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Briggs Governance Endorsement

The Lyman Briggs Director’s Advisory Council considered the merits of a return to College status several times during September and October and called a meeting of the Briggs Community Council to engage the wider community in the discussion. On October 18, 2005, the Briggs Community Council discussed this proposal and overwhelmingly endorsed a return to College status (30 votes in favor; 1 abstention). On October 21, 2005, the Lyman Briggs Student Advisory Council unanimously endorsed this proposal and a return to College status. On October 22, 2005 the Lyman Briggs Alumni Association Executive Board unanimously endorsed a return to College status.

CNS Governance Endorsement

This proposal was discussed at the November 2, 2005 meeting of Chairs and Directors in the College of Natural Science and at the meetings of the CNS Dean’s Faculty Advisory Council on November 9, 2005, December 14, 2005, and January 11, 2006. The Dean’s FAC approved the proposal without dissent on January 11, 2006.
Given the renewed University emphasis on residential academic communities, the imminent founding of a New Residential College in arts and humanities, and the expectation that the Lyman Briggs School collaborate with James Madison College, Honors College, and the New Residential College on student recruitment, academic programs, and faculty development, it is time to consider whether Lyman Briggs should return to College status.

This proposal argues in the affirmative: the University’s ongoing generous investment in its residential academic programs, particularly in the expansion of the Lyman Briggs program, will have a far greater impact if Lyman Briggs returns to College status as soon as possible. The argument draws, in part, on the reasoning used in the Summer Task Force 2005 Report to support College status for the New Residential College in the arts and humanities. It also reflects the fact that, by comparison to the living-learning programs at other U.S. universities, Lyman Briggs and James Madison appear to be unique as true academic units with their own curricula and faculty. Overall, restoring Lyman Briggs College will help advance the strategic imperatives of Boldness by Design, particularly those related to the student experience, diversity, and stewardship.

It will be essential for the new Lyman Briggs College and the College of Natural Science to maintain a strong relationship. Most Briggs students undertake coordinate majors with a CNS department, a large cohort of Briggs alumni are also CNS graduates, and a number of our faculty benefit from having joint appointments in CNS departments. Lyman Briggs anticipates that a continuing collaboration will benefit the students, faculty, educational missions and research programs of both units.
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1. Introduction:

Lyman Briggs was founded as a College of Michigan State University in 1967 and graduated its first class in 1971. In 1981, financial and political pressures led the University to change the status of Lyman Briggs to that of a School within the College of Natural Science. James Madison College, founded at the same time as Lyman Briggs, remained a College.

Dr. Lou Anna K. Simon’s 2003-04 report *Realizing the Vision: Liberal Arts in the 21st Century Land Grant University* acknowledges the role that residential programs currently play at MSU, calling them “a vital asset in attracting a wide range of academically talented students,” and noting that they “provide a more personal undergraduate experience,” which is “the benchmark for the kind of rigorous, high-quality practical liberal education we aspire to provide.” The report calls for MSU to “improve the quality, breadth, and community of the undergraduate experience by expanding degree-oriented residential options and doubling the number of students participating in these options.” As a result, MSU has requested both Lyman Briggs School and James Madison College to increase their enrollments (by 25% in the case of Briggs), and is preparing to establish a New Residential College in the arts and humanities in fall 2007.

Given the renewed University emphasis on residential academic communities, the imminent founding of the New Residential College in arts and humanities, and the expressed expectation that the Lyman Briggs School collaborate with James Madison College, Honors College, and the New Residential College on student recruitment, academic programs, and faculty development, it is natural to consider whether Lyman Briggs would be better able to undertake these collaborations and sustain its own distinctive mission if it returned to College status.

This document argues in the affirmative: The University’s ongoing generous investment in its residential academic programs, particularly in the expansion of the Lyman Briggs program, will have a far greater impact if Lyman Briggs returns to College status as soon as possible – preferably in fall 2006. Restoring Lyman Briggs College will also help to advance the strategic imperatives of Boldness by Design, particularly those related to the student experience, diversity, and stewardship.

At the same time, it will be essential for the new Lyman Briggs College and the College of Natural Science to maintain a strong relationship. Most Briggs students undertake coordinate majors with a CNS department, a large cohort of Briggs alumni are also CNS graduates, and a number of our faculty benefit from having joint appointments in CNS departments. Lyman Briggs gratefully acknowledges the strong support it has received from CNS under the leadership of Dean George Leroi, and anticipates that a continuing collaboration will serve both units well.
2. Lyman Briggs Context: The Program and Its Ongoing Expansion

The Lyman Briggs School of Science is a residential undergraduate academic unit devoted to studying the natural sciences in their historical, philosophical, literary and social context. All under one roof, LBS encompasses physics, chemistry, and biology laboratories; classrooms; faculty, administrative, and academic support staff offices; student residences; and a dining hall. With approximately 1600 students, LBS offers the benefits of a liberal arts college with the resources of a great research university. The disciplinary faculty members, whose primary appointments are in Lyman Briggs, span the fields of biology, chemistry, literature, history, mathematics, philosophy, physics, and sociology. Students’ majors likewise are broadly chosen: in addition to interdisciplinary concentrations such as “Physical Sciences” or “Science and Technology Studies (STS)”, they can choose from over two dozen majors and specializations joint with departments in Natural Sciences, Engineering, James Madison, and Agriculture & Natural Resources.

