

MICHIGAN STATE
UNIVERSITY

August 29, 2024

To: Steering Committee Members

From: Thomas D. Jeitschko, Ph.D., Interim Provost and Executive Vice
President for Academic Affairs



Subject: SPDC Consolidation and Governance Review

I write to inform you about the upcoming consolidation of the School of Planning, Design and Construction (SPDC) under the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources (CANR). Currently, SPDC reports to two colleges – the College of Social Science and CANR. This change follows the recommendations of the SPDC (Re)Structure Review Committee, which was charged with evaluating the administrative structure of SPDC.

The committee's report presented compelling reasons for this consolidation, including centralized decision-making, streamlined processes, and improved financial management, among other benefits. After thorough consideration, I have endorsed this recommendation, and we are planning to implement the one-college model by July 2025 (FY26).

While the overall restructuring has been approved, it's important that we undertake a review of the impact this consolidation will have on academic matters, particularly curricula adjustments. Thus, I am forwarding this matter to the Steering Committee pursuant to bylaw 3.4.2.4.:



OFFICE OF THE
PROVOST

Michigan State University
Hannah Administration Building
426 Auditorium Road, Room 430
East Lansing, Michigan 48824

Phone: 517-355-6550
Fax: 517-355-9601
provost.msu.edu

“The Steering Committee shall advise the Provost regarding the appropriate faculty, academic, and student governance bodies, if any, to consult on proposals for establishment, moratorium, discontinuance, or merger of basic academic units, including departments, schools, institutes, colleges, and the Graduate School.”

Interim Dean Matt Daum has appointed Dr. Kelly Millenbah to lead the transition process, ensuring a smooth and efficient implementation. I am confident that this new structure will enhance our ability to advance knowledge, prepare innovative leaders, and support the practice of planning, design, and construction. I appreciate the thoughtful contributions from faculty, staff, and administrators throughout this process and look forward to the Steering Committee's engagement in the review of this important transition.

Attachments

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

To: Dean Donnellan, College of Social Science; Dean Millenbah, College of Agriculture and Natural Resources

From: School of Planning Design and Construction (Re)Structure Review Committee

Date: April 25, 2024

Subject: SPDC (Re)Structure Review Committee Memo & Final Report

Dear Deans Donnellan and Millenbah,

On behalf of the School of Planning Design and Construction (SPDC) (Re)Structure Review Committee, I am submitting our final report in the attached document.

Revisions: This report is the revised version of the draft submitted to you on 3/18/2024, which includes feedback received from you (no revisions requested), SPDC, and MSU Org Change Workgroup. The revisions are outlined here:

- Added cultural & identity in the areas across all categories;
- Changed a category name from Grants to Funding and included endowments;
- Revised overview table (Appendix A) to reflect all cross-cutting areas;
- Revised the whole document to separate 'logical steps that might be burdensome to complete but not negatives' from 'cons';
- Added timeline clarifications per MSU Org Change Workgroup feedback; and
- Added two Appendices (D & E) showing documentation of stakeholder feedback.

Voting Results: Our committee presented the final report to SPDC on 4/19 followed by a survey to collect the School's final reflections on the report options. Results show **very strong support for "Option 1-Consolidate all of SPDC under one college, with CANR being the likely choice"** while evaluating Option 2 as unacceptable-

- collectively from SPDC (32 votes in favor of Option 1 versus one [1] vote in favor of Option 2) and
- with unanimous vote from URP (all 11 votes in favor of Option 1, despite likely being the most affected program by the change).

Insights to the survey are as follows:

- Results:
 - **Option 1** (Consolidate all of SPDC under one college, with CANR being the likely choice)
 - **Acceptable:** 32 votes
 - **Unacceptable:** 1 vote
 - **Option 2** (Assign administrative leadership roles to one of the colleges, designating CANR as the primary and CSS as the secondary college)
 - **Acceptable:** 5 votes
 - **Unacceptable:** 23 votes



School of Planning, Design & Construction

Construction Management
Interior Design
Landscape Architecture
Urban & Regional Planning

Human Ecology Building
552 W Circle Drive Rm 101
East Lansing, MI 48824

517-432-0704
Fax: 517-432-8108
Email: spdc@msu.edu
spdc.msu.edu

- **Preferred option**
 - **Option 1 preferred:** 32 votes
 - **Option 2 preferred:** 1 vote
- Sample Statistics:
 - 61% response rate (n=33).
 - Staff – 5; Voting Faculty¹ – 28; and Non-Voting Faculty – 0.
 - CM – 7; ID – 3; LA – 3; URP – 11; NCI – 1; and SPDC – 8.
- Make up of SPDC Faculty and Staff (n=54):
 - Staff – 9; Voting Faculty – 34; and Non-Voting Faculty – 11.
 - CM – 13; ID – 7; LA – 7; URP – 12; NCI – 2; and SPDC – 13.

Final words: It is this committee’s conclusion that “Option 1- Consolidate all of SPDC under one college, with CANR being the likely choice” is the best option between the two. The faculty and staff strongly believe that Option 2 does not provide an acceptable solution to SPDC’s challenges related to the dual-college structure.

Sincerely,



Sinem Mollaoglu
 Chair, SPDC (Re) Structure Review Committee
 Michigan State University

CC: Committee Members:

Mary Beth Graebert – SPDC FO and HR (staff support), Committee Secretary

Eunsil Lee, chair, SAC

Victoria Morckel, SAC

Marie Ruemenapp, SAC

Won Min Sohn, SAC

Zenia Kotval – URP rep with RPT experience

Angela Moore – SSC FO

Audree Baxter – CANR FO

Dave Ivan – MSUE rep

Steve Shablin - RO

Greg Deppong – Controller

Bethan Cantwell – Institutional Research – ORR processes

Joy Speas, Curriculum

Guest- Adrianna High from OOI Office

¹ Per SPDC bylaws, the voting faculty comprises all regular faculty, as well as full-time fixed-term faculty and full-time academic specialists of the School who have served in SPDC for at least one year.

SPDC (Re)Structure Review Committee Report

Background: During the process of assembling a search committee for a new school director, in early Fall 2023, the School of Planning Design and Construction (SPDC) faculty and staff raised concerns regarding challenges with SPDC's two-college administrative structure.

The Deans of the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources (CANR) and College of Social Science (CSS) tasked SPDC's School Advisory Committee (SAC) with developing a document detailing those challenges. On October 20, 2023, SAC provided the deans with a memo as a result of this task and a survey of the SPDC faculty administered by an ad-hoc committee.

The two Deans, their faculty affairs advisors, and the interim Provost met to discuss concerns and recommendations presented in this memo. On November 28, 2023, the two Deans met with the SPDC Director and SAC and shared that:

- MSU is unwilling to create new colleges at this time and
- The focus of any future discussion will be on streamlining the School's administrative home, via either 1) consolidation into one College or 2) designating a lead college for operations.

To move forward, the Provost asked the School to vote on whether it wished to proceed with a Review Panel. SPDC voted favorably to proceed.

On February 2, 2024, CANR and CSS Deans charged the Review Panel, namely SPDC (Re)Structure Review Committee (see members below), with further exploring the details of how the two options might be implemented. More specifically, **the charge** is as follows:

To develop a report for the pros and cons of:

Option 1: All of SPDC under one college – CANR is the likely option per reports to date

Option 2: Making one of the colleges administrative lead (CANR as the primary and CSS as the secondary college)

Review Panel/SPDC (Re)Structure Committee Members:

1. Sinem Mollaoglu, SAC – Committee Chair
2. Mary Beth Graebert – SPDC FO and HR (staff support), Committee Secretary
3. Eunsil Lee, chair, SAC
4. Victoria Morckel, SAC
5. Marie Ruemenapp, SAC
6. Won Min Sohn, SAC
7. Zenia Kotval – URP rep with RPT experience
8. Angela Moore – SSC FO
9. Audree Baxter – CANR FO
10. Dave Ivan – MSUE rep
11. Steve Shablin - RO
12. Greg Deppong – Controller
13. Bethan Cantwell – Institutional Research – ORR processes
14. Joy Speas, Curriculum

Guest- Adrianna High from OOI Office

Report Structure: This report addresses the pros and cons for Option 1 (SPDC under one college) and Option 2 (SPDC administered by one college). To bring insights to how these options might be implemented, the report also presents areas of concern, considerations, stakeholders, time periods, and impacted university systems. This information is presented through eight (8) categories (listed below along with the other report contents that are **bookmarked** in this document for ease of navigation).

