

CAL CAC Minutes APPROVED

3 February, 2022

3:15–5:00pm

Minutes recorded by Emily Katz

Present: Bump Halbritter (Chair), Dionne O’Dell, Emily Katz, Yore Kedem, Danielle DeVoss, Gary Hoppenstand, Penny Shanks, Chris Long, Saulo Gouveia, Philip Pellino, Thomas Berding, Matt Handelman, Ruth Nicole Brown, Sonja Fritzsche, Ellen Moll, Chris Frilingos

1. Meeting called to order by CAC Chair (3:16pm)
2. Motion to approve the agenda. No discussion, passed unanimously.
3. Motion to approve the 13 January minutes. No discussion, passed unanimously.
4. Dean Long’s action items
 - a. Dean Long conveyed that he appreciates hearing about how faculty are navigating the return to campus. He emphasized that the advertised modalities of courses should not be changed but that faculty should continue to have the autonomy they have always had to cancel a class session or move online as needed.
 - b. The College has just submitted the progressive planning letter to the Provost. This letter details how CAL is moving forward with a number of initiatives. It also details last year’s OCCI returns numbers: we are down close to 2 million dollars. Since it had been hoped that these funds could help bridge budget cuts, we are in a challenging position. This difficulty is highlighted in the planning letter, as CAL will need the Provost’s help in addressing this. Dean Long explained that the main factors contributing to this decline in OCCI funds are (1) flat-rate tuition has decreased summer demand, and (2) students have become exhausted with online courses (due to taking so many online courses during COVID). University CFO, Lisa Frace, is aware of the difficulty and anticipates significant shifts in how the budget operates.
 - c. We are in the midst of the appreciative inquiry process. This process is happening in the spring, and department heads will bring some of what comes out of the process to their units in the fall.

There were some questions about the budget and OCCI funds:

- Thomas Berding asked whether the Provost’s help with the 2 million dollar OCCI shortfall would come in the form of a loan. Dean Long replied that 2 million dollars is equivalent to another 5% cut to the budget, so this is unsustainable for us. CAL has requested that the Provost restore our share of OCCI funds to 75/25. Dean Long also explained that the incremental budget model, which has been used for the past several years, has aged out of its usefulness. There is a need to re-evaluate the base budget for the College.
- Bump Halbritter asked about block tuition (flat-rate tuition), which seems to be a systemic problem and is having a huge impact on our budget. Dean Long explained that with block tuition, students pay for 15 credits and can take up to 18 credits for the same price. Consequently, students taking more courses in fall and spring and so not needing more in the summer. Block tuition has generated money for the university overall while

having a negative impact on the College's funds. (In the chat, some speculated that the pressure to take 18 credits in a semester may also be contributing to student mental health issues.)

- Thomas Berding asked whether the College is actively looking to engage faculty close to retirement about the possibility of retiring. Dean Long replied that the College has pushed hard for a university-level retirement buyout package but that this has not yet happened. CAL has been as proactive as possible within the constraints of what it has to work with. Everyone who is considering retirement has been encouraged to reach out to Associate Dean Fritzsche. Note that anyone hired before 1992 is eligible for a "consultantship year" (100% pay, 50% effort).

5. Discussion and action items

- a. Associate Dean Fritzsche discussed proposed changes regarding fixed-term (FT) faculty contracts. The goal is to create career pathways and allow FT faculty to make long-term financial decisions. It used to be the case that anything beyond a 1-year renewable contract required special approval from Provost's office. The Interim Provost shifted this to allow 3-year contracts, and this change was reaffirmed by Provost Woodruff. COVID postponed further discussion. The majority of FT faculty have 3-3 loads and are either 100% teaching or 90/10. CAL has the goal of creating greater financial stability for FT employees by offering longer-term contracts. The current proposal is that when the College makes a hire, this person will start on a 1-year contract to ensure the arrangement works out for both parties. If the first year is successful, then the chair or director could recommend to the Dean's office that the employee be offered a 3-year contract. The criteria for such a recommendation include excellence in annual review, stability of the funding source for position (so, e.g., this is not for grant-funded or OCCI-funded positions), and that the candidate have no history of discipline. After the end of the 3-year contract, there would be a more robust review (something more than the typical annual review), which would determine eligibility for another 3-year contract. The details of this more robust review are still being worked out. After the 8th semester working full-time at MSU, the employee can apply for Designation B (rolling 3-year contracts). (This would not apply to any temporary replacement positions.) There would be similar criteria for full-time FT academic specialists. The College is also looking into criteria for shifting academic specialists into the continuing system but is waiting for the release of the academic specialist handbook (to ensure that the College's proposed criteria align with those in the handbook).

