**College of Agriculture and Natural Resources**

**Minutes of the College Advisory Council**

**13 March 2020, 3:30 PM, Room 75 Ag Hall**

**Meeting Attendees**

Committee Members Present:

Monique L Sakalidis (chair)

Michael Wagner

Steven Gray

Rafael Auras

Marisol Quintanilla

Leslie Bourquin

Ryan Warner

Frank Lupi

Lisa Tiemann (alternate for Mary Hausbeck)

Garrett Knowlton

Mohamed El-Gafy

Michelle Elizabeth Neff

Pouyan Nejadhashemi (alternate for Timothy Harrigan)

Almudena Veiga-Lopez (alternate for Jason Knott) – acting Secretary

CANR Representatives Present:

Ron Hendrick

Suzanne Lang

Guests Present:

Brian Teppen

Runsheng Yin (TAPC)

**Agenda Items**

**1. Approve minutes from February 14th meeting.**

**2. Additional items for the agenda?**

**3.** **Information item: Role of the CAC in the Faculty Senate and University Council, according to the MSU Bylaws for Academic Governance (Brian Teppen).**

CAC should have two members (one of which should be the chair) that attend the Faculty senate, and the CAC should also attend the University Council. The CAC have not been represented in the Faculty Senate or the University council for some time.

Dr. Brian Teppen was selected to represent Dr. Monique Sakalidis at these meetings for Fall 2019/Spring 2020

**4. TAPC Presentation (Runsheng Yi)**

Dr. Runsheng Yi shared the work the TAPC have done on the common syllabus.

**5. Does the college have a strategy for COVID-19?**

Dr. Ron Hendrick provided information regarding COVID-19 impact on teaching, travel, research and hiring.

-there would likely be two CAC meetings per month.

-no travel out of state to meetings, within state travel would require waivers and detailed records would need to be taken.

-likely to be long term disruption

-Hiring may continue with a move to online e.g. zoom interviews.

**6. Feedback from unit leaders on current practices for confronting violations of community norms.**

The committee revisited and continued a discussion of the need for practices to ensure accountability with the community norms developed by individual units and the college. Feedback was provided on interviews of unit leaders guided by the following three questions.

1. What are the recent policies and practices that have been used to deal with concerns about community norm violations?
2. What are the mechanisms available in the Department for reporting concerns about community norm violations?
3. Are these mechanisms working?

**The following items were discussed**

Specific community norm violations that impact graduate students may be captured in an annual survey of graduate student experiences which would be shared with unit leaders (typically chairs) and DEI committee. Exit interviews with both graduate and undergraduate students may also capture some violations.

There is a recognition that not all departments currently have a set of community norms. Adoption or adaptation of the CANR, or another department’ s community norms is one possibility. However, peer-to-peer conversation on either the development of community norms or adaptation of other unit’s community norms is a critical part of the culture change process and adherence and acceptance of community norms.

There is need for oversight due to power differentials and additional/alternative reporting opportunities. The university ombudsperson, DEI office and HR may be additional places to report community norms violations.

There are complications associated with anonymous reporting, specifically that investigations cannot move forward without a victim self-identifying.

The committee recognizes that community norms could be used to prescribe behaviors, ie. develop specific guidance on behavior in faculty meetings, how meetings are conducted and interactions with graduate students.