

## CAL CAC Minutes—APPROVED

October 7, 2021

3:15–5:00pm

Attendance: Tom Berding, Silvina Bongiovanni, Ruth Nicole Brown, Cara Cilano, Chris Frilingos, Sonja Fritzsche, Bump Halbritter, Gary Hoppenstand, Christopher Long, Elen Moll, Dionne O'Dell, Rajiv Ranjan, Elena Ruiz, Melissa Staub.

1. Call to order by Bump Halbritter, 2021-22 CAC chair. Silvina Bongiovanni serves as scribe for this meeting
2. Approval of agenda. Gary Hoppenstand makes motion to approve. Seconded by Tom Berding. Passes unanimously.
3. Approval of September 2, 2021 CAC minutes:

<https://teams.microsoft.com/l/file/5F9FFFF1-D621-4B00-878C-87888176C135?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%209-21.docx&baseUrl=https%3A%2F%2Fmichiganstate.sharepoint.com%2Fsites%2FCALCAC&serviceName=teams&threadId=19:70534118e7c14d738d691d4cda38241f@thread.skype&groupId=a20bada9-b3ad-4ddd-bb34-710f6b147f73>

Tom Berding moves to approve. Seconded by Gary Hoppenstand.  
Passes unanimously.

4. Update from Associate Dean Fritzsche regarding Designation B evaluation and promotion process.

<https://teams.microsoft.com/l/file/7A0E44F8-D390-4D0E-A0F8-698BD4FD2D64?tenantId=22177130-642f-41d9-9211-74237ad5687d&fileType=docx&objectUrl=https%3A%2F%2Fmichiganstate.sharepoint.com%2Fsites%2FCALCAC%2FShared%20Documents%2FCAL%20CAC%20Agendas%202021-2022%2FDocuments%20for%20October%207th%20Meeting%2FCAL%20Designation%20B%20Fixed%20Term%20Review%20Guidelines%20Final.docx&baseUrl=https%3A%2F%2Fmichiganstate.sharepoint.com%2Fsites%2FCALCAC&serviceName=teams&threadId=19:70534118e7c14d738d691d4cda38241f@thread.skype&groupId=a20bada9-b3ad-4ddd-bb34-710f6b147f73>

Associate Dean Sonja Fritzche informed that the call for nominations for committee members for the college-level NTT promotion review committee has been sent to chairs. Once nominations this new committee are received, the CAC will review them in light of requirements to serve on the committee and will then create a ballot for NTT faculty to vote. The college-level NTT promotion review committee will be organized similarly to the RPT promotion committee for tenure-stream faculty. However, current bylaws do not make provisions for NTT faculty that are not affiliated to a department. This time around, it will only include NTT faculty in departments, but bylaws will have to be updated soon.

Associate Dean Sonja Fritzche also announced that there was an update to Designation B policies, which was precipitated by changes made in the Academic Human Resources office. Until now, Designation B

candidates' dossiers included all SIRS forms, in addition to syllabi and all other required materials, which often amounted to ~500-page dossiers. Academic HR now requires that dossiers do not extend beyond 85 pages. Associate Dean Sonja Fritzche has worked with department chairs to ensure that no NTT faculty was disadvantaged by this change. Despite the fast timeline of these changes, CAL is on track to be in compliance.

However, in light of this development, CAL will have to update college guidelines to Designation B to reflect the 85-page requirement, in addition to other necessary policy updates, namely: (a) eligibility to Designation B, (b) adding a requirement to ensure that there is at least one NTT faculty member reviewing dossiers, and (c) better understanding of the 85-page limit. Regarding (c), candidates will be able to add an appendix in which to include additional materials for departments to review. Candidates will decide which materials go in the 85-page dossier and which materials go in the appendix. Members of the CAC were encouraged to share this information with their respective units.

Bump Halbritter pointed out that labor contracts do not necessarily accommodate for the amount of work that serving in these review committees take. Given that this labor-intensive work may be an imposition of service on NTT faculty, especially in units where there are not as many NTT faculty, he asked if the union been consulted regarding this issue.

Sonja Fritzsche replied that the president of the union is the chair of the NTT task force. The recommendation from the College is that NTT faculty be allowed to have a 5% or 10% of service in their appointment, provided this is their wish. Associate Dean Sonja Fritzsche is aware that some units may have fewer NTT faculty among which this type of work is typically divided, so she is paying close attention to service loads and is working with units to balance those commitments.

