Action Committee Report and Recommendations for the Establishment of a
School of Language Sciences & Literary and Cultural Studies

Action Committee Report and Recommendations for the Establishment of a
School of Language Sciences & Literary and Cultural Studies
Submitted by
Susan M. Gass, University Distinguished Professor of Second Language Studies
Rocío Quispe-Agnoli, Professor of Hispanic Studies
Co-Chairs, Action Committee
On behalf of the Action Committee
May 15, 2017

I.   Preliminaries

I.1. *The Task Force*
In April of 2016, the Dean of the College of Arts & Letters, Christopher Long, established a
Task Force to consider the possibility of establishing a School that would incorporate faculty and
staff from the Departments of Linguistics & Germanic, Slavic, Asian and African Languages,
Romance and Classical Studies, and CeLTA, On May 11, 2016, the Dean issued a charge to that
Task Force (*Appendix A*) with a report due to him by October 1, 2016. As stated in the Task
Force Report, the rationale for the charge was the following:

> The College of Arts & Letters has recognized strengths in all of these areas, but we do
> not currently have the infrastructure that will enable us to establish ourselves as one of
> the leading universities for the study of languages in the world. We have many of the
> components in place, but we are missing a way to showcase and support these
> components in ways that reflect and advance our position as a leader in language studies.
> In order to accomplish this, we need to establish an academic and administrative structure
> that will enhance collaborations across languages, to compete for more prestigious and
> larger external funding, to develop more innovative approaches and initiatives, and to
> differentiate ourselves from our peers.

The goals of the Task Force were:

1. Investigate the opportunities and challenges associated with establishing a School of
   Language Studies at Michigan State University;
2. Explore models at peer universities to identify best practices and determine how MSU
   can distinguish its approach and structure from others in order to position itself as an
   international leader in language studies;
3. Submit a plan to establish an Action Committee structured to address relevant issues
   identified during the exploration and planning phase. The Action Committee should
   include relevant stakeholders and opportunities for open discussion among the faculty
   as it develops a proposal for a "School" that would undergo university review in
   AY2017-18 and be put in place to begin operation in 2018.

The Task Force members were:
- o Susan Gass (co-chair), University Distinguished Professor, L&L/TESOL and SLS
- o Rocío Quispe-Agnoli (co-chair), Professor of Hispanic Studies, RCS
- o Sonja Fritzsche, Professor of German and Chair, L&L

- Anne Violin-Wigent, Associate Professor of French, 2015-2016 Associate Chair, RCS
- Safoi Babana-Hampton, Associate Professor of French and Francophone Studies, RCS
- Miguel Cabañas, Associate Professor of Latin American and Chicano/Latino Studies, RCS
- Jason Merrill, Professor of Russian, L&L
- Alan Munn, Associate Professor of Linguistics, L&L

On October 1, 2016, the Task Force submitted its report (https://msu.edu/~cal/language/pdf/task_force_reports/Task_Force_Final_Report.pdf) and its Appendices (https://msu.edu/~cal/language/pdf/task_force_reports/Appendixes.pdf) with the following major recommendations:

A. The Task Force recommends the formation of an Action Committee to lead further faculty-centered discussions concerning the structure and governance of the School.
B. The Action Committee should consider:
  i. Mission statement and School name.
  ii. School structure: administrative and academic configuration of programs (Language Studies, Linguistics, Literary and Cultural Studies) and the role of CeLTA.
  iii. School Leadership
  iv. New positions
     - Media and Events Coordinator and Community Engagement Liaison
     - Digital Humanities Liaison
     - Grant Support
  v. An appropriate platform to foster collaborative initiatives
     - Criteria for the establishment of this platform
     - Close collaboration with other units to avoid duplication of efforts.
  vi. School Academic Governance and Bylaws
     - Committee structure (standing, ad hoc)
     - Representation on College and University Committees
     - Annual merit review and RPT procedures
  vii. Budget structure (revenue, salaries, hiring, position requests, existing endowments).

I.2. *The Action Committee*
As a result of these recommendations, an Action Committee was established on November 1, 2016, consisting of Task Force members (with one sabbatical replacement) and the addition of two Fixed Term faculty members.

Action Committee membership is as follows:
- Susan Gass (co-chair), University Distinguished Professor, L&L/TESOL and SLS
- Rocío Quispe-Agnoli (co-chair), Professor of Hispanic Studies, RCS
- Adolfo Ausín, Assistant Professor (FT), RCS
- Safoi Babana-Hampton, Associate Professor of French and Francophone Studies, RCS

- o Miguel Cabañas, Associate Professor of Latin American and Chicano/Latino Studies, and 2016-2017 Associate Chair, RCS.
- o Sonja Fritzsche, Professor of German and Chair, L&L
- o Zarema Kumakhova, Assistant Professor (FT), L&L
- o Alan Munn, Associate Professor of Linguistics, L&L
- o Tze-Lan Sang, Professor of Chinese, L&L
- o Anne Violin-Wigent, Associate Professor of French, RCS

The specific charge to the Action Committee (see *Appendix B*) was made public in a message sent by the Dean's office to the faculty at large on November 1, 2016.

