Town Hall Meeting
School Executive Planning Committee
January 26, 2018, 3:00 PM
Q&A

- Introduction: School website
  - Brief summary of Task Force (Phase 1), Action Committee (Phase 2) and Executive Planning Committee (Phase 3) and respective membership.
  - Charge to to the EPC (Phase 3): to execute the recommendations that the Action committee (Phase 2) put forward in May 2017.
- Updates January 2018.
- SLSLC summary (PPT available in website).

Q&A

1. Will each Program have a separate operating budget? Will the Program Head have authority to make budgetary decisions?

    Yes, the Programs in the School will have their operating budget and, for each Program, the Program Head, the Program Director, or the Program Coordinator will make budgetary decisions on the budget items they receive. For details on what budget items are assigned to each Program, visit the Town Hall Presentation, slides 14 (Program Head), 15 (Program Director), and 16 (Program Coordinator).
    http://languages.cal.msu.edu/files/2017/10/2018-School-Town-Hall-1.pdf

2. When can Programs expect to receive feedback and guidance on their bylaws? Is there assurance that there will be uniformity across programs regarding the bylaws? If so, who will have oversight of the finalization of the bylaws and assuring there is uniformity across programs?

    a) *French, German, Linguistics, SLS/TESOL, and Spanish submitted their draft bylaws to the EPC on December 1, 2017. The members of EPC made the first reading/review of the documents submitted by each Program, and soon after they were sent to the Faculty Grievance Office where they are currently under review. Once this review is finished, they will be sent to the Dean's office for review and then back to the Programs with recommendations for revisions if they are needed. This is the regular procedure for the development of bylaws at MSU.*

    b) *Uniformity across programs regarding bylaws will be provided by the School bylaws that are still in a draft version. Between November 2016 and May 2017, the Action Committee first developed the School bylaws in consultation with the FGO. The School EPC started revisions in September 2017 until very recently (December 19, 2017). When working with the conveners and director of these Programs in the fall semester of 2017, we asked them to develop Program bylaws that will contain the necessary elements and work well for each Program, keeping in mind not to contradict the draft School bylaws.*

    c) *The School bylaws cannot be approved before the School starts, that would be July 1, 2018. Before doing this, the School Director will call for one-two meetings in early fall semester with the School faculty to discuss anything that is pending or review any questions or potential changes. After these discussions and changes, the School will proceed with a vote to approve the School bylaws. Once the School bylaws are voted on, they will be submitted to the Dean's office for the final stamp. Working with the Faculty Grievance Office at the beginning of the process*

1

(Action Committee) will save time on the approval process of the School bylaws. See Q21, page 7: http://languages.cal.msu.edu/files/2017/10/Program-Bylaws-QA.pdf

d) *Until the School bylaws are formally approved the Associate Provost for Academic Human Resources has recommended to label the school bylaws as "interim and vetted, pending official vote." In the interim, the faculty would agree to abide by the School draft bylaws. See Q22, page 8:* http://languages.cal.msu.edu/files/2017/10/Program-Bylaws-QA.pdf

---

3. What will happen to the "School" idea if there is no strong support from the faculty?

The School EPC is will meet the same day the voting period ends, will count the votes, and will report the outcomes of the vote to the Dean as well as to the faculty of the units. The Dean will then make a decision and take next steps.

---

4. The Dean has repeatedly stated that the idea of the School originated among faculty? When will these faculty members be identified?

In April 2016 the Dean started conversations about the School with the leaders of LL, RCS and CeLTA. At this point, half of the members of the Task Force (Phase 1) were recommended by the chairpersons or selected by the Dean. The Advisory Committees of LL and RCS appointed the other half. The names of all members are included in the School website.
In November 2016, most of the Task Force members continue serving in the Action Committee with one replacement and the addition of two non-tenure stream faculty (Phase 2). Both committees received the charge to explore the idea of the School and make recommendations to the Dean. See Phases 1 and 2 in: http://languages.cal.msu.edu/