Regarding the documents included in the dossier, Rajiv Ranjan raised the concern of lack of equitable access to professional development opportunities, teaching awards and honors sections, due to the size of the department (i.e., fewer NTT faculty), typical teaching assignments for NTT faculty (e.g., primarily teaching at the 100- and 200-level courses) and the pandemic. So, he inquired if the college accounts for the potential impact that access to these opportunities may have when dossiers are evaluated.

Sonja Fritzsche assured the CAC that these categories allow to recognize the work of NTT faculty, not just in teaching but also with assessment, review of teaching, and student success and such endeavors. Professional development is not a requirement at the college level. Departments do have specific criteria, so it is important that the candidate pay attention to those. With regard to professional development opportunities, it is likely that there are offerings outside of the home department (such as AAN) or through professional organizations. Since professional development funds across units vary, if financial access is a burden, there are resources in the College to help with that.

Next, Thomas Berding brought attention to a deadline for feedback on the NTT evaluation guidelines document. Sonja Fritzsche requested feedback by the end of October, via email directly to her.

## 5. Updates from Associate Dean Cara Cilano

### a. Discuss CUC bylaws.

Associate Dean Cara Cilano explained the history of the CCC and its relationship to the CUC.

Prior to the creation of the CUC, there was not a space to discuss undergraduate matters broadly. The CUC is currently looking at some bylaws, modeled on the CCC, CAC and other college committees. Associate Dean Cara Cilano will bring these bylaws to the CAC once they are finished, in the hopes to get the CUC ratified as College-level committee and made visible in the College bylaws.

b. Possible nesting CUC and CC under CAC in Teams?

Associate Dean Cara Cilano shared that the CUC and the CCC are interested in developing a structure similar to the CAC's Teams. Because both of these committees operate under the umbrella of the CAC, Associate Dean Cara Cilano asked if they should be channels on the CAC's Teams or should they be independent Teams.

Dean Long wanted to bring attention to the CAL Teams, which includes all staff and faculty in the College. The CAL Teams has channels for, for example, Chairs and Directors. Thus, one possibility would be to migrate the CAC Teams to a channel under the CAL Teams, as well as the CUC and CCC. One issue with this approach is that it does not allow for the channels presently nested under the CAC Teams. However, it seems like having those CUC and CCC as part of the CAC Teams makes sense, with the caveat of ensuring that conversations that are meant to be internal to a committee remain that way.

Bump Halbritter brought up the concern that these tools may create records of documents or conversations that are decontextualized and could possibly be repurposed with other aims.

Next, Thomas Berding circled back to the CUC bylaws. He highlighted the importance of having CUC bylaws that are calibrated and articulated regarding membership to reflect that curriculum is the province of faculty. Associate Dean Cilano clarified that the draft of the bylaws do not currently stipulate who should serve from each department (e.g. Associate Chair). Departments decide internally on their representative to the CUC.

Referring back to the conversation about Teams, Sonja Fritzsche suggested that the CAC could write guidelines with best practices in the use of Teams and provide some clarity.

## 6. Dean Long's action items

Dean Long opened his remarks by addressing issues regarding COVID protocols. Dr. Johanna Schuster-Craig, CAL representative at the University Committee for Faculty Affairs, had shared an update (which will be available on Teams) at the time that many of the decisions regarding protocols were being made (and communicated). Dean Long clarified that decisions about protocols are made at the University level, but he acknowledges the reactions these brought about among faculty and staff. Dean Long then invited comments from CAC members.

Silvina Bongiovanni shared with the CAC concerns that faculty in her unit had brought up regarding health safety and contact tracing, especially given that there had not been opportunities to discuss these concerns collectively as a College. Dean Long assured that these are messages that are coming from multiple sources. He recognizes that faculty and staff see a CAL meeting as a space in which to discuss these issues, and he remains open to the suggestion. At the same time, he observed that in order to remain productive, it is critical to have a clear sense of the purpose that such a meeting would serve.

Chris Frilingos noted his unit there has discussed the verification process of vaccination status. Dean Long observed that there are options to verify vaccination status, though these venues are not easily

accessible. In turn, Bump Halbritter draw attention to the fact the current system requires faculty to trust the facts presented by students and pandemics are immune to trust.