In this charge, the Dean asked the Action Committee to investigate the following specific questions:

1. How can we create an administrative and academic configuration that will give School leadership enough leverage to advance strategic improvement and programs enough autonomy to ensure intellectual integrity and academic agility?
2. How can the mission statement of the School distinguish us from our peers and position us to be an international leader?
3. What name can we agree upon that is simple enough to have broad public appeal and inclusive enough to have broad internal support?
4. What assessment measures should be developed for the school in order to ensure that its goals and objectives are attained and superior outcomes are achieved? How can individual programs be supported in developing goals, objectives, and outcomes that can be measured as part of the program assessment process within the School?
5. What opportunities for revenue generation might the School leverage to ensure it has the resources to accomplish its strategic priorities?
6. How can we facilitate and support collaborative initiatives that will differentiate us from our peers?
7. How will the School cultivate practices of inclusive excellence in graduate and undergraduate education, pedagogy and research?
8. How will the faculty in all units be included in the conversation and the process by which recommendations will ultimately be made?
9. What level of staff support will the School require in order to achieve excellence and maximize visibility?
10. What are our opportunities for collaboration with other units in the College and across the University and what structures can we create to develop and facilitate a culture of collaboration within the School?

This report includes recommendations to address these questions, although we recognize that many more details (including modification of these recommendations) will likely take place during the transition year, academic year 2017-2018.

I.3. *Background Rationale for the establishment of a School*
As Dean Long stated in his charge to the Task Force, the charge to investigate the viability of a School structure is based on the fact that there is recognized strength in the area of language

study, but there is not an infrastructure that can take advantage of the separate components. A unified structure will enable us to continue to impact and provide leadership to the national scene.

The importance of language study has been prevalent in the national conversation. In fact, a recent report from the Commission on Language Learning established by the American Academy of Arts and Sciences ("America's languages: Investing in language education for the 21st century," 2017) decries the lack of emphasis on language education and "recommends a national strategy to improve access to as many languages as possible for people of every region, ethnicity, and socioeconomic background—that is, to value language education as a persistent national need similar to education in math or English, and to ensure that a useful level of proficiency is within every student's reach" (p. 8). They suggest that there be a national strategy to 'broaden access' (p. 27) to international study including cultural immersion and a general emphasis on "building a strong world language capability alongside English" (p. 31).

Furthermore, the scientific study of language plays a crucial role in providing basic research that supports the language teaching enterprise and informs public policy in a variety of ways. Linguistic research focusing on language description, language theory, and language as part of human cognition seeks to determine the nature of language more generally, while more applied research areas focus on the roles of language in society, and education, the preservation and documentation of the diversity of world languages, and understanding the relationship between language properties and second language learning and teaching. These facets of language study contribute to both STEM and Humanities education. A School structure where language, linguistics, literature and cultural studies are unified is a step in making the recommendations of many learned societies a reality.

A School structure such as the one proposed in this report, in which the study of language in all of its multiple dimensions is unified, creates a unique way to elevate this research area and more fully demonstrates its significance to an understanding of the human condition.

II. Action Committee Operations

Between November 12, 2016 and May 15, 2017, the Action Committee engaged in the following tasks.

II.1. *Meetings*
Action Committee members held their first meeting on November 12, 2016 with Dean Long addressing the committee and responding to queries about the charge and expected outcomes. Subsequent meetings of the whole group were held on:

November 12, 2016*
December 14, 2016
January 4, 2017
January 23, 2017*
February 6, 2017

February 13, 2017 (Guest: Professor Bill Donohue, Faculty Grievance Officer)
February 27, 2017
March 13, 2017
March 27, 2017
April 11, 2017
April 18, 2017*
* Dean Long attended the first hour of these meetings.

At the initial meeting (11/12/16), it was determined that there were two priority issues to be addressed: School Administrative Structure and School Academic Governance. The Action Committee subdivided into two subcommittees to discuss each of these and make recommendations. Subcommittee meetings were held on the following dates:

Administrative Configuration/Structure	*Academic Governance/Bylaws*
November 14, 2016	November 29, 2016
November 23, 2016	December 8, 2016
December 5, 2016	January 3, 2016
January 4, 2017	January 12, 2017
February 24, 2017	February 16, 2017

To provide opportunity for faculty feedback, there were open meetings during the spring semester of 2017. Information about these meetings and other communications with faculty at large are included below in "Faculty information and consultation."