The educational philosophy of Lyman Briggs is based on the belief that those sharing an interest in the sciences will benefit from learning and living together. By taking many of their academic courses in the building where they live, students find it easy to form study groups or to seek the advice and assistance of Briggs upperclassmen, who have taken the same courses in previous years. LBS faculty, staff, teaching assistants, and academic advisors based in Holmes Hall are readily accessible for questions and guidance. Many of the undergraduate learning assistants also live in Holmes Hall and are available to work with students on an individual basis.

As of fall 2005, Lyman Briggs has 1580 students, of whom 561 are entering freshman. The Briggs freshman form 37% of the CNS freshman cohort and 7.6% of the MSU freshman class; 19% are members of the Honors College. Given the national attention being paid to the need for encouraging more women and persons of color to pursue studies and careers in science, it is notable that the Briggs freshman class is 66% women and 20% students of color. As discussed on page 7, our students’ rates of membership in the Honors College, graduation within six years, and pursuit of graduate or professional studies are all significantly above the University average.

In working to expand the Lyman Briggs School, according to the University’s request, the challenge has been to maintain the aspects of LBS which Dr. Simon’s report praises: “more writing, hands-on lab experience, critical thinking experiences, small classes, and individualized faculty mentoring.” These characteristics, along with the strong sense of community, the interdisciplinary curriculum, and undergraduate engagement in the faculty’s disciplinary scholarship are what the students find especially valuable. To sustain, and indeed enhance, these facets of the Briggs experience the University has generously increased its investment in faculty and staff, in physical plant, and in operating funds. At the same time, LBS has been working with CNS to raise development funds (so far: $1.75M from foundations, $250k from individuals) to support the improvement and enlargement of the teaching laboratories required by the expansion. See the LBS Expansion Plan (available on the LBS website) for details.
3. MSU Context:

Comparison to the Proposal for a New Residential College in Arts and Humanities

The Report of the Summer Task Force 2005 for the New Residential College/School [below abbreviated RSTF] makes a strong case in support of giving the new unit College status. Here, we summarize the arguments and show that they similarly support College status for Lyman Briggs.

The primary reasons given for favoring College status for the New Residential College apply equally well to Lyman Briggs:

1. *Distinctive approach:* “The program… represents a distinctive interdisciplinary and engaged approach to issues and problems that are not solely within the domain of or paramount in the mission statements of any of the existing colleges. The visibility of this endeavor and its identity would be greatly diminished if it was embedded within [a] … college in the existing college structure.” (RSTF, p. 17)

Lyman Briggs takes an interdisciplinary, student-centered, writing-intensive, inquiry-based approach to the undergraduate study of science in its historical, literary, philosophical, and sociological context. Our courses and undergraduate majors complement those of multiple MSU colleges, including CNS, SSC, CAL, ANR, ENG, and COE. The LBS emphasis on undergraduate education and the study of effective teaching methods differentiates it from the disciplinary departments in CNS, SSC, and CAL in which Briggs faculty have 25% joint appointments. The visibility and identity of the Lyman Briggs School have indeed been diminished by its status as a school, as demonstrated by comparison to its peer, James Madison College.

2. *Distinctive subject matter:* “The core curriculum … map[s] out a subject matter that cuts across several colleges…” (RSTF, p. 17)

The curriculum of Lyman Briggs includes both the study of core science subjects and the study of the societal context of science. Lyman Briggs offers its own distinctive curriculum in mathematics, physics, biology, chemistry, and the history, philosophy, and sociology of science (HPS). Briggs students satisfy their Tier 1 and Tier 2 writing requirements with courses taken in Lyman Briggs, and take a special senior capstone course that unites science and HPS topics. The new laboratory renovations are supporting the continuing development of unique inquiry-based laboratory courses. The Briggs faculty is currently working to interweave the different curricular components together so as to capitalize on ties between disciplines and help students appreciate these connections. Thus, the Briggs curriculum is distinctive and is becoming more so over time.
3. **Student body:** “This distinctive approach to a set of interdisciplinary … issues will increase the number of talented and academically accomplished students who come to MSU…” (RSTF, p. 17)

This statement has long been true of Lyman Briggs for students in the sciences. The six-year graduation rate for students matriculating in Lyman Briggs is 88%, compared with 69% for all students entering MSU. The rate of membership in the Honors College is 19% for Lyman Briggs freshmen, compared with 7% for all MSU freshmen; conversely, Briggs contributes the largest student cohort to the Honors College each year. When students graduate from Lyman Briggs, nearly 70% go on to pursue advanced graduate or professional education.

4. **Connections among students:**

The Lyman Briggs approach to education, coordination with the residence life co-curricular programs of Holmes Hall, and utilization of Lyman Briggs undergraduates as supervised course assistants all create strong connections among student peers and students of different entering classes.

The responses to key objections to College status for the new residential program in arts and humanities also apply directly to Lyman Briggs:

1. **Objection:** A Lyman Briggs College “will draw the best students away from” CNS.  
   **Response:** The description of the anticipated students in MSU’s New Residential College (RSTF p. 18, with “CNS” substituted for “CAL”) reads, in part:
   A distinctively engaged and interdisciplinary… program may be able to bring good students to MSU (and [CNS]) who would not otherwise have come,… and the … curriculum … requires that the students do substantial work in other colleges, most likely but not exclusively in [CNS].”

   This is also a good description of the current Lyman Briggs student body in relation to that of CNS as a whole. Many students who responded to the Briggs survey noted that they chose to attend MSU specifically because of Lyman Briggs.

