

**Advisory Council Minutes  
College of Arts & Letters  
December 7, 2017  
321 Linton Hall**

**Present:** Danielle DeVoss (WRAC); Jon Frey (AAHD); David Godden (PHL); Saulo Gouveia (RCS); Karen Kangas-Preston (THR); Suzanne Wagner (L&L); Tiffanie Quinn (UG Rep, ATD);

For CAL: Chris Long (DEAN); Fritzsche (Assoc. Dean)

**Agenda:** Motion to approve Devoss; second Keune; approved.

**Minutes:** Motion to approve as submitted: Devoss; second Keune; approved

**Dean comments:**

- thanks for coordinating faculty meeting; opportunities for conversation w/ faculty is welcomed; conversations are a valuable learning opportunity for Dean and faculty;
- moving closer to vision of true advisory structure of CAC meetings and not just reporting;
- Academic Leadership Fellows group to nurture leadership among faculty: Dean Long has put his name forward for this project through AAN; will have shadows 5 hrs/week to learn leadership styles from various deans on campus;
  - Long's shadow is working on diversifying curriculum initiatives;

**Summary of feedback from Faculty meeting** distributed by DeVoss and posted on D2L CAC site; themes were identified based on repeated comments; potential action items for our continued discussion are below;

**THEMES**

- non-tenure track (NT) faculty pay equity
- faculty events including writing retreats and informal social gatherings
- facilitated mentoring experiences and opportunities
- continued support for participation in programs like Adams Academy, travel support for conferences, CAL URI

**POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS**

1. create and distribute a survey at the start of spring semester, with a few select probing questions for:
  - a. any further feedback or comments about the three prompts provided;
  - b. faculty who weren't at the meeting to share ideas/opinions; and
  - c. how faculty would like CAC (specifically) to help address or guide discussions around their feedback and recommendations
2. implement a college-level plan and support for NT faculty mentoring, with attention to Des B and NT promotion processes
3. coordinate with the CAL Awards Task Force (Staub, DeVoss, Frey, McKeon, Roznowski, Rundblad)

### **Discussion on format of fall faculty meeting:**

- Some informal feedback received from units:
  - Can there be a mechanism for faculty to engage online?
  - Table discussion could be to brainstorm for solutions to problems (ie: in response to student success issue that came up); Is this more or less successful when issues arise on the spot as opposed to prompts in advance?
  - Q&A time with chairs of CGC/CCC/CIPC—seems to be an easy fix to add this;
  - Online interaction: Humanities Commons? TopHat? (something like the President uses in her meetings); both in person and online/anonymous questioning/feedback gives opportunity for all; questions could be fielded by CAC members
- Soliciting general feedback: can we create a place for anonymous feedback/questions from CAL faculty to CAC for topics people are hesitant to say to administration in person?
- Wagner plans to create an online survey with the three prompts from the meeting and an additional comment/question field to send over break so faculty can respond up until the next CAC meeting in January; (#1 from above action items)
- faculty mentoring came up in response to prompts often for NT and AS faculty: Emily Bouck working with Fritzsche on mentoring program;
  - college level programs in peer mentoring (for pre-tenure faculty now, associate later);
  - scheduling more meetings with topics of discussion for spring;
  - college mentoring fellows program is being developed to present to Dean to launch in spring—to give training in on being a mentor on all levels;
    - all currently for tenure stream; focus on NT/AS for next year;
  - new FT & AS faculty and Post Doc orientations are happening in the college; monthly meetings with Fritzsche for these groups for feedback and topics of conversation that also allow for some informal peer mentorship;
  - training for mentors in departments;
  - readings available to help generate conversations;

**CAC meeting planning for spring:** upcoming meetings: January 11, February 1, March 1, April 5, spring full faculty meeting May 7, 3-5pm

#### January

- review feedback from web survey and in detail on notes that DeVoss provided;
- Ned Watts from University Steering Committee would like to come talk with CAC;
- School of Languages—changes to CAL bylaws,
  - representation of the School to CAC and other CAL committees all need to be determined
  - What should Chair's meetings look like with a school Director involved instead of two chairs?
  - Possibly including an associate member or rep from one of the smaller programs?