II.2. *Faculty information and consultation*

a. *Websites*
   The Action Committee established a new public-facing website to keep the MSU community informed of our activities, discussions, progress and recommendations: *Advancing Leadership in Languages* (http://languages.cal.msu.edu/) . The original password-protected website (https://msu.edu/~cal/language/) remained for posting of such information as well as Task Force activities and report, and meeting minutes of the Task Force and the Action Committee.

b. *Meetings with Faculty*
   In January 2017, the Action Committee conducted six open meetings to which all faculty members of MSU language programs were invited to attend. We also offered the possibility of remote attendance by means of Zoom. The first three meetings were devoted to presentation and discussion of ideas for an administrative configuration/structure of the School. They took place on January 18, 2017; January 19, 2017; January 20, 2017.

   These were followed by open meetings devoted to present and discuss our ideas for the School's academic governance and criteria to develop Bylaws. These meetings took place on January 25, 2017; January 26, 2017; January 27, 2017.

A preliminary version of this report was sent to Dean Long on 3/30/2017. The Action Committee received the response of the Dean to this preliminary version and after discussing it with the Dean, two informational meetings with the faculty were held on April 21 and April 28, 2017.

Members of the Action Committee led these meetings and were available for faculty to seek clarification, provide feedback and, in general, for a general questions and answers session. In addition to the open meetings, many informal conversations took place as well as conversations in fall and spring faculty meetings in LGSAAL, RCS, CeLTA, and SLS. Faculty also communicated their ideas and concerns to their respective chairpersons or faculty representatives in the Action Committee who, in turn, transmitted them to the full Action Committee for consideration in our discussions.

A discussion of the School appeared on the agenda of the two language departments faculty meetings both held in late April and early May, 2017.

Finally, the College faculty meeting held on May 8, 2017, also included an informational item with updates about the School preliminary report.

c. *Faculty survey*
Faculty were invited to respond to a survey about the current departmental structures between January 6-13, 2017. This survey asked faculty to respond to three questions: 1) What works well from our current departmental structure? 2) What are the problems or limitations with the existing departmental structures? And 3) What would you like to see as priorities in the new School structure?

All of the feedback from the survey, open meetings, electronic messages, and informal conservations were taken into account by Action Committee members as they formulated the responses to the original charge (*Appendix C*).

II.3. *Seed Money - Collaborative Initiatives*
One of the goals of the new School is to foster and encourage collaboration across disciplines and language programs. To this end the Dean provided funding to facilitate faculty projects based on interdisciplinary research and pedagogical initiatives.

A first Call for Collaborative Projects was issued on September 8, 2016 (*Appendix D1*). Three proposals were received and funded following recommendations of a review committee, made up of Bill Hart-Davidson, Associate Dean for Graduate Studies and Research, and two members of the Action Committee.

A second Call for Collaborative Projects was issued on January 16, 2017 (*Appendix D2*). Five Letters of Intent were received by the deadline and a select number of faculty teams met with Associate Dean Bill Hart-Davidson, Barbara Miller (Research Grant Administrator), Scott Schopieray (Assistant Dean of Technology and Innovation), and Rocío Quispe-Agnoli (co-chair, Action Committee), to work on the development of

proposals and budgets. Three final proposals were received on March 13, 2017. The team leaders of the funded projects have made appointments to meet with Associate Dean Hart-Davidson with the purpose of discussing needs for their proposed plans, review their budgets according to this discussion, and activate their access to approved funds. These meetings would take place before the 2016-2017 academic year ends.

The six faculty teams will participate in a forum in September 2017, and will present their projects to interested faculty with the goal of acquainting others with the scope of their projects and receiving feedback. Funded projects (*Appendix D3*) started working immediately after receiving confirmation from Associate Dean Hart-Davidson and their funding period will end on June 30, 2018.

III. Report

The report is organized around the questions originally posed by Dean Long. Following responses to the original charge questions, we make recommendations for the next step.

Question 1: *How can we create an administrative and academic configuration that will give School leadership enough leverage to advance strategic improvement and programs enough autonomy to ensure intellectual integrity and academic agility?*
In this section, we lay out the proposed structure for a new School. In coming up with our proposal, a number of principles guided our discussions:

A. **Membership**
   Our starting point is the fact that we have many programs to incorporate into a School structure. These programs are diverse in size, mission, and disciplinary focus. The 17 programs, with a total of approximately 105 faculty members (60 tenure-system and 45 non-tenure system) to be incorporated are:

   Language Programs and Literary and Cultural Studies:

African Languages	Hindi
Arabic	Italian
Classical and Ancient Mediterranean	Japanese
Studies (includes the teaching of	Korean
Greek and Latin)	Less Commonly Taught Languages
Chinese	Portuguese
French	Russian
German	Spanish
Hebrew	

   Language Sciences Programs:
   Linguistics
   Second Language Studies / TESOL

Supporting Unit for all Programs above:
Center for Language Teaching Advancement (CeLTA)

B. **Organizational Principles**
1. The Director provides the academic leadership and is the 'face' of the School. He or she must have enough *gravitas* to drive strategic decision making.
2. There must be disciplinary and intellectual integrity and autonomy.
3. The School must be a School and not a big Department, the latter occurs when most decision-making is centralized. A big Department with decisions at the School level contradicts principle (ii) above.
4. There must be a structure to encourage, facilitate, and sustain interdisciplinary collaborative initiatives.
5. Fair and balanced representation to School committees must be established.
6. Administrative practicalities must be recognized.