2. **Objection:** A Lyman Briggs College “will siphon off the best faculty from” CNS.  
   **Response:** The description of the anticipated faculty hires for MSU’s New Residential College (RSTF p. 18) reads, in part:
   The faculty members…are those who wish to make undergraduate teaching their primary work… and those whose research interests are interdisciplinary. These faculty would not likely be the top hiring choices by departments.

   This is also a good description of the current faculty members of Lyman Briggs.

   Briggs faculty members have a distinctive approach to teaching and scholarship, as consistent with the focus of Lyman Briggs on undergraduate education. For example, many Briggs faculty members undertake externally-funded research and peer-
reviewed publications in science and mathematics education and take a scholarly approach to curricular development and pedagogy in Briggs. The criteria by which faculty members are evaluated for hiring, merit raises, and promotion naturally reflect the mission of Lyman Briggs. These criteria differ in ordering and emphasis from those employed in the disciplinary departments of CNS, SSC, and CAL in which Briggs faculty are jointly appointed. Indeed, these unique approaches to teaching and scholarship would be more easily encouraged, developed, and rewarded if Lyman Briggs were an independent college, rather than a unit of CNS.

3. **Objection:** Providing resources to a new Lyman Briggs College “would reduce the budgets of other colleges or deny them new needed resources.” (RSTF, p. 18)

**Response:** The budgetary impact of a transition to College status would be modest when compared to either the existing budget of Lyman Briggs or the costs of implementing the expansion.

- The largest items in the Briggs salary and SSE lines, respectively, are the faculty and the operation of the teaching laboratories; neither would be affected by the change of status; both are already being augmented as part of the expansion plan.
- Some of the staff additions (e.g. for computer support) are already needed for successful implementation of the expansion plan.
- Some of the costs of the transition to College status can be in the form of NR seed funds to be replaced by development funds as the new strategic alumni relations and development efforts mature.
4. National Context

Comparison with academic residential programs at other U.S. universities reveals that Lyman Briggs and James Madison are unique. This section presents some formal comparisons for Briggs; anecdotal reports from personnel attending national conferences on living-learning programs or discussing Briggs with colleagues from other U.S. institutions yield similar results.

The Association of College and University Housing Officers International recently sponsored a four-year National Study of Living-Learning Programs (NSLLP). The results were published in 2004 and were presented at the 8th Living-Learning Programs & Residential Colleges Conference. The NSLLP collected data from 274 living-learning programs (LLPs) within 34 universities. Each program included satisfies three criteria: (1) The program involves undergraduate students who live together in a discrete portion of a residence hall (or the entire hall). (2) The program has staff and resources dedicated for that program only, and not for the entire residence hall. (3) Participants in the program partake in special academic and/or extra-curricular programming designed especially for them. While Briggs satisfies these criteria, the detailed survey results show that Briggs differs from the other programs in crucial ways.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>LLPs from survey</th>
<th>Lyman Briggs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>48% have 50 or fewer students 54% are selective</td>
<td>Has 1580 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Has no special admissions criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Content</td>
<td>73% offer no courses for credit 25% offer academic advising 51% have 1-5 faculty with direct roles in the LLP 33% have no faculty involvement</td>
<td>Has own curriculum / courses Offers academic advising for all students 25 faculty have their primary academic appointments in Briggs; 14 of these are tenure-stream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding and Reporting</td>
<td>14% funded solely by Academic Affairs unit 68% report to Residence Life or Housing unit</td>
<td>Briggs is an academic unit of MSU for funding and reporting purposes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar results may be obtained by examining the websites of the many “residential colleges” at the 27 U.S. colleges and universities featured on the Collegiate Way website (http://collegiateway.org/colleges). The programs may be loosely classified in three categories. In the first group are academic residential programs of 100-600 students with a few faculty living on-site and some additional faculty affiliates whose appointments are in academic departments. These offer a few courses in-house, often general-education seminars, and also provide peer mentoring, faculty advising, and co-curricular activities. Typically, either all university undergraduates are assigned randomly to one such program, or the university sponsors a few small programs with selective admissions. The

---

1 See http://www.livelearnstudy.net/pages/14/index.htm
2 See http://livinglearning.indiana.edu/LLRCplenaryaddress.pdf
programs in the second group are honors programs, which are selective, offer access to designated honors courses, and span the liberal arts and sciences disciplines. The third group is composed of the living-learning communities, which focus on a specific topic such as women-in-science or environmental studies or community outreach. These tend to have selective admissions and 40-100 students; often only freshmen or freshmen and sophomores are eligible. They offer some special seminar courses that relate to the programmatic theme, and also co-curricular activities, peer mentoring, and advising.

Again, all of these other programs differ significantly from Lyman Briggs (and James Madison). Briggs is the tenure home for its own multi-disciplinary faculty, offers its own special majors, has its own well-established courses and curriculum which form the core of the majors, and has a broad array of classrooms and teaching laboratories on-site. Briggs is first, and foremost, an academic unit of the university. The academic advising and residence life programs play important, but supporting roles.

Two conclusions follow from these findings.
• First, by comparison to the other living-learning programs at U.S. institutions of higher education, Lyman Briggs and James Madison stand out as the only ones that are true academic units with their own curricula and faculty. This strongly supports the case for restoring Lyman Briggs to College status within MSU.
• Second, MSU has a wonderful opportunity to exploit the unique nature of Briggs and Madison (and the forthcoming New Residential College in arts and humanities) in its recruitment and development activities. In addition to describing the exceptionally strong education offered by these Colleges (a.k.a “The Best of Both Worlds”), MSU can also stress that no other American university offers even remotely comparable programs. This may be a useful component of a strategy to differentiate MSU from its peers.
5. Aspects of Lyman Briggs Not Affected by Resuming College Status
The following aspects of the Lyman Briggs community and program would not be
changed if Lyman Briggs were restored to College status. See the Appendix for further
information.