---

5. Is CeLTA faculty/staff going to be represented on the School Advisory Council?

The School draft bylaws indicate the following for the membership of the School Advisory Committee: Item 9.2.d: "two at-large representatives from non-tenure stream faculty". CeLTA faculty/staff could serve in these positions on the SAC. See slide 10 in: http://languages.cal.msu.edu/files/2017/10/2018-School-Town-Hall-1.pdf
The Director of Celta will be a member of the School Leadership Council. See slide 9 in: http://languages.cal.msu.edu/files/2017/10/2018-School-Town-Hall-1.pdf

---

6. When we were first asked to vote online in early December, with that request to vote came an attachment that outlined the compensation packages for professors who take on administrative roles, like being the head of a graduate program, or being the director of a program. The baseline compensations were cut from what they are now. Are we voting on baseline compensation packages for faculty administrative roles? Or are new terms (baseline compensations) for faculty admin roles going to be set by the Dean's office regardless of the passing of the School?

Compensation packages for Program Heads and Program Directors will be negotiated with the Dean taking in consideration the needs of each Program. Program Heads will be elected and recommended by their program faculty this semester and appointed by the Dean for two years. After these two years, the School Director may reappointe PH for three additional years. See Q13, pages 5-6 in: http://languages.cal.msu.edu/files/2017/10/Program-Bylaws-QA.pdf

Any level of compensation for DGS, DUS, graduate advisors, etc. within a Program will be decided by the Program Head and will use the resources and budget of such Program.

7. Program officers. We understand that the PH will report to the School Director. To whom do other officers (e.g. director of graduate studies) report? To the PH? To the School Director? We'd like some clarification of expected reporting lines. Thanks!

DGS, graduate advisors, or any other faculty in a similar position within a given Program will report to their Program Head. Program Heads and Program Directors will report to the School Director (and will be evaluated by the School Director). Program Coordinators will report to and will be evaluated by the Associate Director for Administration (AD2). See slides 3, 7-8, 14-16 in: http://languages.cal.msu.edu/files/2017/10/2018-School-Town-Hall-1.pdf

8. As of November 30, 2017, we are informed that PH cannot be grieved. The School Director can be grieved. Can Associate Directors be grieved?

Standard university policy states that all grievances are directed at line administrators. In the School, that line administrator is the School Director. The Associate Director for Administration and Program Heads who will conduct annual reviews cannot be grieved for personnel matters. If there is any grievance about merit raises, reviews, rpt, it will be filed against the School Director. See page Q19, 7: http://languages.cal.msu.edu/files/2017/10/Program-Bylaws-QA.pdf

9. While writing program bylaws last semester, it felt as if we were constantly uncovering new uncertainties and problems regarding the new School structure. This was a useful process, but also made me feel pessimistic that the School will be an actual improvement on the current structure. What can you say to convince me that the School will be beneficial to the average TS faculty member? Concretely, how will it make my research program advance, my teaching improve, or my service burden more efficient/useful? I have heard the arguments about greater program autonomy. What other arguments are there?

One example of "Program autonomy" is the access to budget (like OCCI revenues) that at this point may be solely administered by the Department Chairperson. More information about budget lines for the School and its Programs will be decided after the general budget for the next fiscal year has been approved by the University and the College.
Another example is the necessity to develop a sustainable platform to foster collaborative initiatives with research, teaching, and community engagement and outreach components. Working on collaborative initiatives aligns with interdisciplinary work and also visibility of what we do at the School, College and university levels. For example, we may be working on the same area or have similar interests about a given topic that is examined in different languages and disciplines. The platform for collaborations that the School will foster will assist us in discovering common patterns across languages and disciplinary boundaries. Collaborative networks are also open to fixed term faculty who wish to join. The Associate Director for Academic Affairs and the proposed School Initiatives Committee will assist the creation of this platform and its development. A brief study we conducted as part of the Task Force revealed that many of us are doing great work already across language and disciplinary lines, but these are usually short-lived projects (due to lack of funding or a platform to sustain it for longer time), are not systematically rewarded as part of annual reviews or

RPT, and remain invisible to the university community. This mid- to long-term work will help us to apply for and receive grants and get more leverage as players in the university.
The School structure that we are proposing also aims to give us more visibility and hopefully release faculty from some university and college service. A larger structure like the School with more programs to represent will give us more weight in university academic governance.