C. **Proposed Administrative Structure** (*Appendix E*).
1. The basic organizing unit is the Program of which there are 17. These are academic programs organized around language or disciplinary entities (Linguistics; SLS/TESOL). They are disciplinary groupings of faculty for day-to-day running of activities.
2. Administration: Given the recommended administrative structure, we propose the following School Officers:
   a. Director (to be selected following a national/international search)
   b. Two Associate Directors (to be initially appointed by the Dean from current faculty). Future appointments will be made by the School Director.
      i. Administration (day-to-day activities)
      ii. Academic Affairs (Interdisciplinary collaborative initiatives)
   c. Program Heads/Program Directors/Program Coordinators (to be selected from current faculty and initially appointed by the Dean).
      i. Program Heads direct programs with six or more tenure-system faculty. These Programs confer Graduate degrees.
      ii. Program Directors direct language programs (a) whose faculty members number five or fewer and (b) have a BA (major) and minors.
      iii. Program Coordinators direct language programs (a) whose faculty members number five or fewer and (b) offer only minors and no BA degree or (c) provide language instruction only with no major or minor.
3. Governance: There are two governing bodies, the Leadership Council and the School Advisory Committee. See reference to Bylaws at the end of this section and *Appendix G.*
   a. The Leadership Council includes 14 members as follows:
      i. Director, s/he chairs the Leadership Council (1)
      ii. Associate Directors (2)
      iii. Program Heads (5) and Programs Directors (4)
      iv. Rotating representation from Program Coordinators (1)

9

      v.   CeLTA Director (1)
- b.   The School Advisory Committee includes 14 members as follows:
    - i.   Tenure-stream Faculty representatives from Programs (9)
    - ii.   Non-tenure-stream Faculty representatives (2)
    - iii. Director, ex officio (1)
    - iv. UG and G student representatives (1 each)

4. <u>Duties of School Officials</u>

   Appendix F lists the recommended duties and responsibilities of the positions proposed above (2.i-2.iii). The organizational chart (*Appendix E*) distinguishes between reporting lines (solid lines) and what we refer to as 'go to' lines (dotted lines). The latter are intended to be resources to whom one goes to for day-to-day issues. Importantly, communication between and among the leadership team is essential. The role of the leadership team is to foster the profile of the School as a collective entity and of the individual Programs and faculty members.

5. <u>Other positions</u>
   a. The current support staff that serves LGSAAL, RCS, SLS, and GSAH needs to be reviewed and reorganized to serve the School. See Question 9 for specific recommendation.
   b. We recommended the creation of a new position: Coordinator of Marketing, Outreach, Recruitment, and Events (MORE); see below.
   c. Since fall 2016, the UG advisors report to and are evaluated by the Assistant Dean for UG Student Affairs & Study Abroad. We recommend that these advisors also report to the Associate Director of Academic Affairs and work closely with the Program Heads, Program Directors and Program Coordinators as needed.
   d. Current faculty members will assume administration positions (e.g., Associate Directors, Program Heads, Program Directors).

Question 2: *How can the mission statement of the School distinguish us from our peers and position us to be an international leader?*
We suggest the following mission statement:

The School of Language Sciences & Literary and Cultural Studies brings together teachers and scholars of language learning and teaching, world literatures and cultures, and linguistics to investigate cultural production, local and global communities, language learning, and language and cognition viewed through the lens of the great variety and diversity of the world's languages.

Using interdisciplinary approaches, faculty and students engage in issues of how language reflects the nature of the human mind, how language is acquired, and the interaction of language, literature, and culture. The School's collaborative environment promotes a world-class research agenda, innovative teaching, opportunities for outreach and community service, and enhanced learning experiences for students.

With its unique organization into language-related and disciplinary units and with its cross-disciplinary research networks, the School provides a structure to break down traditional language and disciplinary boundaries and to foster creativity and new ways of understanding.

MSU's unique position:
What is unique about MSU's School (reflected in this mission statement) is the configuration of disciplines represented and the emphasis on collaboration. In the first case, there are no other Schools that we are aware of that emphasize the Language Science part of the School to the extent that will be profiled at MSU. There are some Universities that have Linguistics, but not SLS and others that have SLS but not Linguistics and some that have neither. To our knowledge, no university incorporates both.

Question 3: *What name can we agree upon that is simple enough to have broad public appeal and inclusive enough to have broad internal support?*
We recommend that the new School be named **School of Language Sciences & Literary and Cultural Studies** (SoLSaLCS).

