Michigan State University  
College of Veterinary Medicine  
Spring Faculty Meeting Minutes  
Wednesday, April 27, 2016  
G150 VMC, 3:00 p.m.

Faculty Attendance: 

Dean's Office: Abreu, Baker, Chaddock, Funk, Grabill, Malinowski, Pazak, Yuzbasiyan-Gurkan 

DCPAH: Reams, Wise 

LCS: Carleton, Contreras, Cook, Esser, Kaneene, Kinsley, Mansfield, Moeser, Neuder, Norby, Saeed, Schott, Weber, Wilson 

MMG: Abramovitch, DiRita 

PDI: Bolin, Buchweitz, Fulton, Harkema, Kiupel, Les, Mullaney, Patterson, Scott, Sonea, Swenson, Tadros, Thomas, Wagner 

PHM: Ganey, Hegg, Roth 

PSL: None 

SCS: Dejardin, Koenigshof, Komaromy, Kruger, Nelson, L., Olivier, Pease, Petersen-Jones, Robertson, Rosser, Sanders, Sikarskie, Vilar Saavedra 

Veterinary Technology Program: Bohart, Judge, Mayer, Vani 

Meeting Notes: 

1. **Call to order.** Dr. Bari Olivier, Chairperson, College Advisory Council, called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. 

2. **Approval of agenda.** Dr. Olivier requested that items 4 and 5 on the distributed agenda be reversed. There was no opposition to this request, and the agenda was approved with that amendment. 

3. **Approval of minutes.** A motion was made and seconded that the minutes of the December 16, 2015 regular faculty meeting be approved as printed and distributed to the faculty. Motion carried. 

4. **Discussion/Action Item – Introduction to the DVM Curriculum Review Process.** Dr. Julie Funk, Associate Dean for Academic Programs and Student Affairs, presented a motion to the faculty regarding DVM curriculum review and reinvention (see
Attachment 1). Dr. Funk described the planned committee structure and principles guiding the process. A Steering Committee reporting to the CVM Curriculum Committee will guide the process, and will direct the activities of various working groups that will design the new curriculum. The Steering Committee will include representatives from each CVM department, a basic science representative, the Veterinary Technology Program, students, MSU Hub, and the MSU Office of Medical Education Research and Development (OMERAD).

Members of the Steering Committee include:
- Dr. Julie Funk, Associate Dean for Academic Programs and Student Affairs
- Dr. Jon Patterson, Pathobiology and Diagnostic Investigation
- Dr. Laura Nelson, Small Animal Clinical Sciences
- Dr. Rob Malinowski, Director, Center for Academic Technologies
- Jolynne Judge, Preveterinary and Veterinary Technology
- Dr. Brian Mavis, OMERAD
- Dr. Jeff Grabill, Associate Provost for Teaching, Learning and Technology
- Dr. Leigh Graves Wolf, Hub for Innovation in Learning and Technologies
- Felix Rodriguez, Student
- Jamie Solgat, Student
- Basic Science representative to be named

The first three working groups will be formed before the end of May and may be targeted for a particular discipline. We want to ensure that we don’t make changes with unintended consequences. The working groups will be comprised predominantly of faculty, and the Steering Committee will invite all faculty to participate in one of the groups. A link will be set up on the CVM website to provide Curriculum Reinvention updates.

A motion was made and seconded that the proposal for adoption of the process for reinvention of the Doctor of Veterinary Medicine curriculum be approved as printed and distributed to the faculty.

Following brief discussion, a vote was called for on the motion to approve and the motion carried.

5. Discussion/Action Item – Proposed Revisions to CVM Bylaws. Dr. Olivier explained that the college is required to review its bylaws at intervals not to exceed five years; college bylaws must be in conformity with the MSU Bylaws for Academic Governance.

The proposed revisions that have been distributed to the faculty for consideration have been approved by the dean, the CAC, associate and assistant deans, unit chairpersons and directors. The major proposed changes are highlighted in yellow. Some changes have been mandated by new provisions in the MSU Bylaws for Academic Governance, while other changes were prompted by emerging college needs.
A motion was made and seconded to approve distribution of this proposed document to the voting faculty for confidential paper ballot, after discussion and consideration of each proposed change. There were no questions as to the revisions approval process and the motion carried.

Discussion of the proposed revisions followed (see Attachment 2).