1. Human Resources (HR)
2. Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT)
3. Student Matters
4. Curriculum
5. Academic Governance Finances
6. Institutional Support
7. Funding (Grants & Endowments & Other)
8. Finances
9. University Systems
10. **Concluding Remarks**
11. Appendices

The table below presents a snapshot of the areas covered in each category along with the cross-cutting elements and impacted university systems for each category (**Appendix A** displays a larger version).

Categories							
HR	RPT	Student Matters	Curriculum	Academic Gov.	Inst. Support	Funding	Finances
Areas							
Faculty Appointments & Funding Lines	New hire needs	Advising, Graduate & UG students	RO Space	Bylaw Changes	Extension	Pre award	Accounts
	Expectations for existing faculty		Accreditation	Committee Assignments	University Outreach	Post award	Cost Distributions
<<<Workflow changes		Recruitment	University Committee Procedures		Center for Community & Economic Development	Workflow Changes >>>	
RPT process		Degree requirements				Grants (accounting)	
Mentoring		Student coding in SIS				Indirect Costs	
<<<Salary Raises	URP faculty engagement for tenure home change					Endowments	Salary raises >>>
						Facilities	CSS future funding commitments
					AgBioResearch investment		OFPB Allocation/Budget Transfer
Culture & Identity							
University Systems							
EBS/HR Payroll	EBS RPT Reports	RO Space	RO Space			Kuali Research	Security changes
PageUp/Applicant	EBS Business Intelligence for downloading from D	Slate	COURSES			SPA	HR Workflow changes
	CANR uses SharePoint to gather materials, and CSS uses Teams	Security Roles in	Academic Programs Online Forms				KC/Research Admin
			Campus Solutions				Business Intelligence/PowerBI
			Admissions Application List (Slate)				Spartan Financial Navigator
			EBS RPT Reports				EBS/HR Payroll
							eGrad Fellowship-Campus Solutions
							CAMS (asset tracking)
<<< ... >>> : Indicates cross cutting areas between the first and last columns of the table.							

The report went through reviews, feedback collection, and revision processes with the deans, SPDC, and MSU Org Change Workgroup in Spring 2024 and is finalized as of 4/24/2024.

1. Human Resources (HR)

Overview:

Areas:

- Modifying faculty appointments and funding lines
- Modifying reporting relations and unit assignments in university systems (**overlaps with Academic Governance and University Systems**)
- HR Workflow changes (**overlaps with RPT& Funding categories**)
- Reappointment, Promotion & Tenure Process (**overlaps with RPT category**)
- Mentoring (especially URP faculty moving to a new college) (**overlaps with RPT category**)
- Salary Raises (overlaps with **Finances** category)
- Culture & Identity (Cross Cutting Category)

Considerations:

- All support staff are already 100% CANR, no union implications expected.
- Union and bargaining for tenure-track faculty (in negotiations) might be impacted.
- Can get help from OOI office (Bethan Cantwell and Adrianna High).
- Raises no longer require joint department validation.
- Annual reviews already follow CANR process.
- Access to many systems (finance, HR, and student info) are based on org code, so we'll have to resubmit access requests and need to ensure that this is done in a way that prioritizes changes that can affect AY operations.
 - Leads to execute this at org account level are Audree Baxter (CANR) and Angela Moore (CSS).
 - Dawn Martinez will provide a list of individuals that can access systems in both organizations.
 - Dana Bridges will make the change on relationships for secondary reporting (CANR primary) and Mary Beth will make the change for academic appointments with Change of Status forms, attaching the MOU about tenure home change (CSS). (11 employees will change home and funding lines, all secondary orgs need to be removed - they report to CANR and CSS both at this time).

Stakeholders

- University HR/Payroll
- College HR
- SPDC staff
- Unit and college administration and staff

University Systems

- EBS/HR Payroll Forms
- PageUp/Applicant Tracking System (former URP searches)

Time Periods

- Prepare during 2024-25 and execute at the beginning of FY26, along with budget/accounting change. More specifically, for Option 1:
 - Conduct the planning work during budget planning time (February to April 2025) with a target start date of 2/1/2025.
 - Target 3/1/2025 to start making the faculty profile changes.
 - Target July 1, 2025 implementation date (FY26).
- Can be done any time in the year – no considerations of AY/ AN except for giving access to individuals that handle information relating to AY calendar (such as advisors, faculty members with administration duties, or reviewing student information via Slate or D2L). Keep CSS org code open until students leave the program. Coordinate HR changes with payroll periods. Avoid the raise process in late summer.

Option 1: SPDC under one college

Pros:

- Some CANR policies are more beneficial to SPDC faculty (e.g., summer salary allowance up to 3 months).
- Less confusion about faculty who are paid by one college but serve a program in the other college.
- Reduces service burden on faculty overall, since SPDC would not be required to have representatives on two colleges' committees.
- Following one set of policies, procedures and deadlines will simplify processes for staff and faculty. Prominent areas include:
 - RPT: Only need to complete one set of RPT forms each year, following one set of policies, procedures, and timelines.
 - Funding: Simplified workflows and follow-up needed for pre and post award. Improved management of resources due to elimination of varying policies and practices.
 - Salary Raises: The administrative burden to negotiate raises with two colleges would be lifted.

Cons:

- URP faculty have expressed concern that reviewers in CANR may not have a social science perspective for RPT reviews. They also are concerned that standards in publications valued, promotion criteria, and grant requirements in CANR may disadvantage their junior faculty and specialists.

Logistical Steps that may be burdensome but are not negatives:

- URP faculty would need to learn about differences in CANR from an HR perspective. It may be helpful to have them participate in CANR new faculty orientation in the fall.
- Need to nullify all SPDC faculty joint appointments.
- It will take time to change URP faculty appointments in HR system. All staff and most student employees are already under CANR org code.
- Need to make sure we don't lose access to historical data in PageUp for URP positions.

Option 2: SPDC is administered by a lead college

Assuming all faculty appointments would move 100% to CANR, many of the pros and cons above would be the same for Option 2.

Pros:

N/A

Cons:

- If some HR processes (like RPT) were to remain under CSS (for URP faculty), this could still lead to confusion.
- Administrative burden relating to workflow processes in HR, salary raises, funding continue.

2. Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT)

Overview:

Areas:

- Workflow changes (Overlaps with **HR** category)
- Differences in culture and guidelines for RPT between the two colleges (overlaps with **HR** category)
- Mentoring & Institutional Knowledge (overlaps with **HR** category)
- **Academic Governance** (Overlap category)
- Culture & Identity (Cross Cutting Category)

Considerations:

- There are no major differences between CSS and CANR RPT guidelines. College packet formatting/material requirements are a little different.
- Colleges and RPT committees should continue following unit and field expectations in RPT evaluations. Working with colleges to ensure the RPT guidelines reflect this while college committees are trained to ensure its appropriate conduct.
- Institutional knowledge of the unit through representation in the college RPT committee over the years go a long way in successful management of the process and mentoring processes.
- Tenure home change evaluation would need to be facilitated for individual faculty members (Kara Yermak, Assistant Provost from FASA can help with the process and drafting the memo between the unit and individual faculty members.)
- Some minor changes in workflow (organization and timing) will be needed due to some differences between the two college timelines (very similar overall).

