership.
  - College level communicators are doing this already — CABS needs to recognize their efforts and learn from their expertise
  - College level Educational Technologists are doing this already—MSU IT needs to recognize their efforts and learn from their expertise
  - This sort of coordination of effort and drawing on local expertise among the faculty, students, and staff needs to become the standard way MSU operates.
- Identify the faculty expertise who can contribute to this from a scholarship perspective
- Establish preliminary set of defining values of leadership at MSU and begin to gather feedback and buy-in
- Begin to develop a long-term plan to create a culture of leadership that is an international model for other Universities.

Who should we involve?

- AAN
- Deans
- Faculty Leadership
- Student Leadership
- Staff leadership
- Leadership of the Unions
- HR and Academic HR
Presidential Search

Process:
1. Diverse, large, balanced search committee of 15-20 members of Faculty, Staff, Students, Alumni, Administrators, and 1 Trustee (non-voting)
   a. Made of faculty (elected, not appointed for this purpose), staff, students, alumni
   b. Consider university presidents Terry Sullivan, Jim Spaniels, Susan Avery and donors Blake Kreiger, CEO Home Depot
2. Search Firm
   a. Transparent process
      i. Write up.
      ii. Communicate to Faculty Senate, University Council, ASMSU, Council of Graduate Students, Staff Organizations
      iii. Get their input, revise
      iv. Send to President, Board of Trustees, Provost
   b. Bring three to four candidates to the campus publicly
   c. Broadly disseminated survey for feedback
   d. Create a report with recommendation to the Board of Trustees (one choice?)

Characteristics of the new President
- Healer-in-Chief
- Empathetic (good theory of mind)
- Fundraiser
- Politically astute
- Respects Academic Governance
- Good delegator, not micromanager
- Vision aggregator and integrator
- Has been dean, president, or provost
- Entertains debate, thrives on the exchange of ideas and is willing to abandon their own ideas when they hear a better one

Other:
- Consider term limits on new president (~5 years?)
- Be careful about parachutes/retention payoffs
- Renewal processes that include input from faculty, staff, students, alumni, administrators

Power Structures (visible and invisible)

Tensions:
- Protect the university/protect people
- Looking good vs. being good?
- Confidentiality/transparency
- Different feelings of security and paths of students, staff, faculty
- Staff in academic units is especially quiet—why? Isolation?
- Speaking up is a risk, or is futile
• Top-down chilling effect—different from many other institutions
  o Faculty governance
  o Staff/administrative leadership

Meaningful input/voice
• Thought leaders in governance
• Culture change re: leadership
• Break down silos (i.e. academic and administrative parts of the university)
• Intentional leadership development-faculty and staff

Staff advisory groups
• Remove toxic leaders quickly
• Value faculty/staff governance
• Make service valued and valuable—worth the time of participants
• Value academic specialists and staff as professionals and colleagues

Advisory groups—especially for staff
• Around specific projects/tasks—create ownership
• Implement
  o Two types:
    ▪ Provide advice
    ▪ Projects
• Toxic and non-inclusive leadership will not be tolerated

Academic and Staff need a real voice and vote, as do
• Deans and chairs
• Affiliate faculty

Visible and invisible structures of power -

Invisible power structures have led MSU to the Nassar trials. Invisible power structures need to be made visible. Invisible power structures bypass bylaws, they bypass faculty governance structures. They are caused not only by sexual harassment, but also by bullying between undergraduates and faculty, graduate students and faculty, faculty and faculty, faculty and staff, faculty and administration. There needs to be an awareness that this is a multi-scale problem. We all also need to listen to discover the invisible power structures since they are not readily apparent.

How do we disincentivize bad behavior? How do we protect students?

There needs to be more clarity with reporting and policies. There needs to be more understanding as to what to do after something is reported to OIE. OIE doesn’t follow up reports that don’t meet a threshold, but what are strategies for a chair or others to handle an existing situation that doesn’t meet the threshold?

Chairs need training on how to navigate the gray areas before there is a minor disciplinary action. On how to keep documentation, talk with faculty when an event occurs. Documentation needs to be
transferred from chair to chair. Associate Deans and Deans need to help chairs. There needs to be a no tolerance policy. MSU needs to create a culture of care. There needs to be trust and self-candor in order to do this.

Survivor Support
1. Confide in someone other than mandatory reporter—someone in the department they can go to
   a. Many want someone to talk to without that person being ordered to “report”
2. Legal support for survivors who may be sued by perpetrator. If accused found “innocent and they then sue the accuser, the accuser needs help with legal defense.
3. Closing the loop to survivors who report incidences.
4. Mandatory reporters not hearing back after the case is reported—Silence
5. Survivors feelings when perpetrator who is “tenured” received only a slap on hand. Relegated to office work for period of time
6. Protection of MSU brand higher priority than priority of survivors—message from parents hearing that we now need to rebrand.

Recommendations
1. Can current procedures be changed to allow for 1, 3, 4?

More thoughts
2. There is a need for people to be comfortable in asking if procedures are normal.
3. Who to involve: the survivors themselves. Have we reach out to ALL students that Nassar “treated.”? Proactively contacted them?
4. Civil Action- Limiting MSU liability vs. support for survivors. Insurance company involvement—are they driving the legal actions? Is this appropriate?
5. What are we doing to identify all of the survivors? How do we know if there are others? Be proactive—not passive in identifying them?
6. What are we doing to support the survivors? In the next 30 days, tell the MSU community what actually is being done
   a. $10 m. fund
   b. Teal ribbons

Student Behavioral Health Delivery
1. 3x increase in staff
   a. More fully licensed staff
   b. Competitive pay scale
   c. Mixed-mode (locations)
      i. Central
      ii. Embedded (colleges, Neighborhoods, etc.)
2. Normative Campaign
   a. Culturally-sensitive services
3. Focus throughout students’ first year on campus
   a. Zero-credit course that is required