There were some questions about this proposal:

- Yore Kedem asked if it would be clear in the hiring letter that the initial 1-year contract could lead to a subsequent 3-year contract. Associate Dean Fritzsche replied that this pathway would be discussed early on but would not be in the offer letter. The actual decision would be made after the annual review.
- Bump Halbritter asked if, during the hiring process for especially competitive candidates, CAL would offer an initial 3-year position in lieu of just the 1-year contract. Associate Dean Fritzsche replied that we do not normally offer 3-year contracts to incoming personnel except for spousal hires. Since this is consistent with the practice at our peer institutions, we are not losing out on attracting the best candidates.

- Thomas Berding expressed approval for this CAL initiative and asked two questions: (1) Should the possibility of a 3-year contract after the first year be alluded to in the offer letter, just to make the position more attractive? (2) If the 3-year contract offer cannot be made happen until after the annual review, this might be rather late in the year. Is there any way to expedite this process for personnel we especially wish to retain? Associate Dean Fritzsche replied that: (1) She hesitates to include this language in the contract in case things don't work out, but it is ok to talk about the possibility of the 3-year contract during the interview and to describe it as a practice of the College (given the fulfillment of certain conditions). (2) If a chair or director is concerned about retention and hoping to expedite the process, they can bring the issue to Associate Dean Fritzsche's office for discussion.
- b. The Provost's Memo from 2021 & new DEI requirement for RPT: Associate Dean Fritzsche highlighted two new items from the Provost's memo:
- that since it is a core value of MSU that candidates and faculty should be engaged in DEI activities and efforts, these efforts will be recognized and considered in the RPT process (memo item 7), and
 - that (i) accomplishments enhancing the culture and climate of the unit, College, and University, as well as (ii) repeated actions that go against MSU's core values should be considered in RPT decisions (memo item 8). Both (i) and (ii) will be phased in for RPT 2022–23, annual review 2022, and for and academic specialist (continuing positions) review 2022-23.

Associate Dean Fritzsche noted that the proposal that DEI be part of RPT and annual review aligns with CAL's values and priorities (Equity, Openness, Community, Inclusion as a matter of habit). The goal is to create an explicit space in the RPT/review process to reward and give credit for the excellence of those doing DEI work. The Provost is still working on final recommendations for how to roll this out. In particular:

- Should this be a separate statement or should the narrative be expanded to 5–7 pages?
- How will this be integrated into department peer review for annual review? Perhaps a rubric can be developed that would educate people about the many possible ways in which faculty might be pursuing DEI goals in their existing work. The rubric would be designed to save labor so the unit has a starting-point and can pick or choose from the rubric (or add to it as needed) what is most applicable for their unit members' academic work.

Additional materials are currently being prepared (The CODD has looked at peer institutions' models.)

- Wording for offer letters for incoming faculty so that it is clear from the outset that DEI work is an expectation for promotion
- Wording for external referee request letters.

Associate Dean Fritzsche's requests:

- Chairs & directors should mentor those going through the RPT process or academic specialist review starting in 2022-23 about what DEI work they are/plan to do and how to interweave this into their narrative.
- There should be unit-wide conversations that result in a rubric that can be in place for Fall 2022 RPT and 2022 annual review.

- The College/CIPC will work on a rubric for academic specialists (continuing system). Units can review and adopt this rubric or prepare their own.
- What might this look like for FT faculty promotion?

The Council of Diversity Deans (CODD) has developed recommended guidelines for writing and evaluating DEI in the faculty annual review and RPT process. An *ad hoc* College of Social Science academic specialist committee developed recommended guidelines for writing and evaluating DEI statements for academic specialists' annual review and promotion process. These documents and the Provost's memoranda that prompted them can be reviewed here:

[https://michiganstate.sharepoint.com/:b:/r/sites/CALCAC/Shared%20Documents/CAL%20CAC%20Agendas%202021-2022/Materials%20for%20Feb%203rd%20Meeting/UCFT%20-%20RPT%20Updates%201.5.22%20\(1\).pdf?csf=1&web=1&e=xiBz4A](https://michiganstate.sharepoint.com/:b:/r/sites/CALCAC/Shared%20Documents/CAL%20CAC%20Agendas%202021-2022/Materials%20for%20Feb%203rd%20Meeting/UCFT%20-%20RPT%20Updates%201.5.22%20(1).pdf?csf=1&web=1&e=xiBz4A)

Associate Dean Fritzsche communicated that feedback would be welcomed and appreciated. The CAL Representative on the University Committee for Faculty Tenure, Matt Handelman, would also appreciate feedback that he can bring to the UCFT.

- c. Update on progress to fill the vacancy of academic specialist/NTT CAC representative from a non-department unit and on how this should be done in the future. The vacancy has not yet been filled. Associate Dean Fritzsche suggested that the CAC could reach out to Centers and the Dean's Office each year with a call for nominations/self-nominations. The ballot could perhaps include short bios.