Educational Mission
Lyman Briggs is a residential undergraduate academic unit devoted to studying the
natural sciences in their historical, philosophical, literary and social context. Briggs
offers its students “The Best of Both Worlds”: the benefits of a liberal arts college with
the resources of a great research university. Maintaining a diverse, inclusive community
is also a vital part of the Briggs mission. The essential aims of Lyman Briggs did not
change when it became a School, and would not alter if College status were restored.

Size of the student body.
The size of Lyman Briggs is limited both by its physical facilities in Holmes Hall and by
its nature as a smaller, more close-knit community within the larger university. The
current university-requested expansion to a freshman class of 625 and total enrollment of
1810 will saturate the physical and community resources. The size of Briggs would not
be altered by a change to College status.

Class sizes.
The sizes of the classes are set by pedagogical considerations (e.g. promoting interactive
class sessions, inquiry-based labs, and writing-intensive courses) and are long established
within Briggs. This would not be affected by a return to College status.

Curriculum, majors, and advising
The Briggs curriculum and the system of coordinate majors and fields of concentration
are independent of the status of Briggs. They have existed since the founding of Briggs
as a College, through its transition to a School, and would remain intact if Briggs
returned to College status. Likewise, Lyman Briggs would continue to have its own
Academic Orientation Program (AOP), Welcome Week, and advising staff to serve
students’ academic needs.

Size of the faculty.
The size of the faculty is currently growing to accommodate the expansion of the student
body, while maintaining the scope of the educational programs, in accordance with the
Lyman Briggs Expansion Plan. Making Briggs into a College will not, of itself, require a
further increase in the number of faculty.

Faculty joint appointments
The faculty members in the Lyman Briggs School of Science are actively engaged in
research and scholarship as well as in excellent, innovative teaching. This is made explicit at
every stage of the hiring, reappointment, tenure, and promotion processes. The faculty will
continue to have joint appointments in disciplinary departments to facilitate their
scholarship and increase ties between Briggs and the broader university.
Scholarly Mission and Collaborations
Briggs will maintain its interdisciplinary research mission, which is distinct from that of the College of Natural Science and which is a source of strong collaborations with other units across the university. The primary scholarly field of each Briggs faculty member matches that of the joint appointment department; our 14 tenure-stream faculty members are spread across 10 disciplinary departments, many of which are outside CNS (see Appendix). While many Briggs faculty members individually participate in research clusters within their disciplinary departments, the Briggs faculty do not constitute a research cluster in any single CNS discipline. There are, however, two interdisciplinary research clusters within Briggs, to which many of the faculty belong: (a) History, Philosophy, and Sociology of Science, and (b) Scholarship of Undergraduate Teaching and Learning in Science and Mathematics. The first involves the disciplines of several colleges other than CNS (e.g. CSS, CAL, CHM). The second is not a discipline supported by individual CNS departments; rather, it overlaps the interests of the Division of Science and Mathematics Education, which jointly reports to CNS and the College of Education.

Admissions.
The first-come first-served admissions policy of Briggs serves the community well by promoting diversity and access. This will not change if Briggs becomes a College.

Student Participation in Governance
The Lyman Briggs tradition of student participation in standing and search committees is an essential part of the community and will be maintained.
6. Aspects of Lyman Briggs Directly Affected by Resuming College Status

See the Appendix for further details.

Visibility
As a College, the Lyman Briggs community will have greater visibility within and outside MSU. This will enhance opportunities in student and faculty recruitment, raise the value of an LBS degree as perceived by graduate and professional schools, and help Briggs gain more widespread acknowledgment for its accomplishments. These issues were referred to explicitly in many of the survey responses and discussions. Briggs recruitment staff, in particular, have stated quite forcefully that the designation ‘school’ is ambiguous to potential students and their parents, who tend to infer that Briggs is a pre-college rather than an undergraduate program.

MSU is expanding James Madison and Lyman Briggs and creating a New Residential College in arts and humanities because it perceives these residential/academic programs to be valuable for recruiting high-ability students and providing a top-quality educational experience. MSU will clearly benefit from having these programs be highly visible. The greater visibility that College status would accord Lyman Briggs can only help MSU.

Parity and Partnerships
Having the same status as its peers, James Madison College and the New Residential College, will enable Lyman Briggs to be a more equal and effective partner in joint ventures on recruitment of excellent students, fundraising, creation of academic specializations, course exchanges, and faculty cluster hires.

Reporting
A Dean reporting directly to the Provost would lead Lyman Briggs College. At the present time, when residential programs are integral to the university’s success in recruitment and academic quality, such access would help to ensure that the Briggs residential program receives the attention required for its continuing success. It would also mean that the fortunes of Briggs would be less adversely affected by the advent of a CNS Dean less appreciative of Briggs than the current Dean. On the other hand, it means that Briggs would need to speak up for itself as a small College within MSU rather than having one of the largest colleges in the university advocate on its behalf.

Resources
The change in visibility and reporting line would directly affect the ability of Briggs to obtain the resources required to maintain and improve its programs.

For example, within MSU, Briggs would be able to speak directly to the upper administration to advocate for support of its programs during the APP&R and Quality Fund processes. On the other hand, Briggs would also be directly responsible for its share of any budgetary cuts, rather than benefiting from the ability of CNS to mitigate the effects on its departments.