At the conclusion of the discussion and consideration of proposed modifications to the revised Bylaws document previously distributed to the faculty, a motion was made and seconded that the final document with approved modifications be sent by confidential mail (paper) ballot to all voting members of the College. Motion carried.

NOTE: The existing CVM Bylaws require a two-thirds majority of the total number of voting faculty to approve the suggested changes.

6. Adjournment. A motion was made and seconded to adjourn. Motion carried and the meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Terrie Bunn, CVM Dean’s Office.
Motion to Approve the Process for Reinvention of the Doctor of Veterinary Medicine (DVM) Curriculum

Rationale

The last major revision to the DVM curriculum was in 1992 with semester conversion. Since then, revisions have been modest and the most recent of those is beyond the 7-year review cycle mandated by AVMA COE accreditation. The 2015 strategic planning process in CVM, with input from faculty, students, alumni and employers, has highlighted the need to reinvent the curriculum, both in content and design. In response to these expectations for curriculum revision, the Dean has charged Associate Dean Julie Funk to lead a review and renewal process. The goal outlined by the Dean is a learner-centered curriculum that prepares career-ready, high-value graduates and is attentive to costs to both students and the College. A motion is presented here that outlines the process that will guide Dr. Funk and lead to final approval of a new curriculum by the full CVM faculty in the spring of 2017.

Moved that the CVM faculty approve the following process guiding the DVM Curriculum Reinvention.

1. The process guiding the reinvention of the DVM curriculum will:
   a. Provide channels and opportunities for stakeholder input
   b. Be transparent, allowing stakeholder access to progress reports
   c. Be evidence-based, incorporating contemporary educational practices
   d. Be data-driven, relying on sources of internal and external information
   e. Be monitored by the CVM Curriculum Committee at appropriate intervals to allow for realignment as needed
   f. Reach out to incorporate expertise and assistance as needed to facilitate the process and the achievement of the design goals

2. A Steering Committee of faculty, students and others will ensure that the goals outlined by the Dean are achieved. The Steering Committee will seek input from stakeholders throughout the process via a Stakeholder Advisory Committee. The Steering Committee will direct the work of interdisciplinary Working Groups of faculty that will develop the details of the curriculum.

3. Following approval by the CVM Curriculum Committee, the full CVM faculty will vote to approve the proposed curriculum. The vote will be yes/no/abstain on the complete curriculum and majority rules. Faculty will have ample opportunities for input during the process and for understanding of the final proposal before the vote, which will take place according to CVM Bylaws.

1 Evidence will be gleaned from published literature and other disciplinary sources

2 The Steering Committee will include representatives of each CVM department, a basic science representative, the Veterinary Technology Program, MSU Hub, students and OMERAD.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Julie Funk, Associate Dean for Academic Programs and Student Affairs

FROM: John C. Baker, Dean

RE: Charge for the Curriculum Review and Revision

DATE: March 31, 2016

The College of Veterinary Medicine, veterinary medical education, and the veterinary profession are at a critical juncture. An increase in the cost of education paid by students has resulted in student debt rates that are unsustainable; decreasing application-to-seat ratios place significant pressures for student recruitment (and a risk for failure to recruit qualified students); a lack of diversity limits the profession's ability to serve a broad section of society, and a failure to adopt innovations in education provides significant risk for disruption from non-traditional education providers. MSU CVM is specifically at risk as a result of a relatively high tuition rate compared to other Colleges of Veterinary Medicine (in particular for non-residents); a shrinking state population placing pressure on the pool of qualified in-state applicants, and low to moderate success in recruiting under-represented students to the College.

However, these challenges provide a significant opportunity for the College to be an international leader in veterinary medical education. The College is well positioned to re-imagine and innovate veterinary medical education. Through an extensive strategic planning process, three critical strategies for DVM education at MSU have been identified: 1) It must be cost-effective for students and not increase the cost of delivery for the College, 2) the curriculum must be learner centered, 3) there needs to be more integration within the curriculum and 4) the outcome is a high value, career ready graduate.