Stakeholders

- Faculty
- Mentors
- Faculty Affairs & HR at College and University Levels
- RPT Committees at School, College, and University Levels & School Reps in those Committees
- School and Program Leaders
- Staff

University Systems

- EBS RPT reports
- EBS Business Intelligence for downloading Form D grant data
- CANR uses SharePoint to gather materials, and CSS uses Teams

Time Periods

- 2024-2025 - Academic Governance
- 2025-2026 AY- Transition Work
- 2026 - Until the Existing Stakeholders are Grandfathered in the System
 - CSS faculty members in SPDC to go through the RPT process in the next five years:
 - ❖ Zeenat Kotval Karamchandani, Associate to Full Package in 2027 RPT 2028
 - ❖ Noah Durst, Associate to Full Package in 2028 RPT 2029

- ❖ Deyanira Nevarez Martinez, 3-year review Full Package 2024 RPT 2025 and Tenure Review Full Package 2026 RPT 2027
- ❖ Si Chen, 3-year review - Full Package 2025 RPT 2026 and Tenure Review 2029

Option 1: SPDC under one college

- URP faculty would like to meet with the CANR dean to discuss whether CANR sees a net benefit from their presence and contribution to their core interests. URP may need to educate/remind the CANR leadership about what they do (perhaps a brief presentation on who they are, what they do, and connections through the state).
- URP faculty will need to sign a memo indicating their willingness to change tenure home from CSS-SPDC to CANR-SPDC. The following policy in the Faculty Handbook related to tenured faculty reassignment: [Principles of Faculty Reassignment \(Position Elimination\) \(msu.edu\)](#). This has to do with the dissolution or curtailment of a department, college or other academic unit in which tenured faculty members are primarily assigned. There are eight faculty members in this position. Those faculty members are as follows: Deyanira Nevarez Martinez, Si Chen, Noah Durst, Zeenat Kotval-Karamchandani, Mark Wilson, Zenia Kotval, Jesus Lara and Laura Reese (planning to retire in 2024).

Pros:

- All programs work under same wider expectations
- Timelines are largely similar for all
- Submissions streamlined
- Similar guidelines between the two colleges. LA and ID should have paved the way with RPT for fields outside the traditional Ag focus and can assist.
- URP faculty would no longer have a double service burden. This would be an important benefit, given that it is a small program and that there are many college committees in CSS – in the typical unit, that burden would be shared across the entire unit, but our small program shoulders the entirety of it – but it is outweighed by the fact that we’d lose our voice in the governance process.

Cons:

- URP faculty are social scientists. Is there a place for them in CANR? URP unsure of expectations.

Logistical Steps that may be burdensome but are not negatives: SPDC expectations in RPT guidelines is not laid out clearly in Bylaws. This needs to be implemented and CANR needs to agree/endorse these guidelines.

Option 2: SPDC is administered by a lead college

It is unclear how Option 2 would change the current status quo.

Pros:

- URP knows expectations.

Cons:

- If URP has no representation in CSS governance, they are unaware of changing expectations for RPT.
- There are different expectations for RPT between colleges, including different timelines and submission requirements.
- Challenges related to academic governance: URP wouldn't have inside knowledge on the RPT or curriculum process. That would put URP faculty at a clear disadvantage for tenure cases or revisions to the curriculum. This concern alone might disqualify option 2 from being a viable one.

3. Student Matters

Overview:

Areas:

- Advising
- Recruitment
- Degree requirements (Overlaps with the **curriculum** category)
 - Changes to student program of studies
- Student coding in SIS
- Culture & Identity (Cross Cutting Category)

Considerations:

- The requirements and processes for student advising and recruitment differ greatly between CANR and CSS. If we choose option 2, we should explore ways to streamline student services.
- Processing on Slate remains consistent as the protocol is guided by Slate and does not represent either college.
- All PDC PhD programs are administered through CANR, so there will be no changes.
- The future of MIPS (Master of International Planning Studies) could be impacted.
- For Option 1:
 - Degree conferral would continue as is under current plan codes until the students either graduate or transfer out. Then as students move through the new major it's conferred in the new major. Once the major (in the old code in the system) is empty MSU closes it out. MSU establishes a new major (with a new plan code) in the new unit for the incoming students.
 - Once the changes go through governance and there is an available program in CANR for URP, students can move plans if they choose to and there is no disadvantage to the student and doesn't add time to degree.

Stakeholders

- SPDC student services
- Degree Audit team in the Registrar's Office
- College recruitment and retention
- URP undergraduate students – incoming and current students
- URP graduate students
- Graduate student advisors and Graduate committees (master's and PhD program committees)
- SPDC faculty and staff

University Systems

- RO Space
- Slate
- Security Roles in Campus Solutions

Time Periods

- 2024-2025 - Academic Governance
- 2025-2026 AY- Transition Work
 - For Option 1:

- Curriculum Changes
- New Program Creation with a new org code in MSU systems (URP programs in CANR) for incoming students
- All system changes in the registrar's system should be in place before enrollment starts in March 2026 for the new set up to be in effect for Fall 2026.
- 2026 - Until the Existing Stakeholders are Grandfathered in the System
 - For Option 1:
 - 3 years for grandfathered students in URP programs.
 - Once all existing students graduate, the old program with the old org code (URP/CSS) gets closed.
 - For MIPS students, shorter timeline (Currently 5 students are enrolled in the program).

Option 1: SPDC under one college

Pros:

- Consistent centralized student services would enhance the overall student experience.
- Streamlined advising and recruitment would eliminate the need for advisors to learn two different sets of college requirements and processes.
- The recruitment process for graduate students in URP would be faster with CANR's decentralized responsibility and multiple access points.
- CANR's data-driven support for student recruitment and destination surveys, along with its support system for organizing recruitment events and career fairs, could benefit the URP program.
- Same deadlines for degree audits, milestones, graduations etc. would ensure consistency and clarity for students and staff.
- CANR's strong connections to extension and outreach, including programs that reach rural communities and links to 4H, could benefit URP by providing opportunities to reach a new audience.
- Student learning can be enhanced through increased interdisciplinary opportunities.
- Consolidating all scholarship processes into a unified system would streamline operations and offer greater convenience for staff and faculty.
- CANR's reduced requirements for coursework can make graduation easier for URP students.

Cons:

- Loss of resources and opportunities from CSS (e.g., PURI, awards, funding).
- Uncertainty surrounding what the move might mean for URP recruitment. Will students look for an "urban" major (URP) in an agricultural college (CANR)? It is worth noting that the main draw for URP students seems to be that the program is externally (PAB) accredited.
- Due to requirements relating to minor in CSS, URP has a Cities minor. While this is an added requirement for URP students they tend to enjoy the minor.

Logistical Steps that may be burdensome but are not negatives: The future of MIPS students is uncertain because it's unclear whether the program can maintain the same special negotiation with CANR as it does with CSS. The MIPS program has just started and has 5 students. This is a 30 credit online only

Masters in International Planning Studies degree. According to the current revenue sharing agreement on this with CSS, the budget includes a 25% share for the Office of the Provost and the 75% balance is reinvested in the URP program.

Option 2: SPDC is administered by a lead college

Pros:

- URP aligns better with CSS on content, branding etc.
- MIPS Program stays the same.
- Students can benefit from expanded opportunities for funding, training, and activities provided by both colleges.

Cons:

- Differences in college requirements still complicate advising, causing inefficiencies and challenges in student services.
- Remains difficult for students to navigate courses and transfer across units.
- Double service burden remains on degree audits, commencements, recruitments, etc.
- Variation in deadlines between CANR and CSS can lead to inadvertent non-compliance.
- Differences in expectations and requirements for students, especially for graduate students, can pose challenges in formulating consistent policies for student admission and supervision.
- Discrepancies in graduate advising requirements between the colleges can potentially lead to division among the student body and a perceived lack of belonging.
- The availability of scholarships and fellowships can be confusing for students based on the affiliating college of their degree.