As a College, Briggs would also be expected to maintain an active development effort. Realization of greater development (including endowment) income would allow Briggs to provide new academic opportunities to its students and faculty.
7. Lyman Briggs College Operations
This section describes the structural and operational differences between Lyman Briggs School and a proposed Lyman Briggs College (LBC). The benefits to the Briggs community and the university are outlined.

Personnel
The change to College status will require adding a total of 0.75 FTE in administrative personnel and 4 FTE in staff positions as shown in the table on the following page. The start dates can be staged gradually over the first two years of College operation. For a few existing staff positions, compensation will need to increase, commensurate with increased responsibilities. The number of teaching personnel remains as in the existing expansion plan for the Lyman Briggs School.

Space
Due to the LBS expansion, Briggs now has sufficient space for faculty and staff offices only through 2006-07. We are working with the Office of Facilities Planning and Space Management to find space in Holmes Hall for the expansion-related offices needed starting in fall 2007. The additional staff required for College status will also need offices in Holmes Hall; space for these will also have to be identified.

Computer Support
The ongoing Briggs expansion is leading to an increase in faculty, staff, lab classrooms, and high-tech teaching rooms. As a result, Briggs already needs an increase in computer support staff. The transition to College status will bring additional responsibilities and personnel, requiring an additional 0.5 FTE of computer support

Faculty Actions:
Appointments and annual evaluations:
These should proceed much as they do now. The main difference is that negotiations on these issues regarding faculty with joint appointments would take place between the Deans of the respective colleges (whereas joint appointments with other CNS units are now negotiated between the LBS Director and the other department’s Chair with the CNS Dean’s assistance). For LBS faculty jointly appointed in LBS and a department outside CNS, there will be little change – their appointments already span two colleges. For LBS faculty jointly appointed in LBS and a CNS department, their status will now resemble that of the other joint appointees. For LBS faculty appointed 100% in LBS (nearly all of these are in fixed-term positions), there should be essentially no change.

Promotion and tenure:
The qualitative difference here is that the primary college-level review would be within Lyman Briggs College rather than within CNS. This means that the college-level review would be more assured to focus on criteria and emphases consistent with the mission of Lyman Briggs as well as the mission of MSU. The review committee will include members drawn from the other two Residential Colleges and from appropriate liberal arts and sciences departments outside Briggs in order to assure that the college-level review is informed by an appropriately broad perspective.
Personnel Plan for Transition to Lyman Briggs College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lyman Briggs School (includes expansion)</th>
<th>Lyman Briggs College</th>
<th>Justification of change needed for College operations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEACHING:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, graduate TA’s and undergraduate learning assistants all per LBS Expansion Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADMINISTRATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director (1 FTE)</td>
<td>Dean (1 FTE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Director (part-time)</td>
<td>Assoc. Dean (full-time) (adds .75 FTE)</td>
<td>To help fulfill responsibilities such as assuring College compliance with university policies and procedures (including sensitive data security and FERPA), increased governance and university committee work, and more effort in development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Director</td>
<td>Director of Student Affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STAFF</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Officer and Asst. to Director</td>
<td>Budget Officer</td>
<td>Enables Briggs to meet responsibilities associated with College-level financial management and the increasing number of Briggs grant proposals, while providing appropriate staff support for the Deans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans’ Office Asst. (adds 1 FTE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing Asst.</td>
<td>Purchasing Asst.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs Asst./Business Office Asst.</td>
<td>Student Affairs Asst./Business Office Asst.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Officer (adds 1 FTE)</td>
<td></td>
<td>To lead new College-level development efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni / Public Relations Coord. (adds .5 FTE)</td>
<td></td>
<td>For new College-level alumni and public relations efforts. Reports to Development officer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs Sec’y /Alumni Asst.</td>
<td>Student Affairs Sec’y /Alumni Asst.</td>
<td>Provide staff support for growing development and alumni efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Asst. (adds .5 FTE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer support (now .5 FTE; to support expansion, must add 1 FTE)</td>
<td>Computer support (for College must add .5 FTE)</td>
<td>For hardware and software purchases, maintenance, and training for all faculty, staff, lab classrooms, and mobile computers used in LBC-maintained class and help rooms. Maintains and develops LBC website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs Sec’y/web assistant</td>
<td>Student Affairs Sec’y/web assistant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory Technician (1 FTE; expansion needs 1.5 FTE)</td>
<td>Laboratory Technician (1 FTE; expansion needs 1.5 FTE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor Specialists</td>
<td>Advisor Specialists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Services (adds .5 FTE)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hired jointly with Career Services. To work closely with CNS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Recruiter</td>
<td>Student Recruiter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Student Affairs**
The Student Affairs Office of Lyman Briggs would take on responsibility for certain matters now handled by the CNS Associate Dean for Student Affairs. These include certification of graduation applications as meeting College requirements, monitoring administrative action forms, ensuring FERPA compliance, certifying transfer credit equivalencies, monitoring course listings and changes, and dealing with students at risk of academic probation or dismissal.

CNS currently handles science-related pre-professional (e.g. pre-medical, pre-dental, pre-vet) advising for all MSU students and it is anticipated that this will continue. Hence, Briggs students would still receive such advising through CNS.