For the curriculum revision process, I charge the Curriculum Review and Revision Committee with the following minimum standards:

1) Innovation that re-imagines veterinary education. The new curriculum developed will be recognized nationally and internationally as a model for the future of veterinary medical education. Important components of this innovation:
   a. A cost-effective education
      i. Aims for a 1.4:1 (or less) debt to first year income ratio for graduates.
      ii. Maintains current revenue to the College.
   b. High quality, student centered education.
i. The learning experience is personalized, hands-on, and flexible. Allows students the opportunity to focus on their career interests.

ii. A supportive learning environment and student wellness are critical components of student centered learning.

iii. Cultural competence, diversity and inclusiveness as principles of the curricular design.

c. Increased integration of the curriculum
   i. Interdisciplinary approaches to learning are a focus.
   ii. Learning is contextualized in real-world application.
   iii. Integration includes both curricular and co-curricular learning opportunities.

d. High value, day 1 career-ready graduate
   i. Graduates meet or exceed employer expectation for day 1 competencies.
   ii. Data-driven metrics are developed to benchmark current status, set goals and mark progress for achieving the goal.

2) A process for the curriculum review and revision be developed and approved by a vote of the CVM faculty by April 2016. (Spring faculty meeting).

3) The process be efficient and timely, delivering a design for a revised curriculum to be reviewed by the College Curriculum Committee early Spring Semester 2017.

4) An assessment tool for evaluating the performance of the revised curriculum will be developed for continuous assessment, revision and improvement.

5) Transparency and clear communication are required. A communication plan, outlining opportunities for faculty input and process status report updates is required.

6) The recommended curriculum meets or exceeds accreditation standards of the American Veterinary Medical Association Council on Education and the Higher Learning Commission.

7) The revised curriculum is in alignment with the mission, vision and values of the College and Michigan State University.

cc: June Youatt, Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs
FAQs about the DVM Curriculum Reinvention Process

Why is the curriculum being revised?

The last major revision to the DVM curriculum was in 1992 with semester conversion. Since then, revisions have been modest and the most recent is beyond the 7-year review cycle mandated by AVMA COE accreditation. The 2015 strategic planning process in CVM, with input from faculty, students, alumni and employers, has highlighted the need to reinvent the curriculum, both in content and design.

What is the goal of the revision?

The Dean has directed that the new curriculum should be learner-centered, preparing career-ready, high-value graduates, while also being attentive to costs to both students and the College.

What is the projected timeline for the revision?

The design of the new curriculum should be completed by early spring semester 2017 so the CVM Curriculum Committee can complete its review and approval process. The CVM faculty as a whole will then vote, also in spring 2017. Once approved, the new curriculum will go forward for University Curriculum Committee review in AY 2017-2018. A year of preparation is then planned to develop instruction, conduct pilot sessions, and provide faculty development. So the first courses would be offered in AY 2018-19 for the graduating class of 2022.

How will this affect the current students?

The current students will complete the current curriculum, as will all entering classes until fall 2018 when the new curriculum is implemented for that entering class. There will be three years of overlap during which the old curriculum will be taught at the same time that the new curriculum is phased in each year. These changes will have minimal impact on students in the current curriculum unless they choose to participate in Working Group to offer input to the design of the new curriculum.

Who is involved in the process?

A Steering Committee has been formed and has already begun working. It includes Associate Dean Julie Funk, faculty representatives from each CVM department, students, the Office of Medical Education Research and Development, MSU Hub and the Veterinary Technology Program. The Steering Committee will be advised by a Stakeholder Advisory Council that includes faculty, students, alumni, employers, and others with an interest in DVM education. The Steering Committee will compose Working Groups, as needed, to carry out the curriculum development and design.

Who is on the Steering Committee?

Dr. Julie Funk, Associate Dean, Large Animal Clinical Sciences
Dr. Jon Patterson, Pathobiology and Diagnostic Investigation
Dr. Laura Nelson, Small Animal Clinical Sciences
Dr. Rob Malinowski, Director, Center for Academic Technologies
Jolynne Judge, Pre-Veterinary and Veterinary Technology
How can faculty have input to the process?

The most direct way to have input will be to participate in a Working Group. Faculty can also provide direct feedback to members of the Steering Committee. Additionally, there will be updates at faculty meetings throughout the process so that faculty can discuss proposals. The CVM Curriculum Committee will review the progress of the Steering Committee at regular intervals, so feedback to Curriculum Committee members is another conduit for input on the curriculum design.

Is any new teaching space expected with a new curriculum?