Question 4: *What assessment measures should be developed for the school in order to ensure that its goals and objectives are attained and superior outcomes are achieved? How can individual programs be supported in developing goals, objectives, and outcomes that can be measured as part of the program assessment process within the School?*
We approach assessment from a variety of perspectives; a fuller assessment plan will be developed by the new Director and his/her administrative team and advisory committees. The School Programs should conduct assessment of their curriculum, students, and faculty members on a regular basis in order to evaluate their position vis-à-vis the university metrics of excellence and productivity.

The School Officials should consider assessment (a) at the various levels of operation of the School (student learning goals and outcomes, Program's and faculty performance goals and outcomes), and (b) as a mid-term/long-term plan, and as an ongoing process that includes, for each of these levels at least the following: articulation of goals, operationalization of identified goals, and identification and use of direct and indirect methods to assess goals and outcomes vis-à-vis the mission and the vision of the School and its multiple components.

1. *Assessment of UG Students and UG Programs*: In general, assessment plans should focus on student learning outcomes that reflect the values of the academic unit, use multiple measures, and are easily managed. Each Program should regularly assess its curriculum taking in consideration the University Learning Goals and the interactive rubrics provided in: http://learninggoals.undergrad.msu.edu/

   In addition, UG Programs can be assessed by means of enrollments and SCHs; numbers of majors and minors; faculty teaching performance (overall and average means), including study abroad were relevant; revenue generated other than enrollments; awards; internal and external grants; program development and innovations, collaboration within

the School, College, and University, and, as indicated above, overall alignment of Program with University Learning Goals and assessment.

2. *Assessment of Graduate Students and Graduate Programs*: The Graduate Directors of the School Programs that offer graduate degrees work with the College Associate Dean for Graduate Studies and the Graduate School to measure graduate student success by means of metrics such as time to degree, internal and external fellowships, internal and external grants; publications, conference presentations, awards, recruitment (number of applicants vis-à-vis number of admitted applicants); graduate population (MA and PhD); number of graduate assistantships (TAs and RAs); graduate enrollment and participation in certification programs (Digital Humanities, Teaching Certificate, Critical Diversity, etc.) or programs outside of MSU (Humanities Without Walls); placement after graduation. Graduate Programs should be regularly assessed.

3. *Assessment of School Faculty*: The School bylaws provide a general frame for the implementation of annual performance reviews of faculty and academic specialists, and evaluation of candidates for promotion, reappointment, and tenure (tenure-stream faculty); promotion to Designation B (fixed-term faculty); and continuing status for academic specialists. The School Officials should be consistent and observant of the close relationship between annual performance reviews and application for promotion (and tenure if applicable). Variable workload plans may be available for faculty members who do not to follow the expected workload (research 40%, teaching 40%, service and outreach 20%). Assigned workloads are to be taken into account as part of the evaluation process.

   RPT. Each Program (or cluster of Programs) will develop Bylaws in which they will include specific information and processes about faculty annual review performance and RPT. Minimally, these are to include expectations for teaching, research, and service and are also to include procedures such as timing of notification to faculty of upcoming promotions, procedures for selection of external letters, and committee make up (see §13 of School Bylaws).

   Each individual reappointment or promotion committee shall have one faculty member from outside his/her program (see §13.5.2.2 of School Bylaws).

   For reappointment and promotion/tenure, the School Director will work with Program Heads/Associate Director for Administration in the initial stages to ensure fair and balanced committee structures. The Program Head or Associate Director for Administration will make recommendations for or against reappointment/promotion to the School Director. The recommendation will include the Committee letter, a letter from the Head/Associate Director and a completed Form D. The School Director will write his or her own endorsement (or not) and all evaluative letters (Committee, Head/Associate Director, School Director) will be forwarded to the College.

After a reappointment decision is made, the School Director will write a specific letter to the candidate outlining from a School perspective what the candidate needs to accomplish prior to the next promotion (tenure).

See Appendix F for a visual layout of RPT procedures and additional information for reappointment.

4. Taking into consideration the reporting and consulting lines proposed in the recommended School administrative structure (*Appendix E*) and the School Bylaws, review performance of School Officials (Director, Associate Directors, Program Heads, Program Directors) will take place every year and at the end of their terms and according to College Bylaws. Terms for Associate Directors are three years and the term for the Director is not to exceed five years; renewal is possible. Bylaws indicate that Program Heads, Program Directors and Program Coordinators shall submit a plan for their programs at the beginning and, a report on outcomes and (un)fulfilled goals at the end of the academic year. Ideally, Program Heads, Program Directors and Program Coordinators will assess program productivity and performance consistent with MSU metrics of success.

In sum, annual assessment of students, faculty, Programs and School officials will assist evaluations of the School as a whole, which we recommend to take place in intervals not to exceed three-five years. The more innovative and productive Programs, faculty, students are, the better they will be positioned to be recipients of College and University investment (e.g., faculty lines, resources for programming, graduate assistantships, human resources).

Finally, an assessment of the School must go beyond assessment of programs, students, and faculty and include measures that relate to external funding and extent of collaborative projects that result in grant applications and procurement as well as publications (see response to Question 5 below).