**Benefits**
- LBC would be able to monitor student requirements and approve substitutions directly, when appropriate in the context of the Briggs curriculum and a particular student’s plan of study
- Advising of Briggs students would be maintained more smoothly as students progress towards degree completion

**Challenges**
- Both LBC and the college in which a student completes a coordinate major should receive appropriate credit for their contributions towards the students’ education. SCH are one natural mechanism, but others could be explored.
- It will be necessary to maintain sufficient equivalency of requirements for each Briggs coordinate major with its departmental counterpart. This is already done not only with CNS departments but also with departments in other colleges and should be feasible.
- Attention should continue to be paid to coordinating the advising a student receives from Briggs advisors and faculty (departmental) advisors.
- Briggs students are currently eligible for academic awards in the department of their coordinate major, in which they take many upper-level courses. We propose to work with the coordinate major departments so this arrangement can continue.
- At present, Briggs students attend the CNS graduation ceremony and can choose to march with their Briggs cohort, their coordinate department cohort, or both. Some means should be found to continue honoring students’ dual ties to Briggs and their coordinate major department; perhaps a joint CNS-LBC graduation ceremony should be considered. The distinctive Lyman Briggs graduation brunch would continue to be held to honor students’ accomplishments within the Lyman Briggs program as well as in the wider University.
Change of Major
Any student wishing to change major from a Lyman Briggs coordinate major or field of concentration to a major in another college will still be able to do so, provided s/he meets the transfer requirement of the other college. This presents no change to current procedures for students transferring to most MSU colleges. Students wishing to transfer to a CNS major would now have to meet the CNS requirement of a 2.0 GPA; that would be the only alteration to current procedures.

Coordination with CNS
To best serve the academic and career planning needs of Lyman Briggs students and faculty, it is proposed that Briggs maintain certain well-defined ties to CNS to facilitate communication and coordination. These include the following:

• An LBC representative would attend the monthly CNS Chairs & Directors meetings
• LBC would have a non-voting representative on the CNS Curriculum Committee
• LBC and CNS would continue to collaborate on identifying faculty mentors for their Honors College students who receive Professorial Assistantships
• LBC and CNS would continue to coordinate professional development activities for their student affairs and advising staff
• LBC faculty would continue to have access to the CNS Research Services Office.
• The LBC Career Services and Internships Officer would partner with his/her CNS counterpart to serve the career planning needs of their students and mutual alumni.
• Given our many joint alumni, it would be essential for the LBC Development Officer to work closely with CNS Development. A position shared between the two colleges might be appropriate.
• Likewise, the LBC and CNS Alumni and Public Relations Coordinators should collaborate closely.

Development
As a College, Lyman Briggs would be expected to employ a dedicated development officer; this would enable us to exploit several key development opportunities:

• With the help of CNS, we have recently made a more concerted effort at fundraising, using the lab renovation as the focus. This has built momentum that can now transition into a more sustained and structured development program.
• The change of status should be a fundraising magnet, as the lab renovation has been. The attendant immediate publicity and increased long-term visibility will make a gift supporting Briggs seem more desirable to our alumni and friends.
• The recent retirements of many of the original LBS faculty members presents an opportunity to establish endowed scholarships in their honor. Some of these have been started but most are not yet fully endowed.
• The Dutton endowment gives critically needed support for bringing new young faculty into Lyman Briggs. The expansion has accelerated the pace of hiring and made the increase of this endowment a priority.
Benefits:
Realization of greater development (including endowment) income will allow Briggs to provide new academic opportunities to its students (scholarships, research internship support, special seminar), and faculty/staff (support for scholarly and pedagogical projects, professional development funds). In the long term, as the Briggs alumni cohort increases in number and depth, the development effort should become self-sustaining.

Challenges:
LBS and CNS should work closely on these issues and share resources where possible. Many alumni and development prospects are in common; the two colleges (and perhaps also the MSU medical schools, where many Briggs students matriculate) should approach these in a coordinated fashion so as to respect their personal preferences. The Development officer will also have a direct reporting line to the University Development Office.

Alumni and Public Relations
A Lyman Briggs College would have a combined Alumni and Public Relations Coordinator, responsible for improving alumni involvement in Briggs and using the web and other media to enhance the visibility of Briggs and the accomplishments of its community members. This person would report to the Development officer.

Alumni benefits
The alumni coordinator would have the time and resources to build on recent efforts to strengthen alumni participation in Briggs.
- More regular communications via e-mail, the website, letters, and the Briggantine
- Meetings with alumni at Homecoming, LBAA meetings, and gatherings in cities with large concentrations of alumni
It would also enable Briggs to provide consistent and well-organized opportunities for alumni to interact with current and prospective students, including individual mentoring (e.g. via e-mail), participation in recruitment events, and regular presentations to current students in the context of career-planning activities.

Visibility benefits
The public relations coordinator would give focused attention to communicating the accomplishments of Briggs faculty, staff, students, and alumni to University Relations and external media. S/he would consult closely with the LBC computer support staff on improving and maintaining the Lyman Briggs website. These efforts would help Briggs reap the benefits of the visibility boost conferred by returning to College status.

Challenges:
The Briggs Alumni and Public Relations Coordinator must work in synch with his/her CNS counterpart. We have many alumni in common and must take care to acknowledge their connections to CNS as well as to Lyman Briggs. Likewise, the Coordinator will need to strengthen the working relationship between the LBAA and the MSUAA.
Bylaws and Governance
Lyman Briggs would need to revise its bylaws to reflect the change of status; the bylaws of the original Lyman Briggs College are available to serve as a template.