4. Curriculum

Overview:

Areas:

- Curriculum changes (overlaps with the **academic governance** category)
 - Work that needs to go through the curriculum committees across the university levels starting with the school
 - University systems changes
- Potential changes to teaching responsibilities for URP
 - Evaluating overlaps/ collaborations/ co-teaching with units such as CSUS in CANR
 - ISS courses
 - Cities Minor
- Degree Requirements (Overlaps with the **student matters** category)
 - Teaching Responsibilities
- Accreditation matters
- Culture & Identity (Cross Cutting Category)

Considerations:

- If the School becomes a one college administered unit, all of the courses (UP) and three-degree programs in the CSS would need to move to CANR. This goes through the University Committee on Curriculum as a change in administrative responsibility and more than likely a change in the college requirements (potentially). The UCGS will also review the two graduate degree programs (Joy Speas coordinates that review). This can be done during AY 24/25 and implemented for FS25. The requests will need to be put through SPDC via the online system.
- The URP curricula would need to be revised to conform to CANR instead of CSS requirements for BSURP.
- Impact of timing on next URP Accreditation (Fall 2025)
- Degree requirement for curriculum comparisons (See **Appendix B** for comparisons and URP degree requirements):
 - CSS: <https://reg.msu.edu/academicprograms/Print.aspx?Section=2534>
 - CANR: <https://reg.msu.edu/academicprograms/Print.aspx?Section=645>
- Office of the Registrar tasks for Option 1:
 - Create new academic plan codes in Campus Solutions if CSS plan codes are moved to CANR
 - End date CSS plan codes in Campus Solutions when current students complete their degrees under CSS
 - Affected courses that move to CANR from CSS will need to be updated in Campus Solutions
 - Update degree requirements for the degree audit in Campus Solutions if applicable

Stakeholders

- School and URP leaders
- School, college, and university staff to assist implementing curricular changes
- Students

University Systems

- Office of the Registrar
- COURSES
- Academic Programs Online Forms
- Campus Solutions
- Admissions Application List (Slate)

Time Periods

- 2024-2025 - Academic Governance
 - 2025-2026 AY- Transition Work
 - For Option 1:
 - Curriculum Changes
 - New Program Creation with a new org code in MSU systems (URP programs in CANR) for incoming students
 - All system changes in the registrar's system should be in place before enrollment starts in March 2026 for the new set up to be in effect for Fall 2026.
 - 2026 - Until the Existing Stakeholders are Grandfathered in the System
 - For Option 1:
 - 3 years for grandfathered students in URP programs.
 - Once all existing students graduate, the old program with the old org code (URP/CSS) gets closed.
 - For MIPS students, shorter timeline (Currently 5 students are enrolled in the program).

Option 1: SPDC under one college

Pros:

- Curriculum needs to be approved at the university level so standards should be consistent. All programs would have the same University requirements.
- CANR may not have a general education role so getting away from ISS would save URP couple of courses each year.
- URP faculty may not need to teach in the Cities minor.
- There is no impact on program level curriculum (required by accreditation regardless of college home).

Cons:

- The potential loss of ISS courses and associated summary salary.

Logistical Steps that may be burdensome but are not negatives: Unsure of the timing of changes would impact URP Accreditation in Fall 2025.

Option 2: SPDC is administered by a lead college

Pros:

- No change in curriculum

- Keep the Cities minor for our students.
- No curricular changes required for URP

Cons:

- There is uncertainty about how curricular changes will be made. We assume there would be no change in processes. However, will URP faculty serve on CSS curriculum (and other) committees? If yes, the committee burden for URP faculty remains. If no, URP does not have representation on the committees to advocate for their changes. Both scenarios are problematic.

5. Academic Governance

Overview:

Areas:

- Bylaws
- Service expectations for URP and college-level committee composition
- University committee procedures relating to curriculum (overlaps with the **curriculum** category)
- Tenure home change (overlaps with the **RPT** category)
- Culture & Identity (Cross Cutting Category)

Considerations:

- SPDC bylaws would need to be rewritten to remove any reference to two colleges, two deans, and CSS. Changes need to meet PAB (Planning Accreditation Board) expectations regarding governance and autonomy.
- All UP courses and URP programs would need to go through academic governance (e.g., curriculum committees) to move them from CSS to CANR. OOI codes would need to change.
- URP faculty would need to sign a memo indicating their willingness to change their tenure home from CSS-SPDC to CANR-SPDC. The following policy in the Faculty Handbook relates to tenured faculty reassignment: [Principles of Faculty Reassignment \(Position Elimination\) \(msu.edu\)](#). The passage addresses the dissolution or curtailment of a department, college or other academic unit in which tenured faculty members are primarily assigned. There are eight faculty members in this position. Those faculty members are as follows: Deyanira Nevarez Martinez, Si Chen, Noah Durst, Zeenat Kotval-Karamchandani, Mark Wilson, Zenia Kotval, Jesus Lara and Laura Reese (planning to retire in 2024).
- It is unclear how URP faculty serve on committees during the transition to one college.
- Impact of timing on URP Accreditation in Fall 2025.

Stakeholders

- Faculty (mostly in URP)
- Students (mostly in URP)

University Systems

- EBS RPT Reports
- For Curriculum Changes:
 - COURSES
 - Academic Programs online forms
 - Campus Solutions
 - Admissions application list (SLATE)

Time Periods

- 2024-2025 – Academic Governance process in terms of Bylaws and curriculum changes
- 2025-2026 AY- Transition Work in university systems
- 2026 - Until the Existing Stakeholders are Grandfathered in the System

Option 1: SPDC under one college

Pros:

- Streamlining of processes, procedures, and systems. For example, curricular changes would only need to go through one college's curriculum committee.
- Less service for URP faculty. At present, URP tenure track faculty are the only faculty permitted to represent SPDC on CSS committees. URP faculty provide service to both CSS and CANR, creating a double service burden.

Cons:

None

Option 2: SPDC is administered by a lead college

Pros:

- No pros in terms of academic governance.

Cons:

- This option does not solve many of the real problems that exist from a two-college system. Unless CANR [Deans or committees, depending on the issue] can sign off on or approve things (broadly defined) without input from CSS, there is no real benefit of a "lead college" in terms of academic governance.
- If URP faculty are removed from serving on CSS committees as part of the change to a lead college, SPDC loses all representation on CSS committees—which is a problem if we still have "one foot" in CSS.

6. Institutional Support

Overview:

Areas:

- Extension
- University Outreach & Extension (UOE)
- AgBioResearch Investment (ABR)
- Center for Community & Economic Development (CCED)
- Facilities (Overlaps with **Funding** category)
- Culture & Identity (Cross Cutting Category)

Considerations:

- Can be done any time in the year
- Currently no faculty w/ABR appointments
- 5 faculty w/Extension appointments (Sandra Lupien, Holly Madill , Zenia Kotval, Marie Ruemenapp & URP Specialist vacancy)
-
- Appears that SPDC does not have any faculty w/UOE appointments or affiliations at this time. Not sure what relationship is to CCED, and any appointments there. May needed further investigation.

Stakeholders

- SPDC fac/staff w/Extension appointments
- MSUE Admin
- ABR admin
- Any UOE stakeholders
- CCED

Time Periods

- Changes can be done any time in the year. No AY/ AN considerations.

Option 1: SPDC under one college

Pros:

- Streamlines investment process with MSUE and ABR.
- Potential to expand opportunities with MSUE and/or ABR for additional support if just part of CANR
- Provides a more likely base from which to develop and implement a 'Major Donor Campaign' for SPDC.

Cons:

- How the school would handle infrastructure related needs in transition is uncertain.

Option 2: SPDC is administered by a lead college

Pros:

- Two college connections could keep doors open to new institutional units to collaborate and work with.

Cons:

- Investment, new and current, need approvals and signoffs potentially from both colleges.
- Different cultures and different protocols, additional meetings, additional administrative burden.
- Two development offices to work with around donors could present challenges.
- Keeps SPDC as a “secondary” unit in both colleges and diminishes the commitment of the lead and secondary college to the success and growth of the SPDC
- Neither college (lead or secondary college) will provide the needed support to mount a “Major Donor Campaign” for SPDC, which is an important next step for our achieving the school’s full potential.