Question 5: *What opportunities for revenue generation might the School leverage to ensure it has the resources to accomplish its strategic priorities?*

1. There has to be an emphasis on internal and external grant activity, although in many disciplines there are not many to apply nor are the amounts large. Grant activity is important at the Program level, but the School structure and emphasis on interdisciplinary activity provides a strong basis for collaborative grant proposals. One of the responsibilities of the Director is to locate opportunities for grants and to even possibly consider incentives for faculty to write grant proposals (e.g., a small summer stipend for a promising grant).
2. A second obvious way to generate income is through OCCI revenue. Offering resources to School faculty to develop more fully online courses, or to improve their existing courses will benefit the delivery of such courses and will make our online programming more attractive for students, thus increasing enrollments particularly in the summer sessions. It is anticipated that each Program will embrace this opportunity.

3. The Director will work with the College Office for Development and Alumni Relations to make connections between Programs and donors and to secure donations and endowments. It is expected that the Director will help to develop an active alumni base with the possibility of developing an external advisory board.
4. Collaboration with CeLTA and the Community Language School to increase the number and quality of offerings and enrollments from community members, especially addressing K-12 Teachers of the primary languages offered in the K-12 curriculum in Michigan public schools.

Question 6: *How can we facilitate and support collaborative initiatives that will differentiate us from our peers?*
On June 30, 2016, members of the Task Force submitted a report to the committee with a recommendation for a Plan of Action to consider what crosscutting interdisciplinary initiatives could be put in place in the School and how this might come about (*Appendix H*). A brief review of faculty activity in LGSAAL, RCS, SLS, and CeLTA revealed that collaborative initiatives are taking place among/between faculty of different disciplines (SLS, Linguistics), between faculty of these units and others outside of the language programs (American Indian and Indigenous Studies, GenCen, Global Studies, Jewish Studies, Muslim Studies, RCAH, for example), and to a much lesser extent, between different language programs. These initiatives have a research, pedagogical, and/or community engagement component, and usually come about as a result of individual interest and initiative and, sometimes, with funding external to their departments. In the case of Literary and Cultural Studies faculty, such work is barely acknowledged in annual performance reviews or RPT.

Another important recommendation is the need to encourage faculty and students to expand their interests and in so doing depart from their research directions, agendas, and pedagogical interests so that new connections can be established across programs. See Appendix D3 for examples of funded collaborative initiatives.

In this context, we recommend the following considerations to facilitate and support collaborative initiatives that will distinguish our School from our peers:
1. To meet the objectives of the School (see Mission, Question 2), we have included a new position (Associate Director for Academic Affairs) and a standing committee (School Initiatives Committee) with the responsibility of developing the collaborative emphasis among faculty and students of language and disciplinary programs. We propose that there be 2-3 Research Networks (with a limited lifespan) for which funds would be dedicated to allow faculty in a Research Network to pursue their interdisciplinary group activities. The Associate Director and the School Initiatives Committee, in consultation with the Leadership Council, will select the networks. We envision that the Call for Proposals will be similar to the Calls that were issued in the 2016-2017 academic year, with the requirement of cross-disciplinary connections and strong research outcomes. Each network would have a lifespan of 1-3 years although they could reapply for renewal.
2. In order to facilitate and sustain collaborative initiatives and projects among faculty members of different language programs, literary and cultural studies, and language sciences, it is necessary to create a platform of collaboration and allocate investments (funds and human resources) in these platforms. Participation in collaborative projects and their tangible

outcomes (research products, fellowships and grants, pedagogical initiatives, team-taught courses that are offered on a regular basis, linking teaching or research to community engagement) shall be acknowledged in public venues (School, College, and University venues), and rewarded in faculty annual performance reviews and Program reviews. Leaders (and teams) of collaborative projects should be considered for College and University awards if applicable.

3. The steps indicated in (1) and (2) here will be necessary to extend School collaborative initiatives outwards. That is, collaborative projects may benefit from the expertise and participation of faculty outside the Programs in the School or the College of Arts and Letters. In this regard, it is crucial to foster collaboration with faculty members and academic staff from the Digital Humanities in Arts and Humanities, the Citizens Scholars Program, the forthcoming Center for Interdisciplinarity and the Critical Diversity hires. Collaborations with a component of community engagement will also benefit from College funding (CAL engaged pedagogy fund) and the Provost's Office CIEG (Creating Inclusive Excellence Grant). Ultimately, the School Director and Officials should work closely with the Dean's office to facilitate collaborations between School faculty and those outside of the School.

Question 7: *How will the School cultivate practices of inclusive excellence in graduate and undergraduate education, pedagogy and research?*
The School in itself is already a hub of linguistic, cultural, and ethnic diversity. Excellence in graduate and undergraduate education, pedagogy and research is already developed within our Programs. The main challenge perhaps is building bridges of inclusiveness not only within our Programs but also across Programs, a goal that can be facilitated by the organization of the School and the academic and professional interactions of its members that can be especially fruitful in collaborative projects (see Question 6).