The College would require appropriate standing committees to enact community governance functions. By Briggs tradition and bylaws, such committees have student as well as faculty representation and it is anticipated that this would continue. In some cases, existing standing committees of the Lyman Briggs School could become the analogous standing committees of the College. For example, the Briggs Advisory Council could become the LBC Faculty/Student Advisory Council; the Briggs Educational Policy Committee, the LBC Curriculum Committee; and the Briggs Awards Committee, the LBC Awards Committee. In other cases, new standing committees would need to be created; for example, in parallel with the CNS Dean’s Women’s Advisory Committee, an LBC Diversity Advisory Committee could be created.

University Governance
Lyman Briggs would have representation on University-level governance committees. It may be that Briggs, Madison, and the New Residential College would seek to share representation on some committees, as was done by Briggs, Madison, and Morrill Colleges before 1981. Such sharing would encourage close communication among the three colleges to ensure that the viewpoint of each was appropriately represented, while reducing the service burden on the relatively small faculties of the three colleges.

External Advisory Board
A College Dean should have such a board to help keep the College’s mission well focused and ensure that the institution remains attentive to external realities. All CNS units have been encouraged to have their own Chair’s/Director’s advisory boards; Briggs has already begun to form one, and this could be the nucleus of the LBC Dean’s EAB.
8. Conclusions

This proposal has argued that restoring Lyman Briggs to College status at the earliest possible date will enable Briggs and MSU to take advantage of important opportunities in development and student recruitment and will maximize the effectiveness of the University’s investment in the expansion of Lyman Briggs. Lyman Briggs College will make strong contributions advancing the strategic imperatives of Boldness by Design, particularly those related to the student experience, diversity, and stewardship.

MSU is expanding James Madison and Lyman Briggs and creating the New Residential College in arts and humanities because it perceives these residential academic programs to be valuable for recruiting high-ability students and providing a top-quality educational experience. Arguments about the nature and function of the academic program for the New Residential College that support its college status have been shown here to apply equally well to Lyman Briggs. Moreover, comparison with the residential learning programs at other U.S. universities underscores the unique academic character of Briggs and Madison, with their distinctive curricula, majors, and faculty. Putting all three programs on an equal footing will make it easier for MSU to exploit their unique character as part of a strategy to differentiate the University from its peers. For these reasons, it is appropriate that Lyman Briggs become a College again.

In addition, it is clear that MSU’s significant investment in its residential academic programs, will have a far greater impact if Lyman Briggs returns to College status. Having the same status as its peers, James Madison College and the New Residential College, will enable Lyman Briggs to be a more equal and effective partner in the joint ventures expected of the three units. The unique approaches to science-related teaching and scholarship within Briggs would be more easily encouraged, developed, and rewarded if Lyman Briggs were once again an independent college. In addition, the greater visibility conferred by being a College will be a boon to student recruitment and development efforts. For these reasons, restoring Lyman Briggs to College status will make it an even more effective unit of MSU.

Lyman Briggs looks forward to collaborating with the College of Natural Science on effecting the proposed transition in a manner that will ensure a continuing partnership benefiting all of our students, faculty, alumni, and programs.
Appendix

Responses to Questions Raised by the CNS Dean’s Faculty Advisory Council
Regarding the Proposal to Return Lyman Briggs to College Status
Dr. E.H. Simmons, November 21, 2005

The proposal was discussed at the College of Natural Science Dean’s Faculty Advisory Committee meeting on November 9, 2005 and is on the agenda for the next meeting, scheduled for December 14, 2005. This document responds to some of the questions forwarded to me by members of the FAC and by other interested CNS colleagues. Related material may be found in the Lyman Briggs Expansion Plan and the Lyman Briggs Strategic Plan, both of which are available on the Lyman Briggs website http://www.lymanbriggs.msu.edu.

Lyman Briggs Faculty: An Overview

Faculty Roles in Lyman Briggs

The primary focus of the Lyman Briggs faculty is undergraduate education, broadly defined. Teaching and curricular innovation are judged most heavily in merit and promotion evaluations and the focus on teaching binds the faculty in the diverse disciplines together. Faculty members also maintain active research programs in their disciplines, facilitated in many cases by joint appointments in their disciplinary departments; students regularly participate in these scholarly endeavors. Several of our faculty members are undertaking externally funded research in science education, and our students benefit from their findings. The LBS faculty also have active service roles that include serving as primary advisor for up to 20 LBS students, undertaking outreach projects with LBS students, advising student organizations, and participating in student-initiated co-curricular activities on evenings or weekends – as well as significant faculty peer mentoring and unit governance responsibilities.

It takes a dedicated core of permanently assigned faculty to sustain both the continuity of the Lyman Briggs program and a culture assigning first priority to excellent teaching. We have some visiting faculty on fixed-term appointments in LBS, and a few faculty from other MSU departments take on temporary teaching assignments in Lyman Briggs – but these visiting positions are beneficial to both sides precisely because we have a cadre of permanent faculty available to work with the visitors, mentor them, and learn from them. It is the distinctive Lyman Briggs faculty who undertake the important projects outlined above and who, above all, ensure that our students have a coherent learning experience across disciplines and semesters.

Faculty Scholarship and Joint Appointments

Over the past decade, Briggs has undergone a transition from a school with 1100 students and a faculty focused almost exclusively on teaching to a school with 1580 students and a research-active faculty of teacher-scholars.