Dean Long assured the CAC he understands the concerns, as well as the financial pressures to keep the university open and offer students a vibrant community. He also shared the news that attrition rate is lower than it has been in a long time, which is a positive sign.

Thomas Berding asked if there was a way to ascertain the scope of how many requests for modality had been placed and what criteria had been used in considering these requests. Dean Long replied that there had not been many requests, and that the College had successfully accommodated the ones made. Associate Dean Cara Cilano also weighted in. She indicated that it had been more of an issue with inconsistencies between the information available through the registrar and what was communicated to students through other channels. She also mentioned that across the university some faculty had filed a SEAD (Statement of Employee Accommodation Determination) with RCPD. She finally stressed that decisions are driven by learning goals in each particular class more than anything else.

A conversation about exposure to COVID followed. Bump Halbritter proposed to request topics and action items in each unit for a CAL meeting, should there be one. Finally, Rajiv Ranjan noted that classrooms that would allow to make accommodations are often not available.

Next, Dean Long addressed the budget. The recurring budget in CAL is above 85% tied up in human resources. The Task Force for Budget Reduction has not been able to identify additional sources for budget reduction other than the ones already in place (such as the re-organization of staff into the Functional Teams). Therefore, it was decided to bridge the cuts for a few years knowing that as retirements and attrition happen, we will get closer to the number that the 4% reduction for two years represents (~ \$2.7 million). In the meantime, the College had to use the off-campus revenue to pay the debt to the Provost's office. Dean Long also shared the good news that the Provost announced that CAL will not be taxing CAL next year. Should there be needs for additional monies, there will be a process to make those requests, but the details remain unclear. Nevertheless, CAL is faced with upcoming budget cuts. These will depend on domestic and international student enrollment, state funding, emergency relief money, among other things. Dean Long ended his observations regarding budget by assuring the CAC that the College is taking cuts, similarly to individual units.

Finally, the Dean shared that he will be joining President Stanley in a number of events in LA where they will meet with donors. This opportunity signals that arts and humanities is part of the strategy. Dean Long encouraged the CAC to attend the ethics symposium and noted that these are all opportunities for access to university-level donors.

## 7. Discussion and action items.

- a. How is the CAL admin measuring the effectiveness of the Functional Teams restructuring?  
(Frilingos)

Dean Long expressed that the College gathering mode. Penny Shanks specified that one evaluation period is underway, which has already revealed some breaks in the system, and they are addressing them as quickly as they can. There will be another evaluation period at the end of the semester, and likely be a survey in the Spring. She emphasized that milestones have been planned, as well as engaging stakeholders during evaluations.

Thomas Berding expressed thanks for the efforts, as his unit had already seen improvements. Dean Long recognized that departments like Art, Art History and Design and Theatre had more pressing needs. He also requested to continue to provide feedback and encouraged the CAC to see these efforts as a shared challenge.

b. Action Items for November 4:

- i. Consistent with the College of Arts and Letters Bylaws, we are proceeding with the election process for the 2021-22 RPT Committee: "the CAC will select four (4) nominees for the ballot, after which time the eligible "Voting Faculty" will vote to fill the two remaining slots."

<https://michiganstate.sharepoint.com/sites/CALCAC/Shared%20Documents/CAL%20CAC%20Agendas%202021-2022/Documents%20for%20October%207th%20Meeting/RESPONSE%20REQUESTED%20-%202021-22%20RPT%20Committee%20Election-Department%20Nominee%20Solicitation.rtf>

ii. Discussion of NTT Promotion review procedures

<https://michiganstate.sharepoint.com/sites/CALCAC/Shared%20Documents/CAL%20CAC%20Agendas%202021-2022/Documents%20for%20October%207th%20Meeting/2021-2022%20College%20NTT%20Promotion%20Review%20Committee.rtf>

The CAC will be preparing ballots for elections for the RPT committee. This year, it will include candidates for the NTT annual review committee. Bump Halbritter noted that the CAC's next meeting we will be reviewing the candidates and deliberate to prepare the ballot and reminded CAC members that these materials will likely become available in between CAC meetings.

c. New business.

No calls for new business

d. Adjourn. Gary Hoppenstad moves to adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 5:13pm.

Future meeting dates for 2021-2022: Thursdays from 3:15-5:00 on Nov. 4, Dec. 2, Jan. 13, Feb. 3, Mar. 3, Apr. 7