Community engagement and outreach is one the least developed areas in the current language departments. Aligning research or pedagogical projects with the activities of the Community Language School of CeLTA may serve this purpose. Developing and offering summer institutes for K-12 teachers led/taught by Program faculty (especially from French, German, Spanish and other languages commonly included in the K-12 curriculum of Michigan public schools) would be an opportunity to use our human and intellectual resources to create inclusion across monolingual and monoculture barriers. See Question 9 for a recommendation to create a community engagement/outreach coordinator. The School also should take as a main goal the diversification of its student body across language programs by searching for ways to make language study and study abroad more accessible to its majors and minor.

The School Officials and faculty will also benefit by working with the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education, Diversity, & Inclusion and the opportunity to develop engaged pedagogy (see Question 6). The School would also benefit from working with the College Associate Dean for Research to submit successful proposals to the Provost's Office CIEG.

Finally, the School and its Programs could, when appropriate, include in their reviews assessment of goals related to inclusive excellence and critical diversity in their respective curricula and academic events and activities.

Question 8: *How will the faculty in all units be included in the conversation and the process by which recommendations will ultimately be made?*

As noted elsewhere in this document, the Action Committee has included numerous opportunities for faculty input. These have included public meetings, informal meetings, Departmental meetings, surveys, and informal one-on-one conversations. Action Committee members have also solicited input from their respective program constituencies. Our discussions and deliberations have been informed by the comments we received. In addition, the School Bylaws include various modes of participation appropriate for each area of the Bylaws. We have included four modes of faculty and student participation identified for use in Academic Governance (Consultation, Advisory, Shared Responsibility, Delegated Authority—see § 5.1-5.4 of School Bylaws).

The Transition Team will need to develop a strategic plan for consultation. The Transition Team itself will need to include current Action Committee members as well as faculty who have not been part of the process of the development of the School proposal. This is further elaborated in Recommendation 1 below.

Question 9: *What level of staff support will the School require in order to achieve excellence and maximize visibility?*

We recommend a thorough evaluation of the working of the administrative staff, which currently supports the activities of LGSAAL, RCS, SLS and GSAH. Because no new programs are being added, it is unlikely that major new positions will be needed. However, we are also aware of current shortcomings and await a full evaluation of what might be needed. Questions to be considered:

1. Efficient assistance to the School Officials, faculty at large and students. This includes timely communications and effective use of resources.
2. Organization (and notification) of replacements when staff is absent.
3. Budget office, with effective post-award grant support.
4. Office supervisor(s) and manager of human resources
5. Website design and maintenance.
6. Facilities – offices for School officials and their assistants.

In our visits to other universities, we came to recognize the need for an outreach coordinator to support internal initiatives. At the University of Kansas, for example, the person who coordinates these activities has the title of Marketing, Outreach, Recruitment, and Event (MORE) Coordinator. In our conversations with this individual and with the Director, it was made clear that this was one of the key positions in the School. The duties that are assigned to this person cannot be carried out with existing personnel. Some of the possible responsibilities of this position include:

1. Outreach to K-12 schools (in collaboration with CeLTA and existing program initiatives). Recruitment for MSU UG programs and summer school.
2. Programming, PR and Marketing of events and activities:
   i. Maintaining website and social media for programs that cannot maintain their own. Works together with the College Marketing Office
   ii. Flyers, posters and promotional materials for events. General advertising.
   iii. Facilitating podcasts, video-recording (in collaboration with CAL staff)

iv.   Creating/organizing graduate student recruitment day/fair.
 v.   In collaboration with graduate advisors, assisting graduate student associations.
vi.   Help with alumni development in collaboration with the College Development Office. Aids in internship development coordination between the School and the Excel Network

Question 10: *What are our opportunities for collaboration with other units in the College and across the University and what structures can we create to develop and facilitate a culture of collaboration within the School?*
See responses to Question 2 (Research Networks), Question 9 (Collaborative initiatives), and *Appendices D1-D3*, and *H*.

Bylaws
The Action Committee has developed a set of recommended bylaws that will guide the final bylaws to be approved in 2017-2018. The bylaws are a result of lengthy discussions within the Action Committee and have relied heavily on discussions, emails, and meetings with Bill Donohue, the Faculty Grievance Officer, who has read through the draft that appears in *Appendix G*.

The recommended Bylaws are consistent with the Bylaws of the College of Arts and Letters and Michigan State University. Programs within the School will develop their sets of Bylaws to determine specific processes for annual performance review; reappointment, promotion and tenure; selection of their heads or directors, and representation in academic governance.