The faculty of the Lyman Briggs School of Science are now expected to be actively engaged

---

3 http://www.lymanbriggs.msu.edu/expansion/LBS-reordered-prop-4-23.pdf
in research and scholarship as well as in excellent, innovative teaching. This is made explicit at every stage of the hiring, reappointment, tenure, and promotion processes. Briggs faculty publish books, write articles for peer-reviewed journals, make scholarly presentations at national and international meetings, and apply alone or in collaborations for external funds in support of their research activities. Many supervise doctoral students in their disciplinary departments; most involve undergraduate students in their scholarship.

Each new faculty member is hired with a 25% joint appointment in a disciplinary department to facilitate research through access to colleagues, graduate students, and (where appropriate) laboratory facilities. Several faculty are engaged in productive scholarship related to science education, either as their primary field of research or in addition to work in another discipline; those whose primary scholarship is in science education have joint appointments in the Division of Science and Mathematics Education. Joint appointment departments are involved in the search and selection process to ensure that the new hire will be a good fit with both units. A memorandum of understanding is drawn up to establish the pedagogical and scholarly expectations upon which performance reviews will be based. For example, the Briggs teaching load of two courses per semester is explicitly noted so that joint appointment departments with lower average teaching loads will take the difference into account during performance reviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Joint Appointment Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Cori Fata-Hartley</td>
<td>Microbiology and Molecular Genetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doug Luckie</td>
<td>Physiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Smith</td>
<td>Zoology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Search in Progress]</td>
<td>Zoology, Fisheries and Wildlife, Crop and Soil Science, or Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Robert LaDuca</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ryan Sweeder</td>
<td>Division of Science and Mathematics Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Daniel Dougherty</td>
<td>Statistics and Probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Akilu Zeleke</td>
<td>Statistics and Probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Search in Progress]</td>
<td>Mathematics or Computer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>Walter Benenson</td>
<td>Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gerd Kortemeyer</td>
<td>Division of Science and Mathematics Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Technology Studies (a.k.a. History, Philosophy, and Sociology of Science)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kristie Macrakis</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aaron McCright</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Pennock</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Root-Bernstein</td>
<td>Physiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Shelton</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Search in Progress]</td>
<td>Fisheries and Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Search in Progress]</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Answers to Several Frequently Asked Questions

1. Will making Briggs a College tend to separate the students, faculty, and curriculum from their current connections to research?

Answer: Absolutely not. These connections are strongly embedded in the fabric of Briggs and will be maintained.

- The faculty will continue to have joint appointments in disciplinary departments and will continue to be hired, reviewed, tenured, and promoted based on both scholarly and pedagogical achievements. This expectation will continue to be made clear in memoranda of understanding for all new hires.
- The courses and course sequence taken by Briggs students with coordinate majors in CNS will not change. For example, given that Briggs has 34 different coordinate majors, it is absolutely clear that Briggs students will still take their upper-level science courses in the disciplinary departments. This has always been true, regardless of whether Briggs was a College or a School.
- Briggs science courses, especially those based in the lab, are strongly rooted in inquiry-based investigations involving everything from research-like experiences to original student research mentored by faculty.
- Briggs students are and will continue to be strongly encouraged to join research teams led by faculty in Briggs or in other units across campus. Given the relative numbers of Briggs students and faculty, most undergraduate researchers from Briggs naturally work with faculty in other departments.

2. How will a broader perspective be incorporated into the College-level reviews of faculty for reappointment, tenure, and promotion?

Answer: This is an important point that needs to be incorporated into detailed planning for the new bylaws and review procedures. As noted above, Briggs faculty members are expected to be research-active. A rigorous evaluation of scholarship – in conjunction with the appropriate review of teaching and service – is, and will remain, an essential part of reappointment, tenure, and promotion review. At present, each Briggs faculty member is reviewed both by his/her joint appointment department and by Briggs at the “department” level, and is then reviewed from a broader perspective by the CNS committee. The first stage should be preserved, since it ensures that the candidate’s pedagogical and scholarly accomplishments are appropriately scrutinized by departmental colleagues. A second, broader, review could, for instance, be provided by formation of an LBC Dean’s ad hoc promotion/tenure/reappointment review committee including faculty members from Briggs, faculty from Madison or (eventually) the new residential college, and faculty from other appropriate liberal arts and sciences departments. Note also that following the College-level evaluation, the Provost is also responsible for separately reviewing each candidate for tenure and/or promotion.
3. In what specific ways have the visibility and identity of Briggs (which became a School) been diminished, by comparison with Madison (which remained a College)?

Answer: By comparison with Briggs, Madison has had the following advantages as a College:

• Visibility within the university, which helps with recruitment of faculty and students and leads to much greater visibility to outsiders looking at the university.
• Ability to negotiate for resources directly with the Provost.
• Ability to have their own development officer, which yields annual income to supplement academic initiatives.
• Conviction among their alumni that the university values James Madison College.

In contrast, Lyman Briggs College alumni were dismayed at being abruptly "downgraded" and this has adversely affected donations and alumni participation.

4. Why did Lyman Briggs originally lose College status in 1981?

Answer: In 1981, there was a financial crisis and the university proposed to eliminate many programs, including the three residential colleges. At a pivotal Board of Trustees meeting that included a session where MSU community members, including alumni, could speak, the following actions were taken regarding the residential colleges:

• Justin Morrill was eliminated.
• James Madison's alumni and supporters argued strongly enough in its favor that it was kept on as a college.
• Lyman Briggs supporters argued strongly enough that a Trustee abruptly proposed in the middle of the meeting that Lyman Briggs College become a School within CNS [the Trustee did not feel there was the political will to keep on Briggs as a College at that moment]. This was adopted.