7. Funding (Grants, Endowments, and Others)

Overview:

Areas:

- Workflow processes and changes (Overlaps with **HR** category)
- Pre-award
- Post-award
- Interdisciplinary Collaboration
- F& A Matters & University Systems (overlaps with **finance** category)
- Internal Grant Opportunities
- Endowments
- Facilities (Overlaps with **Institutional support** category)
- Culture & Identity (Cross Cutting Category)

Considerations:

- Changes during transitions:
 - Per discussion with the Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP – pre-award) and Contract and Grant Administration (CGA – post-award), there are no concerns about a change of any kind including during the transition process.
 - If SPDC decides they want to make a change to **pending** proposals, OSP can work with the unit to do a mass change, so they don't have to do multiple transactional approvals in the system. Once it is determined if a new Org Code will be created, or if they will use an existing Org Code, certain actions can take place. Additional system updates will need to be made if a new Org Code is created, but this is not a major lift.
 - For any **active** awards, there will be some KFS changes that will need to be made and updates to points of contact (if it applies). These are mostly internal administrative changes - the granting agencies will not need to be involved.
- For Option 1:
 - Endowments would need to be moved to CANR and donors would need to be reached out through college development and communications offices.
 - Endowments/ Scholarships changes in university systems are done manually and need a lot of lead time. Loop in Katherine Daugherty for about half a dozen endowments' move from CSS (org code – 38116).
 - OOI need lists of who and what will be moving.
 - PI profiles will need to be updated. (takes 9 months for them to be updated in federal fund profiles – work with OSP/CGA) This might not require PDs and might be tackled in the background just with dean approval.
 - 3/1/2025 might be a good target date to plan for making the profile changes in the background – about 6 months prior to the change date (7/1/2025). This would align with the RFA calculation timeframe. Move forward once we get the green light from the deans.
 - Unit admin roles – approvers to be moved from CSS org to CANR org unit.
 - Dana Bridges (HR IT) will assist when we're ready to get the list of employees that will be moved.

Stakeholders

- SPDC Faculty and Staff
- College Research Support Units
- OSP & CGA
- Alumni and Donors
- College Development
- Unit and College Communications

University Systems

- Kuali Research
- SPA

Time Periods

- 2025-2026 AY- Transition Work
- Funding doesn't follow the fiscal year timeline (they follow their own start and end dates).
- To align with all university system changes for Option 1, target 3/1/2025 to start making the faculty profile changes.

Option 1: SPDC under one college

Pros:

- The unified college structure centralizes decision-making and ensures consistent pre-award policies, thereby accelerating the proposal development approval process and reducing bureaucratic delays. This is especially beneficial for swiftly responding to time-sensitive grant opportunities and streamlining cost-sharing commitments.
- A single college framework and unified pre-award process foster collaboration across various disciplines within SPDC.
- The indirect cost revenue, previously distributed across two separate colleges, will be merged. This consolidation will more effectively support the facilities and administrative services of the unified college.
- Post-award management tasks such as cost-share verification, financial reporting and amendments, and audit compliance become more streamlined. This efficiency reduces the administrative burden on staff.
- Differences in Guidelines and Resources for Support:
 - Some CANR policies are more beneficial to SPDC faculty (e.g., summer salary allowance up to 3 months).
 - CANR has an established pre-award support that is highly efficient (ABR).

Cons:

- Merging programs into a single college may limit the variety of internal grant opportunities and resources available to researchers. This consolidation could restrict the scope and diversity of research initiatives, as programs might compete for the same pool of resources.

- Communication with donors is likely to be important to handle during the process as many URP donors are CSS inclined.

Option 2: SPDC is administered by a lead college

Pros:

- By adopting a single set of pre-award policies and support mechanisms of the lead college, despite the two-college structure, uniformity in grant application preparation and submission can be achieved.

Cons:

- Despite the streamlined procedures, the requirement for signatures from both colleges in specific scenarios, such as cost-share commitments, may remain. This necessity can prolong the pre-award routing timeframes, introducing delays in the grant application process.
- The division of F&A credit and overhead budget allocations between two colleges still necessitates ongoing, intricate communication with OSP. This arrangement can complicate post-award financial management and reporting, potentially leading to inefficiencies in the execution of grant-funded projects.
- Getting TLE and A&I funds from CSS tends to be tricky as SPDC might be marginalized due to 25% share in SPDC. This challenge would continue.

8. Finances

Overview:

Areas:

- Modifying accounts (changing org code, account manager, etc.) or funding, and closing old accounts (38116)
- Having OFPB allocate funding differently (general, OCCI, F&A, RBI, raises)
- Grant accounting (OSP contacts, change overhead credit, PDs to modify existing funding) (overlaps with **funding** category)
- Modifying faculty appointments, salaries, and funding lines (Overlaps with **HR** category)
- CSS SPDC budget transfer to CANR SPDC
- CSS future funding committed for SPDC faculty start-up or retentions
- University system security changes and workflow changes (e.g., KFS, SAP, SFN) (Overlaps with **HR** category)
- Culture & Identity (Cross Cutting Category)

Considerations:

- Whether we select option 1 or option 2, the transition of SPDC to a single/primary college for financial administration will require consolidation of SPDC accounts under one set of org codes (02116, 57116 and 58116).
- Making changes with the fiscal year turnover is best.
- Do we modify existing funding (overhead allocation), or just start with new funding?
- Can OCCI from Social Science be reallocated to SPDC through CANR?
- When will the new university budget model roll out, and should we time our changes accordingly?

Stakeholders

- Office of Sponsored Programs/Contracts & Funding
- University Budget Office
- Accounting/Controller
- College FO
- SPDC staff

University Systems

- Security Changes
- KFS/Financial System
- Kuali Coeus/Research Administration
- Business Intelligence/Power BI
- Spartan Financial Navigator
- EBS/HR Payroll Forms
- eGrad Fellowship-Campus Solutions
- CAMS (asset tracking)

Time Periods: Prepare during 2024-25 and execute at the beginning of FY26. More specifically, for Option 1:

- Conduct the planning work during budget planning time (February to April 2025) with a target start date of 2/1/2025.
- Target 3/1/2025 to start making the faculty profile changes.
- Target July 1, 2025 implementation date (FY26).

Option 1: SPDC under one college

Financial, staff, and faculty member implications with Option 1 are presented in **Appendix C.**

Pros:

- Having one org code makes budgeting and accounting simpler.
- Following one set of policies, procedures and deadlines will make things easier for staff.
- Not having to validate raises across org codes will make the process simpler.
- Less confusion about faculty who are paid by one college but serve a program in the other college.
- Some CANR policies are more beneficial to SPDC faculty (e.g., summer salary allowance up to three months).
- Not having to negotiate salary raises with two colleges lifts administrative burden.
- Resolves some concerns that SPDC is financially disadvantaged by CSS being the secondary college (only 25%).

Cons:

- Some CSS policies are more beneficial to SPDC (e.g., keeping 75% of OCCI/RBI compared to 70% in CANR, ability to allocate 100% of raise dollars from university to FAS).
- Loss of access to CSS resources, like undergraduate research funding (PURI), graduate assistantship funding (AAGA), faculty/student awards, etc.

Logistical Steps that may be burdensome but are not negatives:

- It's a lot of work to move accounts across org codes and ensure nothing is missed.
- Moving funding (URP-led funding are in the 38116 org code and may need to be moved to the 02116 org code) and changing faculty IDC allocations will take time.
- Funding doesn't follow the fiscal year timeline (they follow their own start and end dates).

Option 2: SPDC is administered by a lead college

Assuming CANR becomes administrative lead (e.g., all SPDC accounts move to one org code, all SPDC faculty become 100% CANR), many of the pros and cons listed above would also apply to Option #2.

9. University Systems

Overview:

Areas:

- University Business Systems
- Impact on other categories (see details, as applicable, in other categories of this report)
 - HR
 - EBS
 - PageUP/Applicant Tracking-
 - RPT
 - EBS RPT reports
 - EBS Business Intelligence for downloading Form D grant data
 - CANR uses SharePoint to gather materials, and CSS uses Teams
 - Student Matters
 - RO Space
 - Slate
 - Security Roles in Campus
 - Curriculum & Academic Governance
 - RO Space
 - COURSES
 - Academic Programs Online Forms
 - Campus Solutions
 - ⊖ Admissions Application List (Slate)
 - EBS RPT Reports
 - Institutional Support— N/A
 - Funding
 - Kualii Research
 - SPA-
 - Finance-
 - Security Changes
 - KFS/Financial System
 - Kualii Coeus/Research Administration
 - Business Intelligence/Power BI
 - Spartan Financial Navigator
 - EBS/HR Payroll Forms
 - eGrad Fellowship-Campus Solutions
 - CAMS (asset tracking)

Considerations:

- Moving all SPDC under a single college (Option 1):
 - Would require coordination between the OOI (Organization of Interest) team and members of the Organization Change Workgroup.
 - SPDC/CSS would need to be cleared of all personnel, accounts. Once the organization is vacant, the OOI team can deactivate org.

