

CAL CAC Minutes-Approved
November 4, 2021
3:15–5:00pm

Attendance: Tom Berding, Silvina Bongiovanni, Ruth Nicole Brown, Chris Frilingos, Bump Halbritter, Gary Hoppenstand, Ellen Moll, Dionne O’Dell, Rajiv Ranjan, Emily Katz, Penny Shanks, Melissa Staub, Yore Kadem, Christopher Long, Kailey Henderson, Brianna Sterbenz, Danielle DeVoss (guest), Associate Dean Fritzsche Fritsche (guest)

1. Called to order by Bump Halbritter, 2021-22 CAC chair. Ruth Nicole Brown served as scribe for this meeting.

2. Approval of agenda. Passed unanimously.

3. Approval of 10/7, 2021 CAC minutes <https://teams.microsoft.com/l/file/5F95FC92-D4AE-47C6-A448-51423188A86B?tenantId=22177130-642f-41d9-9211-74237ad5687d&fileType=docx&objectUrl=https%3A%2F%2Fmichiganstate.sharepoint.com%2Fsites%2FCALCAC%2FShared%20Documents%2FCAL%20CAC%20Agendas%202021-2022%2F02%20Meeting%20Minutes%2FCAC%20draft%20minutes%2010-7-21.docx&baseUrl=https%3A%2F%2Fmichiganstate.sharepoint.com%2Fsites%2FCALCAC&serviceName=teams&threadId=19:70534118e7c14d738d691d4cda38241f@thread.skype&groupId=a20bada9-b3ad-4ddd-bb34-710f6b147f73> : Passed unanimously.

4. New Graduate and Undergraduate Representatives were introduced.

5. Dean Long shared need to depart early to attend university ceremony and reception for recently promoted faculty.

6. Regarding four brief CVs to be considered for the CAL RPT ballot: Berding requested additional solicitations for those at rank of full professor to meet college bylaw requirements. If there are not enough faculty at a particular rank, Dean Long commented that he typically fills in the gap with his nomination. Thom understands good faith actions to balance the ballot by rank and departmental representation with Dean’s recommendation and clarifies that the ballot itself must meet rank qualifications to meet letter of the bylaw. Kadem questioned if fixed term participation is allowed, and Hoppenstand responded, fixed terms with at least 3 years of service or more may vote while also possibly recusing themselves from voting due to current service on the Provost’s tenure and promotion committee. Halbritter suggested Frilingo, who was nominated to appear on the RPT the ballot, also recuse themselves for the same reason. Frilingos agreed. DeVoss (guest) was asked to speak about how CAC dealt with incomplete ballots in the past when she was Chair of CAC.

DeVoss stated that she and Deanna Thomas would make sure the ballot meets the various requirements ahead of placing the ballot on the agenda for a vote. Berding commented that its CAC’s job to oversee the bylaws and interpretation and noted that the ballot according to the bylaws must include additional professors at the rank of full; asked Halbritter to send out a message to Chairs to request additional nominees at the rank of full also sharing bylaws

stipulations that it can be one full professor per department. DeVoss confirmed bylaw stipulations. Dean Long commented that the process must be faculty driven and request we move forward by asking for additional nominations to add to the ballot.

Frilingos motioned for CAC to solicit additional nominees for the ballot from across the college at the rank full, from departments not currently represented on the ballot. Hoppenstand seconded the motion. Halbritter tabled CAL RPT ballot business to be considered in the coming days after the ballot is completed according to the letter of the bylaws.

7. Regarding, the five brief CVs to be considered for the CAL NTT RPT ballot, Halbritter shared we only have one academic specialist on the ballot and bylaws require there be two. Hoppenstand suggested we also table this agenda item until we have the proper roster. Frilingos motioned to table CAL NTT RPT ballot business and O'Dell seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Halbritter will solicit additional nominations for both ballots ahead of the fixed voting deadline. Given Dean Long's need to leave early, our attention turned to the Dean's updates.

8. Dean's Updates: Dean Long shared that meeting the letter and spirit of our bylaws is important for living out our values of shared governance. Recognized the exhaustion everyone feels and requests and reminds us of how important it is to extend patience, generosity, and support to each other as we navigate all elements of the pandemic and various changes in university systems. In conversation with Chairs and FEA, Dean Long urged us to think about how our expectations are aligned with opportunities. If opportunities aren't there, we can't expect people to do things, he said. Kudos extended to Associate Dean Hart-Davidson and Associate Dean Fritzsche for reminding us to align expectations and opportunities to do the work people care most about- with focus on teaching mission and support student experiences. Dean Long encouraged us to be present to where everyone is, noting we have his support, and to support each other.

Dean Long requested feedback on faculty welcome and reception event that occurred this year online. He noted the importance of welcome and recognition rituals and how much time staff give to organizing these events while also noting great variance in participation. Dean Long asked, what do we think are the best ways to welcome and recognize our faculty? And encouraged more conversation is needed about communal rituals of gathering in the college.

Dean Long shared a long-term goal, of establishing a post-tenure faculty review process in collaboration with CAC and asked about the best ways to undertake and explore the possibilities for such a process. Dean Long asked Hoppenstand if the senate is also thinking about this as it is important to give formative feedback throughout the faculty career life course. Hoppenstand affirmed the senate has also had conversations about post tenure faculty reviews.