---

10. With all these officials (PH, PD, Associate Directors) what will the School Director be doing?

The School Director will be the Chief Academic Officer of the School, promote its vision, advocate for its goals and projects, work on getting internal and external funding, set priorities along the Leadership Council, the School Advisory Committee, and the School Initiatives Committee, oversee personnel processes, oversee the staff, among other responsibilities. See slide 11 in:
http://languages.cal.msu.edu/files/2017/10/2018-School-Town-Hall-1.pdf

---

11. CeLTA and its role in the school are not clear and to say that we don't know is not a good answer. We need a picture of what CeLTA's role is in the School.

CeLTA was designed to be a supporting unit to assist the language programs of the two departments. We want CeLTA to have a bigger and more significant role in the School. We need CeLTA to help us to develop better teaching strategies and reach learning outcomes for most (if not all) language programs. For example, we need guidance to avoid curriculum bifurcation and to reach articulation between the instruction of a language not only as second language but also as a professional and academic language at 300-400 level courses. CeLTA can provide the unifying forum to exchange ideas and make them happen. In addition, up to this point CeLTA has been a unit that has reported directly to the College and the Dean. However, in the School, it will report to the School Director and work closely with PH, PD, and PC.

---

12. It has been said that we won't have a proposed budget until fall or summer. What does that mean?

Budget preparation and discussion is going on but we don't know what the actual numbers are for next year. Budget for the School Directors—similarly to what happens with Deans and Chairpersons—will/may be known in June or even later.

---

13. Given the conversation about the vote and the budget, what is the role of the Provost in this? It seems like there would be some negotiation with the budget and vote.

The Provost has called the vote for the School. This is a step to take when units merge and/or new units are created.
The School EPC will report the outcomes of the vote to the Dean who, in turn, will make a decision and submit a recommendation to the Provost. The Provost will make a decision, similarly to recommendations for RPT. Once the Provost received the Dean's request and recommendation to establish the School, the Provost will send it to the University Steering Committee, a body who meets once a month with the University President and Provost to decide on which university committee(s) the request goes to. Eventually, the request will come back to the Steering Committee with the committee(s)'s recommendations or support and then the Steering Committee may bring it to the attention of the Faculty Senate. The Chairpersons of LL, RCS, and the Dean will attend these committees to explain the request for the School and make their case. After all these steps are taken, the Provost will make her final decision and recommendation to the University.

14. School Advisory Committee and Leadership Council: how are these set? Are these bodies open for discussion to add members or to change the percentage of representation? It seems that there is not enough representatives of the smaller programs.

The membership of the School Advisory Committee and the Leadership Council are recommendations that have been made by the Action Committee and revised, as of today, by the School EPC, after reaching consensus. These are recommendations and can certainly admit changes now or later. The School Director will call for faculty meetings and changes can be brought. The ideal goal is balanced representation.

15. What is the difference between the Leadership Council and the School Advisory Committee?

The Leadership Council is a group of School Program leaders and School officials.
The School Advisory Committee, like all advisory committees, is made up of faculty members.
See slides 9-10 in: http://languages.cal.msu.edu/files/2017/10/2018-School-Town-Hall-1.pdf

16. Where will MAFLT be located? Will it continue in CeLTA?

MAFLT is a graduate program currently housed in CeLTA and there is nothing on the table to initiate a change. This does not mean that it will always be under CeLTA, this may change in the future.

17. Will non-voting faculty be notified of the results of the vote?

Yes. All faculty of all units will be notified of the vote outcome by the School EPC.

An explanation of the logistics of the voting process and the vote counting followed. See http://languages.cal.msu.edu/files/2017/10/2018-School-Voting-Logistics.pdf

This Town Hall meeting adjourned at 4:38pm