- Any CSS/SPDC assets (e.g., copiers) would need to be reassigned to CANR, if applicable.
- Access Management: Dawn will provide access reports for each org to SPDC for review, she will need list of people who will be moving (names and net IDs).

HRIT: SPDC can process transfer of employees at any time. Secondary appointment for faculty can be delimited as part of deactivation of org units.

Stakeholders

- HRIT
- Office of the Controller
- Financial Planning and Budget
- Institutional Space Management and Planning (ISPM)
- Sponsored Programs Administration (SPA)
- Institutional Research (IR)
- Access Management

Time Periods

- 2024-2025:
 - Academic Governance
 - New grants to be created using organization codes under the new system.
- 2025-2026 AY- Transition Work. More specifically, for Option 1:
 - Conduct the planning work during budget planning time (February to April 2025) with a target start date of 2/1/2025.
 - Target 3/1/2025 to start making the faculty profile changes.
 - Target July 1, 2025 implementation date for financial systems (FY26).
 - Curriculum Changes
 - New Program Creation with a new org code in MSU systems (URP programs in CANR) for incoming students
 - All system changes in the registrar's system should be in place before enrollment starts in March 2026 for the new set up to be in effect for Fall 2026.
- 2026 - Until the Existing Stakeholders are Grandfathered in the System
 - For Option 1:
 - 3 years for grandfathered students in URP programs.
 - Once all existing students graduate, the old program with the old org code (URP/CSS) gets closed.
 - For MIPS students, shorter timeline (Currently 5 students are enrolled in the program).

Changes in the Organization of Interest (OOI) application are typically scheduled to accommodate payroll (as recommended by HRIT) when staff is moved over in mass. Otherwise, changes can be submitted at any time except for deactivation which is dependent on the organization being vacant.

[Appendix D](#) further details the necessary **tasks for university system changes** and **key contact across MSU** for SPDC and CANR/CSS to work with for necessary changes should the decision to follow Option 1 is reached.

Option 1: SPDC under one college

Pros:

- One less organization to account for in joint total reporting.

Cons:

None

Logistical Steps that may be burdensome but are not negatives: The work items that need to be tackled for the change at the unit, college, and university levels.

Option 2: SPDC is administered by a lead college

Pros:

- From the OOI's perspective CANR is already the lead college – this would not require any changes in the OOI system.

Cons:

- N/A from the OOI perspective.

10. Concluding Remarks

The committee collected feedback on this report from SPDC (see **Appendix E**) in early March, 2024 and finalized the report. Considering all the pros and cons of the two options, below is a table showing **Opportunities & Challenges** for a side-by-side comparison.

OPTION 1: SPDC under One College	OPTION 2: Administration by a Lead College
Opportunities	Opportunities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Centralizing decision-making <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures consistent policies (pre/post award, RPT etc.). • Fewer people needed to sign off on things (presumably). • Streamlining of processes, procedures, and systems. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curricular changes would only need to go through one college’s curriculum committee. • Consistent centralized student services and scholarship/fellowship processes. • Having one set of accounts will make budgeting and accounting simpler. • Reduces service burden on faculty (i.e., committees in two colleges). • Some CANR policies/ protocols are more beneficial/effective <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • e.g., 3-month summer salary allowance, data-driven support for student recruitment, strong connections to extension and outreach, expedited graduate student recruitment. • Resolves some concerns that SPDC is financially disadvantaged by CSS being secondary college (only 25%). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • URP better aligns with CSS for branding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • e.g., student recruitment • MIPS program stays the same • No disruption to URP Curriculum and RPT Processes • Access to CSS resources, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • e.g., undergraduate research funding (PURI), graduate assistantship funding (AAGA), faculty/staff/student awards, training by two colleges.
Challenges	Challenges
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Differences between the two colleges in culture (greatest impact on URP) • Uncertainty about what happens in transition: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on existing URP faculty (RPT) and mentoring practices. • How URP faculty serve on committees. • The future of the MIPS program. • Impacts on student recruitment. • Loss of student-related resources from CSS. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of representation on CSS committees while still having “one foot” in CSS. • The requirement for signatures from both colleges in specific scenarios. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • e.g., cost-share commitments, may still be necessary for grant applications. • The division of F&A credit and overhead budget allocations between two colleges still necessitates ongoing, intricate communication with OSP. • Continued double service burden for SPDC staff and faculty on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • e.g., degree audits, commencements, recruitments. • Lacks efficiency and clarity for student services due to inconsistencies in college requirements and varying deadlines. • Students would continue to face challenges in navigating courses and transferring credits across units. • Some CSS finance policies are more beneficial to SPDC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • e.g., keeping 75% of OCCI/RBI, allocating 100% of raise dollars).

While opportunities and challenges exist with both options, Option 1 offers far more opportunities and less challenges in comparison to Option 2. Equally important, **challenges of Option 1 are mainly related to uncertainties and works during the transition period and rather short-term in nature.** Additionally,

those challenges are most significant for the URP program, yet in SPDC and URP program group discussions, it was clearly expressed that the URP program is in support of Option 1 and ready to work with the leadership towards this option. It is important to address culture and identity fit matters with the Deans to facilitate a successful and inclusive process for the future of the school and all its programs.

Timeline Implications for changes are as follows for Option 1:

- 2024-2025 AY:
 - Academic Governance
 - Tenure Home Change for URP faculty
 - Curriculum Committees
 - URP faculty continues to serve in CSS committees during this AY (only)
 - New grants created using organization codes under the new system.

- 2025-2026 AY/AN- Transition Work
 - Changes in the University Systems (need to be ready for 2026 FY)
 - Conduct the planning work during budget planning time (February to April 2025) with a target start date of 2/1/2025.
 - Target 3/1/2025 to start making the faculty profile changes.
 - Target 7/1/2025 implementation date for financial systems (FY26).
 - HR changes could happen at any time of year but should follow payroll periods and avoid the raise process in August.
 - Curriculum/ Course Changes
 - All system changes in the registrar's system should be in place before enrollment starts in March 2026 for the new set up to be in effect for Fall 2026.
 - 2026 - Until the Existing Stakeholders are Grandfathered in the System
 - Changes in the University Systems
 - Student Services and Students
 - 3 years for grandfathered students in URP programs.
 - Once all existing students graduate, the old program with the old org code (URP/CSS) gets closed.
 - For MIPS students, shorter timeline (Currently 5 students are enrolled in the program).

Final Words

After careful investigation of the two options, SPDC and especially the URP program clearly and overwhelmingly expressed support for Option 1 (consolidating the school under CANR) for the opportunities it provides to all SPDC programs, while they did not see any significant change to the status quo with pursuit of Option 2.

11. Appendices

Appendix A – Overview of Report Categories

Categories								
HR	RPT	Student Matters	Curriculum	Academic Gov.	Inst. Support	Funding	Finances	
Areas								
Faculty Appointments & Funding Lines	New hire needs	Advising, Graduate & UG students	RO Space	Bylaw Changes	Extension	Pre award	Accounts	
	Expectations for existing faculty		Accreditation	Committee Assignments	University Outreach	Post award	Cost Distributions	
<<<Workflow changes	URP faculty engagement for tenure home change	Recruitment	University Committee Procedures		Center for Community & Economic Development	Workflow Changes >>>		
RPT process		Degree requirements		AgBioResearch investment		Grants (accounting)		
Mentoring	Student coding in SIS					Endowments	Indirect Costs	
<<<Salary Raises				Facilities		Salary raises >>>		
							CSS future funding commitments	
						OFPB Allocation/Budget Transfer		
Culture & Identity								
University Systems								
EBS/HR Payroll	EBS RPT Reports	RO Space	RO Space			Kuali Research	Security changes	
PageUp/Applicant	EBS Business Intelligence for downloading from D	Slate	COURSES			SPA	HR Workflow changes	
		Security Roles in	Academic Programs Online Forms				KC/Research Admin	
	Campus Solutions		Business Intelligence/PowerBI					
	Admissions Application List (Slate)		Spartan Financial Navigator					
	EBS RPT Reports		EBS/HR Payroll					
CANR uses SharePoint to gather materials, and CSS uses Teams				eGrad Fellowship-Campus Solutions				
				CAMS (asset tracking)				
<<< ... >>>> : Indicates cross cutting areas between the first and last columns of the table.								