Dean Long discussed how the CPIL model is based on formative intentional reviews and gives people direction to thrive and chart pathways of meaningful leadership work. He suggested the CPIL model can be at the heart of a post tenure review process. Mindful of exhaustion, he also

noted that we do not have start immediately on developing a post-tenure review process and should begin to plan for how to address it in the future.

Strategic planning in CAL will be undertaken in the coming months and Appreciative Inquiry (AI) is the informed approach we will use; fully inclusive and aligned with college values—including our culture care and shared governance. Dean Long is excited about the process and CAL is close to signing a contract with Spartina Consulting (spartinaconsulting.com). CAL solicited nominations seeking participation from faculty and staff to help steer and shape process (taking care to note the AI process is designed for broad participation). Dean Long requested feedback on preferred modality for participation (would one or two full days in person--noting a key feature of AI is everyone being together--or would shorter meetings online over several days enable more participation?). Jan/February is suggested timeframe for meetings. Dean pointed to the University Strategic Plan and identifying key priorities on academic side. Dean Long noted the significance of CAL's contribution across all pillars with emphasis on Arts Strategy and Ethnicities Initiatives. AI process will provide our direction over next 5 years. Also shared news of an upcoming campus plan regarding facilities and built environment. Dean Long's inclination is toward online for AI process and requested feedback from CAC.

O'Dell shared positive experience with AI and says the breakroom function on Zoom was useful for engaging small groups work that would have happen at tables if meeting in person.

Berding shared mixed thoughts about modality noting how Zoom can lead to lack of engagement and encouraged us to think about how to scale exercises and conversations to generate real dialogue. Berding questioned how we get engagement not just attendance and affirmed O'Dell's previous comments.

Dean Long said the experience will be engaging, as the consultants will shape the experience so we can focus on ideas, vision, and direction.

Kadem shared that we can do a combination of online and in person and go with a hybrid approach. Kadem suggested we think about the process as a series of stages and ask at what stage is it beneficial to meet online and what are the stages where meeting in person would works best. Encouraged us to consider cultural difference and promote equity by having a variety of ways to express ideas.

Dean Long said he will take these insights back to the team and concluded there will be many opportunities for different kinds of engagement.

Halbritter asked, what are other folks thinking and what do we need folks to do? He suggested we then think about the best place for that to happen and construct scenes to facilitate process.

Lastly, Dean Long circled back to the NTT Task Force recommendations for peer review. Spoke about the CPIL model also useful for career growth and development and noted variation in bylaws across college for NTT peer review along with the other issue of voting. Dean Long suggested anyone with full time appt in college should have voting rights—as is the case in

several depts already. Dean Long requested we add discussion of NTT Task Force recommendations to a future CAC agenda.

Dean Long left meeting to attend newly promoted faculty reception.

9. Associate Dean Fritzsche followed up on the need to discuss NTT Task Force recommendations. Also, proposed to correct a mistake in the bylaws noting that Centers are not in the bylaws. Associate Dean Fritzsche apologized for omission and offers proposal to add Centers to the bylaw wording in two places in the bylaws 3.4.3.2.1 and 3.4.3.2.3 “Each Department, Center, or the Dean’s Office.” Highlighted text is the proposed new language.

Ellen asked about the need to distinguish differences within the Dean’s Office as there are many units. Associate Dean Fritzsche acknowledged differences and shared, Integrative Studies would be separate from “Dean’s office” umbrella. Berding said it seems appropriate given the different demographics. Associate Dean Fritzsche noted that is possible for a person from a Center to be reviewed but not serve on the review committee. Halbritter shared concerns regarding the labor contract for NTT and encouraged us to work with union for approval and guidance.

Kadem shared that the ability to have a voice is better and also questioned what this service would mean for NTT who do not have any part of their percentage of appointment dedicated to service. Kadem asked us to be careful with our expectations.

Bongiovanni shared that adding service to workload with no additional compensation can feel like more work for the same amount of money. Associate Dean Fritzsche noted the task force is aware and thinking of these issues and wants to create opportunities for those who desire to do service and have it recognized. Also remind us of the option to switch appointment percentages and that there should be no pressure to serve.

Katz asked what is meant by peer review and why must peers be at same rank? Associate Dean Fritzsche responded that the model for peer review varies by dept. In some departments ,NTT do not feel that faculty in different ranks do not understand their work. There are also concerns for dept with small numbers of fixed term faculty. Associate Dean Fritzsche asked CAC to take this discussion back to departments for feedback.

10. CAC then turned to the WRAC Name Change request. DeVoss was present to answer questions and concerns on WRAC name change request. Hoppenstand moved to approve name change. Frilingos seconded it. The motion passed.

11. Halbritter shared new business; the dates/times for the All-College Fall & Spring Faculty & Staff meetings hosted by CAC: Fall 2021: Thu, Dec. 9, 3:00-5:00 and Spring 2022: Mon, May 9, 2:00-4:00.

During our next CAC meeting, Halbritter shared we will plan the All-College Meeting agenda. Frilingos asked if these meetings will be on Zoom or in person. Halbritter said they will be remote. Berding shared his desire for the college meetings to not be a series of announcements and to engage faculty. He would also like feedback on where we are with the budget and update

on university budget model discussions. Halbritter suggested we discuss with colleagues' ways faculty would like to be engaged in the All-College Meetings.

12. As there was no other new business at 4:54 on Thursday 11/4, meeting was adjourned. Kadem motioned to adjourn; Hopenstand seconded it (although Halbritter noted a second is not needed for motions to adjourn).

FIN.