

## CAL CAC APPROVED MINUTES

November 3, 2022

3:15–5:00pm

Attendance: Thomas Berding, Deanna Thomas, Heather Douglas, Kristen Mapes, Danny Mendez, Bump Halbritter, Ashlee Richards, Chris Frilingos, Philip Barry Pellino, Shannon Schweitzer, William Vincent

Meeting called to order at 3:17pm. Ruth Nicole Brown took minutes.

Suggestion made to edit the 10.6.22 meeting minutes for typos.

Thomas Berding motioned to approve minutes with noted suggestion. Seconded by William Vincent. Discussion. No objections. Motion passed.

Thomas Berding motioned to approve agenda. Seconded by William Vincent. Discussion. No objections. Motion passed.

**Re: Election Ballot: RPT.** Inquiry made about the current configuration of RPT committee. Specifically, wanting to know who is on it? Deanna Thomas shared who was on the committee.

Thomas Berding specified criteria for eligibility with regards to rank as to who may serve. The intention on behalf of CAC is to make sure we have a diverse and inclusive ballot regarding rank. It is also noted that the CAC chooses 4 of the five nominees and the Dean also gets a pick.

There was discussion about the materials submitted: Generally, CAC appreciates thoughtful and comprehensive letters and cv's while also noting and appreciating how time-intensive it is to prepare substantive nomination packets. There was also discussion about the nomination form itself and wonderment if CAC could do better to recognize (inter)disciplinary considerations so as not to speculate if candidate's brevity was a response to outdated paradigms that privilege publication as the primary form of scholarly/artistic productivity. Among all materials submitted, there was recognition of brilliance and accomplishment, praise of fairness, and acknowledgement of a highly competitive pool.

Whereas the nomination form does not require a personal statement, the CAC returned to discussion about the need to revisit the structure of the nomination form/call itself. Overall, the CAC desires to receive information about the depth and breadth of candidates' diverse intellectual leadership and account for the range of contributions they have made to the arts/scholar communities to which they belong.

There was a suggestion to disentangle our conversation about the need for revisions to the process itself apart from the decision before us. We were also encouraged to remain mindful about how much labor we ask from our colleagues, especially full professors who are so heavily engaged in service work as is, when we do turn our attention to revising the nomination submission process.

Thomas Berding motioned to approve a ballot that consists of Aslami, Babana-Hampton, Brown, and Polio with a rationale given of increasing diversity with regard to rank on the ballot and noted the exceptional contribution of all candidates. William Vincent seconded. Discussion. No objections. Motion passed.

**Election Ballot: NTT.** Given there are four eligible positions and four nominees, Yore Kedem advised us well to accept them all.

Thomas Berding motioned to approve the four eligible nominees: Li, Kangas-Preston, Smith, and Quinn. William Vincent seconded. Discussion. No objections. Motion passed.

**Election Ballot: DAAC.** We needed to approve five candidates to serve, and we only had 4 nominees.

The DAAC ballot is the only one of three discussed this meeting that requires a statement and we're 1 short. There is a claim made that we are experiencing lack of participation in governance. Suggestions are shared about how we can solicit one more nomination. An observation was shared that the election was supposed to happen last March; therefore, we are with time. There was general agreement to go back to and ask CAL Chairs to help us out by providing another nominee for the DAAC ballot.

There is a need to establish an avenue for communication among units that are NOT a department to solicit additional nominee, as needed. Heather Douglas asked us to include a one-page letter towards equity for future ballot determinations and points to CAL bylaws:3.4.4.2.1.

*The Committee shall consist of seven practicing artists from Departments, Centers, and Programs across the College of Arts and Letters. A practicing artist is someone who is primarily involved in creative production.*

Yore Kedem called our attention to equity and insisted that faculty appointed in Centers who are participating artists, must have equitable representation. Yore Kedem agreed to work with Thomas Berding to contact units across CAL to solicit another nomination. According to Yore Kedem the ballot will consist of the four current nominees and after communicating with Chairs, a 5<sup>th</sup> nominee will be added (that will be the first person to respond to the extended call). The 5<sup>th</sup> candidate will be solicited by Nov. 16<sup>th</sup>, and a vote will be taken two days following 11/16/22.

Bump Halbritter suggested that the DAAC committee determine the length of each nominee will serve per term. Yore Kedem moved us forward by noting we will vote on the DAAC committee, online, once we have enough call candidates and ask for any objections. Hearing none, Yore extended gratitude to all for such a complex and rich discussion.

Dean's Action Item

**Treatment and inclusion of emeritus faculty-** Yore Kedem shared faculty senate minute updates that rank designation of emeritus must now be applied for and is not automatic (as a necessary response to Nassar's conviction and the circumstances around it). William Vincent called for the need to give greater attention to the treatment and inclusion of emeritus faculty noting a desire for emeritus faculty to be invited to department events, given more than 2 days to pack up offices, receive acknowledgement for the contributions, and presented with on-going opportunities to present research in the department, if desired. Bump Halbritter suggested a standardized process might be helpful for Chairs, so they can plan accordingly regarding dept. demands on space and resources as it coincides with retirements.

4:01pm **Introduction of Guest discussants** including Proposal Co-Author - Natasha Jones (WRAC), CIPC members: Tania de-Sostoa-McCue (WRAC), Laura Yares (REL) Associate Dean Kirk Domer.

Kirk Domer commented on current treatment and inclusion of emeritus discussion and notes the significance of the "Legacy lecture series" emerging from a culture of care and recently launched.

Yore Kedem called on departments and CAL to maintain relationships with emeritus faculty and to acknowledge their on-going contributions via newsletters and communications.