No. The new curriculum is expected to be implemented within existing instructional space.
Michigan State University  
College of Veterinary Medicine  

Faculty Review and Discussion of  
2016 Proposed Revised Bylaws of the Faculty  
CVM Faculty Meeting  
April 27, 2016

2.1.1. Motion to approve as distributed made and seconded; motion carried.

2.2.1. Voting Faculty on Internal CVM Matters  
Proposed Change: “and fixed term faculty who have served at least 3 of the past consecutive years (12 months) and are engaged in the academic activities of the College”  
Modification: “and fixed term faculty with full-time uninterrupted appointments for at least the last 36 months. (Appointments in this context could be either academic or annual term appointments).”

Motion to approve with modification made and seconded; motion carried.

2.2.1.6. Motion to approve as distributed made and seconded; motion carried.

2.2.1.7. Motion to approve as distributed made and seconded; motion carried.

3.1.1.2. Proposed Change: “If the total number of CVM faculty senate positions is 3 or more (maximum 5), one elected representative should be a non-tenured faculty member appointed in the tenure system”  
Modification: “If the total number of CVM faculty senate positions is 3 or more (maximum 5), one elected representative shall (to the extent possible) be a non-tenured faculty member appointed in the tenure system”.

Motion to approve with modification made and seconded; motion carried.

3.1.1.3. Motion to approve as distributed made and seconded; motion carried.

3.1.1.4. Motion to approve as distributed made and seconded; motion carried.

3.1.2.1. Election to the CAC  
Proposed Change: “In addition, any specialist or fixed-term, ranked faculty member who has served at Michigan State University with an FTE of 80% or more for the past three consecutive years (12 months), may be selected/elected by the academic unit to serve on the CAC.”  
Modification: “In addition, any specialist or fixed-term, ranked CVM faculty member who has served at Michigan State University with an FTE of 80% or more for the past 36 months (either academic or annual appointment), may be selected/elected by the academic unit to serve on the CAC.”

Motion to approve with modification made and seconded; motion carried.

3.1.2.2. Motion to approve as distributed made and seconded; motion carried.

3.1.2.3. Motion to approve as distributed made and seconded; motion carried.

3.1.2.5. Motion to approve as distributed made and seconded; motion carried.
3.1.2.8. Motion to approve as distributed made and seconded; motion carried.

4.1.2. Motion to approve as distributed made and seconded; motion carried.

4.2.3.1. Motion to approve as distributed made and seconded; motion carried.

4.2.3.2. Motion to approve as distributed made and seconded; motion carried.

4.2.3.4. Motion to approve as distributed made and seconded; motion carried.

4.2.7. University Committee Liaison Representative

**Proposed Change:** "When liaison between College standing committees and certain University committees is needed, the faculty representative to the particular University committee is entitled to serve as an ex-officio member on the related College standing committee without vote (see section 4.2.2.3.). The University committee representative may also be a member of the related CVM standing committee if selected/elected independently to both offices."

**Modification:** "For the College Curriculum and Diversity / Inclusion Committees, the CVM representative to the related university committee (Curriculum, MSU IDEA), will serve on the College committees with vote. For other CVM standing committees, when a liaison between college standing committees and certain university committees is needed, the faculty representative to the particular University committee is entitled to serve as an ex-officio member on the related college standing committee without vote (see section 4.2.2.3.). The university committee representative may also be selected/elected to be a member of the related CVM standing committee if selected/elected independently to both offices."

Motion to approve with modification made and seconded; motion carried.

4.7. Motion to approve as distributed made and seconded; motion carried.

4.7.1. Motion to approve as distributed made and seconded; motion carried.

4.7.3. Committee on Diversity and Inclusion

2. **Proposed Change:** "Assisting in identifying problems or opportunities, and other important issues related to the roles and participation of underrepresented groups in all activities of the College. The committee will bring such issues to the attention of the appropriate leaders within the College, and assist as requested with appropriate responses."

**Modification:** "Assisting in identifying problems or opportunities, and other important issues related to inclusive diversity. The committee will bring such issues to the attention of the appropriate leaders within the College, and assist as requested with appropriate responses."

Motion to approve with modification made and seconded; motion carried.