IV. Recommendations for 2017-2018

1. **First Steps.**
    a.   Establish a transition team and a Director of Transition. The Director of Transition will work closely with the Chairpersons of LGSAAL and RCS, and the Directors of SLS and CeLTA. S/he will also work in tandem with the support staff as needed.
    b.   Appoint the two Associate Directors to allow them to be part of the transition. We recommend that these be two-year appointments beginning Fall 2017 to allow them to be part of the transition team in order for them to have an understanding of the goals and workings of the School. During the first year of operations, the Director will select Associate Directors for three-year terms.
    c.   It is important to have continuity between the current phase (Action Committee) and the next phase (Transition Committee). It is also important to broaden direct involvement in the final stages of transition. We therefore recommend the creation of multiple subcommittees. Each subcommittee would be headed by a current Action Committee member and would include additional faculty members who have not had direct involvement with the School proposal. In this way, there will be continuity as well as broader participation in the transition phase thereby creating a broader understanding of the underlying principles of the School.

Subcommittees will be responsible for specific tasks (in some cases multiple tasks), some of which are listed below.

d. In collaboration with the Chairpersons and Directors of units involved in the School, establish Search Committee for a national search for a permanent Director.
   i. The Search Committee should include some Action Committee members and some non-Action Committee members, and should be as representative of the faculty and School programs as possible.
   ii. The Director of Transition should not participate in the search.
   iii. The position description should be written during the summer of 2017, with an application deadline no later than October 31st.

2. **Next Steps.** Below is an initial list of tasks to be carried out by the Transition Team. We point out that the list below is not a final list; other tasks will undoubtedly arise as the work of transition moves forward.
   a. Finalize School Bylaws
   b. Draft recommended procedures for the review of the Director of the School (Bylaws § 8.1.2.2)
   c. Draw up rotation lists of faculty to serve on the SAC, FTFEC, and ASEC as outlined in the Bylaws.
   d. In collaboration with the Chairpersons and Directors (SLS, CeLTA) of the units that will be part of the School, facilitate the development of Bylaws for Programs with six or more tenure-system faculty. These Bylaws are to include minimally:
      i. Specification of voting members
      ii. Mechanisms for selecting Program Head and graduate advisor, keeping in mind that Program Heads will be selected in consultation with the School Director, and appointed by the School Director.
      iii. Program representation in academic governance
      iv. Role and responsibilities of Program Heads, Language Program Directors, and graduate and undergraduate advisors/directors (where applicable).
      v. Annual performance reviews – procedures and measures for faculty assessment.
      vi. RPT procedures.
   e. In collaboration with the Fixed-Term faculty, facilitate the development of procedures for annual performance review for those fixed-term faculty who do not belong to a program that has 6 or more FT faculty. This document will specify the procedures for their annual performance reviews and should be included in School Supplementary Materials.
   f. In collaboration with the Chairpersons and Directors of the units involved in the School, facilitate the development of annual performance reviews for Academic Specialists. This document will specify the procedures for their annual performance reviews and should be included in the School Supplementary Materials.
   g. In collaboration with the Chairpersons and Directors of the units involved in the School, facilitate the development of Bylaws for Programs with majors and minors, only minors, or only non-degree language instruction but fewer than 6 tenure-system faculty. These Bylaws are to include minimally:

      i.   Specification of voting members

     ii.   Mechanisms for selecting Program Director or Program Coordinator.

    iii.   Program representation in academic governance.

    iv.   Role and responsibilities of Program Directors.

     v.   Annual performance reviews – procedures and measures for faculty assessment.

    vi.   RPT procedures and criteria.

h. Work with College Budget Officer to establish appropriate budgeting lines. The leadership of the Action Committee has begun this conversation with the College Budget Officer to ensure that different budget configurations are possible. For example, Programs can have their own budget; raise lists can be separated out for Academic Specialists so that they are not part of the tenure-system raise list. This is important given the evaluation process we have established.

i. Establish Search Committee and conduct search for MORE Coordinator.

j. Coordinate transition to new School website and promotional materials to be launched fall 2018.

k. Work with Department Chairpersons and Directors (SLS, CeLTA) to determine needs of the support staff.

l. Establish the School Initiatives Committee to begin work in Fall 2017 to determine appropriate mechanisms for collaboration and interdisciplinary initiatives, beyond those imagined by the Action Committee. With this committee, the Director of Transition will:

      i.   Follow up on collaborative projects funded in spring 2017.

     ii.   Select first group of Research Networks.

         ▪ Using the model established by the call for Collaborative Grants, establish guidelines for submission of proposals

         ▪ Issue Call with submission deadline of January/February 2018.

         ▪ Select first group of Research Networks

m. Select interim Associate Directors (1-2 year positions so that new Director can select their own).

n. Work with Department Chairs and Dean to prepare documents for academic governance and for any other transition-related steps as needed. These include Supplementary Materials.

o. Work with Department Chairs and Dean's office to modify FT contracts to include service responsibilities.

p. Work with Department Chairs and Dean's office to ensure appropriate reporting lines for School Advisors.

q. Work with Department Chairs to determine staffing needs.