#### February

- Fritzsche report on joint appointments (has met with program directors, chairs, and dual appointment faculty for feedback)

- Kristin Janka – student awards, how to get more undergrads nominated for awards (possible link with faculty awards committee?);

**School of Languages updates:** (Long and Fritzsche report)

- details on D2L CAC page; in phase three now; updates on all phases are on the website: languages.cal.msu.edu;
- draft bylaws for the School are completed and on D2L page; executive planning committee (EPC) is in place; each program has been asked to create their own bylaws in how they will interface with the school;
  - drafts of bylaws are complete and now looking at how they tie into to school draft bylaws;
- planned vote for early spring on whether to move forward with the proposed school structure; Dean is getting clarity from Provost on what the University needs from CAL in this process;

**School Structure:** (Fritzsche, former chair of L&L and School task force member reported) full task force was in support of the school; school can allow for the director to advocate in a way that current chairs cannot do because of work load; allows time for inter-college collaboration;

School Director with Advisory Council and Leadership Council working with them; councils have reps from programs as noted below in area breakdowns; associate directors (2) for academics and administration; program heads/directors/coordinators as detailed below

Spanish, French, German, SLS/TESOL, Linguistics—each have program heads (PH)

- these areas have graduate programs as well as majors, minors;
- PH will do annual reviews for their own faculty;
- each will have own rep to advisory council and leadership council;

Chinese, Japanese, Russian, Arabic—each have program directors (PD)

- these have undergrad majors/minors only;
- PD will not have annual review responsibilities: one of the associate directors will do annual reviews;
- will have two reps from this category to Advisory Council; and PD from each on Leadership Council

LCTL, CeLTA (has a director who will be part of leadership council for the school), Classics, Hindi, Italian, Korean, Portuguese, African Languages—have one program coordinator (PC) for all (plus CeLTA)

- for programs with minors only;
- PC will not have annual review responsibilities so one of the associate directors will do annual reviews;
- PC will have representation to the Leadership Council and two reps to Advisory Council

Advisory council will also have UG/grad rep (1 each) and two non-TS at large members from any area voted in;

### **Discussion:**

Q: where does burden from work load go to if not chairs?

- Associate directors for most part, some to program heads;

Q: why no vote earlier?

- There was a survey and town hall meetings with programs for feedback; the Provost and University Council have now asked for a vote

Q: what if a program grows from what it is now or shrinks since program leadership is based on current size? How to advocate for smaller programs?

- Collaborative model can help each other promote smaller programs; program leadership is written based on size of program/degree offering so if a program changes they get a different form of leadership (ie: if Korean grows to match size and academic offerings of Spanish they now get a program head of Korean); directors' jobs are to advocate for all areas;

Q: does accreditation of programs/degree offerings change with formation of a School?

- Each program doesn't have a separate accreditation process/organization; degrees remain the same; no changes in majors/minors planned currently; no changes for university accreditation;

Challenges: it's new; people report to someone different (not a chair); how to nurture success of faculty in new structure; will need training for program heads and those doing annual reviews;

Updated version of the school bylaws is needed to help programs draft their own bylaws; updated structure layout will also be helpful; these will be provided to programs as bylaws continue to be worked on.

### **Upcoming School Planning and Moving Forward:**

- L&L and RSC will meet in January to discuss the vote process and whether to have an online vote (per the current bylaws);
- will have town halls before to allow everyone to give feedback;
- vote will be whether the current departments support the school or not; both L&L and RSC have to approve
- Dean feels the school is the future; if the faculty don't affirm this the structure would be refined and re-presented for another vote;
- CAC would need to discuss whether/how to go forward with current searches for directors if vote is "no"; CAC would have to help redefine the school if the vote goes negative;
- Need to be clear on collective benefits of the School and benefits to the individual from the collective and not just individual concerns;

Thanks from Wagner to those who were at the full faculty meeting and helped with set up and gathering of info; thanks to Dean Long for facilitating that type of conversation;

Motion to Adjourn: Devoss; Frey second; Adjourned; 5:17