Appendix B – Differences in Curriculum between the Two Colleges

College of SS vs College of ANR

CSS Requirements

- Admission: 28 credits before declaring major in CSS
- Experiential Learning
- Interdisciplinary Minor
- STEM Requirement
- Distribution
 - Minimum 30 credits 300 level and up
 - Max 12 credits IS
 - Max 12 Internship credit
 - Total may not exceed 20 credits

CANR Requirements

- Admission: 28 credits and admitted to CANR major
- Approved alternative tracks in General Science
- Completion of CANR Math – satisfies University math requirement
 - EC 201 or 202
 - Minimum 26 credits in CANR
 - Completion of specific major

BACHELOR OF SCIENCE URBAN AND REGIONAL PLANNING (120 CREDITS)

UNIVERSITY AND CANR REQUIREMENTS – Complete all the following (37 credits)

- | | | |
|---|--|-----------------------|
| ___ WRA 101 (4) | ___ IAH 201-210 (4) | ___ ISS 200 LEVEL (4) |
| ___ MTH 103 (3) | ___ IAH 211+ (4) | ___ ISS 300 LEVEL (4) |
| ___ ISB 200 LEVEL (3) | ___ ISP 200 LEVEL (3) | ___ ISP/ISB LAB (2) |
| ___ MTH114 or
STT200/201 | ___ ECON 201 or 202 | |

MAJOR REQUIREMENTS

PREADMISSION – Complete with 2.0 or better w/28 completed credits (4 credits).

- ___ UP 201 (4)

UPPER DIVISION REQUIREMENTS - Complete all the following with 2.0 or better (28 credits)

- | | | |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| ___ UP 314 (4) SS | ___ UP 424 (3) FS | ___ UP 494 (6) SS |
| ___ UP 353 (4) FS | ___ UP 433 (4) FS | |
| ___ UP 365 (4) SS | ___ UP 454 (3) FS | |

MAJOR ELECTIVES – Complete three of the following (9 credits)

- | | | |
|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| ___ UP 410 (3) FS | ___ UP 458 (3) FS | ___ UP 478 (3) SS |
| ___ UP 434 (3) SS | ___ PDC 491 (3) US | ___ UP 400 (3) US |

FREE ELECTIVES – A maximum of 6 ESL credits can count toward graduation.

Appendix C – Financial Reporting

SPDC																					
All Budget to CANR																					
Effective Date: TBD																					
	AY/ AN	FY	R/ NR	Salary/ Amount	% of Yr	Unit		CANR SPDC		CANR OCCI		Other Unit/Coll		MSUE State		CSS SPDC		CSS OCCI		TOTAL	
						%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Salary Allocations:																					
TS Faculty				2,767,703	100%	0%	-	54%	1,494,175	2%	41,647	7%	189,507	2%	57,576	34%	954,848	1%	29,950	100%	2,767,703
Academic Staff-Continuing				719,152	100%	1%	10,260	52%	373,660	0%	-	18%	132,545	15%	104,502	4%	30,749	9%	67,436	100%	719,152
FT Faculty				682,799	100%	2%	16,976	53%	362,832	25%	173,735	13%	86,402	5%	36,855	0%	-	1%	5,999	100%	682,799
Staff				423,925	100%	12%	50,918	63%	265,030	10%	40,985	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	16%	66,992	100%	423,925
Total SPDC Personnel							78,154		2,495,697		256,367		408,454		198,933		985,597		170,377		4,593,579
Operating:																					
General Operating				21,289	100%	0%	-	59%	12,555	3%	609	0%	-	38%	8,125	0%	-	0%	-	100%	21,289
Students				24,000	100%	0%	-	100%	24,000	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	100%	24,000
Graduate Students				-	100%	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-

The above table shows the general budget of SPDC, particularly as it relates to personnel. With faculty joint appointments, funding flows from the Provost’s office through each college. Staff and advisors are funded by CANR. We use OCCI funds from both colleges to cover teaching gaps and other general fund gaps due to budget cuts. Faculty joint appointments in other units/colleges are also reflected here. Finally, some SPDC positions have partial appointments and funding from MSU Extension, particularly the Community, Food and Economics Institute (CFEI). Reserve and carryforward funds (not shown here) are also used to cover things like operating expenses and graduate assistantship subsidies.

Appendix D – Tasks for University System Changes (For Option 1)

Follow-Up: SPDC Re(Structure)

MSU Org Change <orgchng@msu.edu>

Thu 4/11/2024 1:25 PM

To: Baxter, Audree <baxtera@msu.edu>; Graebert, Mary <lakemary@msu.edu>; Mollaoglu, Sinem <sinemm@msu.edu>; Melton, Marcus <MELTONM2@osp.msu.edu>; Turner, Brent <turme537@msu.edu>; Vincent, Krysta <vince217@msu.edu>; Speas, Joy <Jlspeas@msu.edu>; DuPrey, Matthew <dupreyma@msu.edu>; EBSP.OOI.Workgroup <EBSP.OOI.Workgroup@campusad.msu.edu>; Moroski-Rigney, Stacia <rigneyst@msu.edu>

1 attachments (913 KB)

SPDC Presentation Slides.pdf;

Hi all,

Thank you for a productive conversation this morning. Thank you Audree, Mary Beth, and Sinem for your presentation (it's attached for reference). Below are my notes on next steps, please add to and/or correct as needed. Let's use "reply all" to continue the conversation about these changes.

For consolidation into 10002116 SPDC CANR (with target implementation by July 1, 2025):

- OOI: OOI will deactivate 10038116 (CSS) once fully vacated of accounts, personnel, etc.
- Access Management: Dawn will provide access reports for each org to SPDC for review, she will need list of people who will be moving (names and net IDs).
- HRIT: SPDC can process transfer of employees at any time. Secondary appointment for faculty can be delimited as part of deactivation of 10038116 (CSS). HRIT will wait for final approval before providing list of employees.

[@Baxter, Audree](#), [@Graebert, Mary](#), and [@Mollaoglu, Sinem](#), when you are able, please..

- Work with [@Ueberroth, Steven](#) on questions regarding movement/creation of accounts.
- Contact Katherine Daugherty for help with endowments/scholarships.
- Connect with [@Melton, Marcus](#) to determine appropriate timing for updating pending proposals, active awards, and changes to PI profiles.
- Continue conversation with [@Turner, Brent](#) regarding transfer from CSS to CANR.
- Also, [@Vincent, Krysta](#) can help with changes to space allocation and space coordinators (if applicable).

Additionally, [@Speas, Joy](#) will be our primary contact for the Academic Governance process and we'll want to loop in [@DuPrey, Matthew](#) as needed for changes to the academic plan table.

Please let us know when the committee reaches a final decision with appropriate approvals (please share documented approvals).