4.8 Committee on Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure

4.8.1. **Proposed Change:** "The committee shall consist of seven professors in the tenure system (two each from the CVM-only departments, and one from the shared departments) and two professors in the HP system (one HP member each from the Department of Large Animal Clinical Sciences and Department of Small Animal Clinical Sciences)."

**Modification:** "The committee shall consist of seven professors in the tenure system (two each from the CVM-only departments and one from the shared departments) and, whenever possible, three professors in the HP system (one each from SCS, LCS and PDI)."

Motion to approve with modification made and seconded; motion carried.
4.8.5.1. Motion to approve as distributed made and seconded; motion carried.

4.9. Safety / Biocontainment Committee

4.9.1. Motion to approve as distributed made and seconded; motion carried.

4.9.2. Motion to approve as distributed made and seconded; motion carried.

4.9.3. Motion to approve as distributed made and seconded; motion carried.

4.9.4. **Proposed Change:** “Required membership for this committee is ex officio and shall include the directors of the veterinary teaching hospital and DCPAH, Associate Dean for Graduate Studies and Research, Associate Dean for Student Affairs, chairpersons from the departments of Small and Large Animal Clinical Sciences, and Pathology and Diagnostic Investigation. In each case, required members may appoint a delegate to serve on his or her behalf.”

**Modification:** “Required membership for this committee is ex officio and shall include the directors of the Veterinary Medical Center (VMC) and Diagnostic Center for Population and Animal Health (DCPAH), Associate Dean for Graduate Studies and Research, Associate Dean for Academic Programs and Student Affairs, chairpersons from the departments of Small and Large Animal Clinical Sciences, and Pathobiology and Diagnostic Investigation. In each case, required members may appoint a delegate to serve on his or her behalf.

Motion to approve with modification made and seconded; motion carried.

4.9.5. Motion to approve as distributed made and seconded; motion carried.

6. Graduate and Medical Student Rights and Responsibilities, Hearing Pools and Boards

6.1. Motion to approve as distributed made and seconded; motion carried.

6.2.5.

6.3. College Graduate Student Hearing Board

6.4. Motion to approve as distributed made and seconded; motion carried.

6.5. College Medical Student Hearing Board

6.8 Motion to approve as distributed made and seconded; motion carried.

7. College Policies and Guidelines

7.9. Motion to approve as distributed made and seconded; motion carried.

9.1. **Proposed Change:** “The CAC shall be charged with the interpretation of these bylaws, and discretionary college policies.”

**Modification:** “The CAC shall be charged with the authority for interpretation of these bylaws, and approved college policies.”

Motion to approve with modification made and seconded; motion carried.

9.2. **Proposed Change:** “Proposed amendments/revisions to these bylaws may be submitted to the CAC for inclusion on the agenda of the next faculty meeting for which bylaw revisions are to be considered. Favorable action at the faculty meeting shall be the decision to submit the accepted proposed amendment(s) or revision(s) to the voting faculty of the college by mail ballot (not email) conducted by the CAC. A majority of the voting faculty in attendance at the CAC meeting (for which bylaw amendments/revisions were published as an agenda item) is needed to accept the amendment/revision
in the proposed Bylaw change. Accepted bylaw proposals must then be distributed for a mail ballot to the voting members of the college. A two-thirds majority of all eligible voting faculty of the College shall be required for acceptance of proposed Bylaw changes. The CAC will announce the results of all mail ballots.”

**Modification:** "Proposed amendments/revisions to these bylaws may be submitted to the CAC for inclusion on the agenda of the next faculty meeting for which bylaw revisions are to be considered. An endorsed motion to approve the amendment(s) / revision(s) triggers a discussion that can include additional motions for alterations of the proposal(s). Such alterations are adopted with majority support from the faculty attending the meeting. The original motion to accept the proposal for distribution and vote is approved with majority support from the faculty in attendance. Accepted bylaw proposals must then be distributed by either mail ballot (or electronic ballot if endorsed by the Dean and CAC) to the voting members of the College. A two-thirds majority of all College voting faculty shall be required for acceptance of proposed Bylaw changes. The CAC will announce the results of all ballots.”

Motion to approve with modification made and seconded; motion carried.

**Addendum 1. Graduate Student Hearing Procedures for the College of Veterinary Medicine**

**Addendum 2. Medical Student Hearing Procedures for the College of Veterinary Medicine**

No discussion on either Addendum 1 or Addendum 2.