There was some discussion:

- Bump Halbritter expressed concern about the CAC being responsible for the election of someone to the CAC. Is this a conflict of interest, given that all other members of the CAC are nominated from departments? Thomas Berding noted that the CAC would not in fact be choosing the member or playing an adjudicating role in their selection, but rather only facilitating the election (by sending the ballot to peers for a vote). However, he also noted that there could be an issue if there were so many candidates that the CAC did have to play an adjudicating role by narrowing down the ballot. Halbritter suggested that charters might help to operationalize bylaws in this case.
- d. Bump Halbritter reported on the results of the vote on revisions to the CAL Bylaws regarding the composition of the Non-Tenure Stream Promotion and Review Committee. The bylaws currently allow only Associate Professors/Full-Fixed Term and Continuing and Senior Academic Specialists in Departments to be nominated to serve on the College Non-Tenure Stream (NTS) Promotion and Review Committee. The revision would allow the nomination of committee members with appointments in College Centers or the Dean's Office in addition to those who have appointments in Departments. The ballot asked whether the proposed revisions to the CAL Bylaws section 3.4.3.2 should be approved. The results were: 92.78% yes (50 votes), 7.22% no (7 votes). Halbritter noted that since 354 are eligible to vote, the total number of votes fell just short of the 30% needed for quorum. Should we run the vote again so that the additional 10 votes needed

to reach quorum can be achieved? Even if all 10 votes went to the minority share, the “no’s” would not carry the vote. How should the CAC proceed?

There was discussion:

- Dean Long suggested that the ballot be re-opened so that additional people can vote. Thomas Berding agreed that the CAC should follow governance and reach quorum. He agreed with Dean Long that the original ballot be re-opened and suggested that members of the CAC give it a push in their units. Gary Hoppenstand agreed that we can re-run the original ballot; there is no need to run it all over again.
 - Motion to re-open the ballot that was distributed regarding the issue at hand to encourage additional votes. The vote for this motion carried.
- e. Bump Halbritter and Danielle DeVoss (the CAL faculty senators) asked the CAC if they should continue sending out Faculty Senate/University Council updates. Do members of the CAC find these updates from the CAL faculty senators useful? In discussion, several CAC members confirmed that they find it useful to receive information relevant for CAL, and that the practice should continue. No views to the contrary were expressed.
- f. Danielle DeVoss described the CAL DEI Coordinators Team Proposal. The proposal is for CAL to create a DEI Coordinators Team. DeVoss explained that this structure would support DEI work in units and create more synergy between unit-level and College-level DEI work. The team would consist of tenure-system faculty (ideally associate or full), academic specialists (ideally continuing system or senior academic specialists), and NT faculty (ideally in departments where the faculty member can adjust their contract percentage). DeVoss made the following requests of the CAC:
- Comments and feedback to take back to Dean Long, Associate Dean Fritzsche, and the team working on the proposal
 - The CAC’s blessing for the team to engage in the next steps, which are to share this proposal and consult with Professors Troutman and Contreras
 - CAC members should share the proposal with the units they represent (ideally via department advisory councils), to seek feedback that can be shared with Dean Long.

There was some discussion:

- Thomas Berding asked whether the proposed team duplicates the DEI work done by e.g. chairs, department DEI committees, and CIPC. Berding expressed concern about bloat in the administration in light of budget cuts. DeVoss replied that these concerns are relevant and will be considered. She explained that positions on the proposed team would be compensated and that team members would be part of CIPC and would support and enhance CIPC’s work. They could, for example, take on projects that CIPC is not able to pursue due to its workload. DeVoss suggested that it would be good to spread this work out, and that the proposed team would make that possible.
- Ellen Moll expressed support for the proposal. She agreed with DeVoss that there is much DEI work to be done, yet the people currently tasked with this work do not have the time to do it all. Much of this work is currently done as unpaid labor

on the side, so it makes sense to create compensated positions. Moll asked why there is a preference for more senior people. She also suggested a climate survey as a possible task for this team.

- Bump Halbritter asked whether the CAC could commit to DeVoss's second request, namely that the committee give its blessing for the team developing this proposal to engage in the next steps. There were no objections to this from anyone on the CAC.
- g. Technology Purchasing (Yore Kedem & Scott Schopieray): At this point in the meeting, we were running quite low on time. Discussion of this matter was initiated, and it was agreed that the CAC would return to it at next month's meeting. Scott Schopieray explained that the issue is not limited to IT purchasing but concerns more generally MSU's institutional policies regarding purchasing. Scott will attend next month's meeting and give the CAC more data and details. Yore Kedem asked CAC members to bring this issue to their units and to report back at the next meeting. Is the work of faculty in their departments being affected by having to wait for IT purchases?
- h. New business
Bump Halbritter reported that he recently asked Jon Ritz and Jon Novello to plan and run a wellness activity for the next all-college meeting. Ritz has already agreed.

6. Meeting adjourned at 5:00