Thank you,
Adrianna

MSU Org Change
orgchng@msu.edu
<https://ir.msu.edu/>



Institutional Research
Office of the Provost
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Appendix E - Feedback Facilitation for Draft v.1 & Results

Overview:

- Survey (3/8-3/18/2024):
 - 5 responses completed: 2 CM, 1 LA, 2 URP.
- SPDC Meeting Feedback (3/15):
 - 12 in person and 23 on zoom were present during the meeting.
 - We spent close to an hour presenting and facilitating discussion with the SPDC faculty. Feedback received during these discussions are highlighted below in yellow.
- Feedback from Programs:
 - Collected during the program meeting on 3/15 from URP, CM, ID. ID and LA program directors reported no additional comments on 3/15.
 - URP program incorporated suggested changes directly on the latest version of the report.
- CM:
 - It is not clear which direction we should go in the report. Good report but too factual. What is a better Option? 1 or 2?
 - It is not clear how the changes will affect programs other than URP. As a response the following items were brought up to discuss impacts on all programs:
 - Admin resources/ staff would be alleviated from the additional burden of running everything through two colleges.
 - Asking of resources all from CANR, one more added program to SPDC through CANR.
 - Less burden on everyone on committee works
 - Streamline pre and post award for all programs
 - Better collaboration opportunities across the school without the burden of going through two colleges for all signatures etc.
 - Option 2 – seems like no change

Feedback Received:

1. Human Resources:

- It looks clear that SPDC under one college -CANR, will benefit all aspects of HR. The listed cons are very minor as compared to huge pros and can be easily overcome.
- Thank you for well-organized thoughts. I agreed all points the committee listed in this section and support the Option 1. It will require some additional work for particularly URP faculty, I don't think CANR is far different than CSS in terms of HR perspectives as all we are eventually following the university guideline in general. CANR leaders seem flexible and supportive to understand each major's differences too. We should keep advocating our work consistently to the CANR leaders.
- We put in a lot of effort on feedback at our Friday URP meeting. I'd like to stay with that feedback.
- Salary raises – **cross cutting with finances**. It is an administrative burden to negotiate raises with two colleges.

2. RPT:

- I see RPT as more of SPDC issue and less of college issue. Each college has so much diversity among their units that now a days college RPT committees are very open to evaluating candidates based on unit culture.
Moving RPT to one college will remove the confusion that currently prevails in SPDC about differing requirements, and it has caused resentment among faculty. This will help us to have a SPDC wide expectations first with some tweaks based on programs.

The recent couple candidates for RPT from URP program would have been very well received by CANR PRT committee.

- I agreed all points listed in this section and support the Option 1. Although some different aspects in terms of RPT between CANR and CSS, the overall expectation within the school is not dramatically different. Also, I think our URP faculty members perform strongly with their publication and grant records over the past year. More close and intensive mentoring should be necessary with this change.
- We put in a lot of effort on feedback at our Friday URP meeting. I'd like to stay with that feedback.
- CANR RPT rep. mentioned that CANR has social scientists (Food Science, Community sustainability, SPDC, Biosystems and agricultural engineering etc in addition to existing disciplines of SPDC). URP faculty still mentioned that this is a chance for the URP to express their concerns and keep these matters in the report.

3. Student Matters

- [Will] work very well if all under one collage – CANR
- I support the Option 1. Although there are some uncertain areas like MIPS, moving to one college will be extremely helpful for our staff and advisors. I understand URP's potential recruitment concern under the CANR. But ID program has nearly no representation to the CANR in general, but maintains one of the top gaining programs in terms of the number of admitted students every year. I believe CANR's systematic approach in recruiting students will eventually benefit to all programs including URP.
- We put in a lot of effort on feedback at our Friday URP meeting. I'd like to stay with that feedback.
- Do students -grandfathered in the system during transition to Option1- get to opt in to the new program (URP under CANR) if they choose to? OR do they have to stay in the program they were admitted to (URP under CSS)? **Cleared with Joy Speas** - Once the changes go through governance and there is an available program in CANR students can move plans. Generally this only happens if there is no disadvantage to the student and doesn't add time to degree.

4. Curriculum

- I also support the Option 1 with reasons the committee addressed in the report. The leading college option keeps much uncertainty as the report listed.
- I find CANR curriculum committee more open and supportive of diverse curriculum. I see no issues with URP curriculum in CANR.
- We put in a lot of effort on feedback at our Friday URP meeting. I'd like to stay with that feedback.
- ISS and Cities minor teaching responsibilities – if moved to CANR, URP faculty is alleviated from this load.
- CANR is more lenient than CSS in requirements such as requirement for minors. It would be easier to go through the program for URP students with less requirements. Although this is a double edge sword, as students tend to enjoy cities minor. This is a cross cutting category with student matters.
Cross cutting with student matters

5. Academic Governance

- This is one of the most important reasons why we should move to one college option. We, particularly URP, have too much burden with the current dual college structure as stated in the report.
- Will be much much much much better with CANR as one college. All the past SPDC directors openly shared their challenges dealing with CSS related to academic governance. CANR majority faculty have always felt 100% ignored and excluded by CSS but opposite is the case for CSS majority faculty with CANR.
- We put in a lot of effort on feedback at our Friday URP meeting. I'd like to stay with that feedback.
- Would URP continue to serve on CSS committees under Option2?

6. Institutional Support

- The one college option will benefit to all programs and allow us to explore more opportunities with MSUE, which several URP faculty members are already engaged and/or leading a similar approach.
- Non-issue. I see no change in terms of institutional support and opportunities but even better if all programs are in CANR.
- We put in a lot of effort on feedback at our Friday URP meeting. I'd like to stay with that feedback.
- Facilities to be added to the areas of consideration under **this category as a cross-cutting matter with finances or grants?** How will we navigate through the infrastructure needs and requests during the transition? Getting TLE and A&I funds from CSS tends to be tricky as SPDC might be marginalized due to 25% share in SPDC.

7. Grants

- More opportunities and more grants available via CANR
- No question not to consider the Option 1. Although both colleges shared some resolutions to adjust our grant submission process, having two colleges is still not effective and against our interdisciplinary research opportunities.
- We put in a lot of effort on feedback at our Friday URP meeting. I'd like to stay with that feedback.

8. Finances

- More streamlined. I am amazed to find that CSS does not provide any funding for staff and operating
- Although there are some cons, I support the Option 1.
- I have limited information, but potential loss from OCCCI funds might be considered in the future discussion about the budget with one college.
- We put in a lot of effort on feedback at our Friday URP meeting. I'd like to stay with that feedback.
- Endowments as a new area to be added to finance (or grants, after changing the title to funding). We need to add alumni and donors and college development officers to this category under stakeholders. Communication with donors is likely to be important to handle during the process as many URP donors are CSS inclined.

9. University Systems

- Non-issue. Better to deal with one college
- I understand this is more administrative process with the university offices which may not significantly affect to our programs including URP. I support the Option 1.
- We put in a lot of effort on feedback at our Friday URP meeting. I'd like to stay with that feedback.

10. Appendices

- No comment. Good job by the committee – Thanks
- I have limited information, but potential loss from OCCCI funds might be considered in the future discussion about the budget with one college.

Additional Comments/ Considerations about the report

- We seem to have too many unnecessary RPT related comments. Seems like we are trying to make it a bigger issue than it is.
- Thank you so much for the committee's hard work to lead this complex subject.
- Culture/ Sentiment – How do we (URP faculty, mainly) feel about it all? Does CANR see value in URP, will they accept URP?

- How do we preserve identity of all programs and the school with and during the transition?

Questions for and Clarifications needed from the Deans

- I'd really like to see responses from Kelly on our clarification questions.
- Please act fast.
- The report talks about MSU not interested in creating a new college right now but what about creating new departments as the existing programs in SPDC are maturing?
- Action items (things to do) under challenges, need to be moved out of challenges category (such as URP needs to learn HR processes). URP faculty will look into which ones to be moved out and what to call them/ how to cover them in the report. It was suggested to consider a title as challenges/ adjustments instead of solely challenges.
- URP is ready for Option 1.
- This assumption is to be clarified and check on with the deans. In both Options 1&2, it is assumed that all faculty, staff and students would be appointed 100% under CANR.
- Take a vote on preference of the SPDC and add program preference in the report along with the committee's sentiments.
- The school is in evolution process, the next steps is creating departments. While we will bring this up with the deans as a question, this discussion might diffuse efforts at this step in moving towards CANR – therefore will be excluded from the report.

Final Support

- Four reported Very Satisfied (4) with the report, 1 reported Satisfied/Moderately Satisfied (3) where a Likert Scale of from 1 (Very Dissatisfied) to 4 (Very Satisfied) was used.
- Visible support towards Option 1 in the SPDC meeting on 3/15.
- URP faculty is in unanimous support of Option 1. Option 2 is not a viable option.