Ellen Moll and Dean Chris Long joined the meeting.

**Introduction of DEI coordinators proposal presented by guest discussant and proposal Co-Author - Natasha Jones (WRAC).** Jones provided an overview of the proposal. The idea is to establish a team of DEI coordinators to work in coalition to gather resources for CAL DEI efforts and advocate on behalf of localized efforts and amplify the DEI work of CAL faculty across the university. Towards greater inclusion and equity, this proposal advocates the labor be undertaken as a team and not fall on one person. Importantly, what makes this proposal distinct is that the team of DEI coordinators would create opportunities for DEI work to flourish and new synergies and opportunities to build community and increase belonging. The DEI coordinators will work collaboratively and in partnership with CAL units to build life-affirming DEI presenting initiatives and programming that engage and promote diversity, equity, and inclusion. It is not, according to Jones, a committee that will police unit activities nor focus on grievance and complaint. Jones invites questions and asks the committee to explicitly share their feedback with care to note pain points and opportunities. Jones is open, accessible, and welcoming in the invitation to expand and shape the current proposal.

In discussion of the proposal, a question was asked about possibility of crossover and/or overlap between DEI coordinators and College Inclusive Practices Committee (CIPC). It is noted that CIPC reps have term limits, and DEI work is a much longer game and the coordinators would provide continuity in efforts that overlap with CIPC. Laura Yares also notes CIPC representatives do not necessarily have expertise in DEI. Yares, a current CIPC rep notes that the DEI coordinators would be a value added to CIPC members.

Heather Douglas raised a fair concern about faculty workload and the service burdens many faculty are currently experiencing, in context of our previous discussion about the lack of nominations for various committees in this very same meeting. Jones noted that faculty workload and increased calls for service is a real burden and a very valid concern. Jones welcomes solutions to this issue in the form of the suggestions given by CAC in this meeting including staggered terms, internal/external hiring, compensation, and recognition on DEI coordinator labor in all forms of appointment letters and promotions. Jones acknowledges that DEI coordinator positions are envisioned as indeed full time positions.

Kirk Domer encouraged us all to think on a global/larger scale, to envision DEI coordinators as content experts as opposed to department representatives, questioned who the DEI coordinators would report to, and called the CAC's attention to the (DRAFT) Scope of Work Statement for CIPC/22-23:

*In AY 22-23, the College Inclusive Practices Committee will work with departments, programs, centers, and the administration to gather, share, discuss, and develop best practices in DEI related to 1) Annual Review & RPT, 2) Faculty Searches, 3) Graduate Recruitment, 4) Syllabi language, and 5) Unit-level Committee development/function to share with our home units to inform and sustain inclusive practices as part of the core work of CAL.*

Jones made a clear and compelling case that DEI coordinators as proposed are not to be thought of as “a compliance position”. But rather, Jones clarified that they are a team that consults and models inclusive behavior and practices in CAL. The DEI coordinators give and spend time towards making DEI possible. They make recommendations, organize us toward thriving and healthy relations, and engage-institute- and create new practices that actively build community in the college. They are in conversations with Chairs and faculty, they are aware of the latest DEI research, and most importantly, they know how to apply the research in tangible ways that result in the doing of DEI.

A request was made to revise the proposal so that it is made clear that the DEI coordinators are NOT compliance officers but are rather DEI institution builders, who are actively creating the communities, bolstering relationships, and enhancing networks for us all to participate in DEI work and play so that we may more fully express the college's purpose and aspirations.

Ellen Moll raised a great question that asked if CAL would be in any way disadvantaged as the DEI coordinator proposal does not structural match the other colleges. The question was much appreciated by the co-authors of the proposal who answered along the lines of, so long as the coordinators are compensated for their labor, there is general agreement that CAL will not be disadvantaged and the call to generate new relations among faculty in CAL centered in DEI can be exemplary.

Yore Kedem wrapped up our discussion and extended gratitude to Jones, Yares, and de-Sostoa-McCue for joining us and encouraged Kirk Domer and Dean Long to follow up.

Chris Long asked that we discuss the December **All college faculty meeting** during our next time together on Dec. 1 because our energy is noticeably fading, and we are out of time. Yore Kedem agreed to work with Deanna to find another time to meet for one hour to plan our all-faculty meeting as a special CAC meeting. Thomas Berding suggested sharing the agenda for full faculty meeting via special meeting or otherwise via email to discuss prior to dec. 1<sup>st</sup> and then decide if we need another meeting.

Dean Chris Long spoke on the **leadership changes at MSU** in context of the recent appointment of Interim President Woodruff. Long noted the effectiveness of the jointly penned letter by the Dean's council and the skilled facilitation they offered and modeled during the Board of Trustee meeting whereby Interim President Woodruff's appointment was approved. The Board's unanimous approval of Woodruff was celebrated as a significant and an important and powerful moment. The Board showed us all, we still have significant issues to address on campus. Long noted that both the ethics committee and arts strategy is generating movement in a good direction. Long asked us how we are all doing given the changes in leadership on campus.

We welcomed the continuity that Interim President Woodruff provides and thought it a wise decision. Dean Long and CAC praised the work of the faculty senate during such stressful changes.

The CAC meeting is overtime.

Danny Mendez motioned to adjourn, and it was seconded by Heather Douglas at 5:04pm.

The scribe acknowledges that it felt much later than the time recorded above and questioned then, how she would provide succinct minutes. Dear reader, she in fact was not at all succinct in the taking of these minutes.

Future meeting dates for 2022-2023: Thursdays from 3:15-5:00 on Dec. 1, Jan. 19, Feb. 16, Mar. 16, Apr.