**College of Agriculture and Natural Resources**

**College Advisory Council**

**Minutes**

 **February 10th, 2023, 3:30 PM**

<https://msu.zoom.us/j/91666235866>
Meeting ID: 916 6623 5866
Passcode: CAC

Attendance: Dale Rozeboom, Matt Raven, Scott Loveridge, Jo Latimore, Satish Joshi, Erik Runkle, Gabriella Alberganti, Runsheng Yen, Michelle Nerf, Janet Ireland, John Wise, Laurent Matuana, Jessica Miesel, Tim Harrigan, Quentin Tyler, Mohamed El-Gafy, Zey Ustunol

1. Call to Order by Dale Rozeboom at 3:33 PM
2. Introductions were conducted
3. Change in agenda in that Dean Millenbah could not make it. Approved as amended by consensus.
4. Minutes for previous meeting were approved as posted with one correction.
5. Update - Assistant Dean for Faculty Affairs and Development - Scott Loveridge reported that the search for DEI Dean is underway. Governor has requested a 4% increase across AgBio, MSUE and CANR and given Democrats control both houses it has high likelihood it will happen.

Old business

1. Subcommittee Report on the issues of Unit leaders voting on unit matters. Laurent Matuana, Runsheng Yin, and Dale Rozeboom reviewed the By-Laws of the departments in CANR and stuck to verbiage around P&T. There were no clear statements about the Chair voting or not voting. Pretty common in the CANR do not vote and the Subcommittee thought clarification would be useful to instill consistency within the College. One suggestion is a clarification on the CANR By-Laws regarding Chairs not being able to vote. Departmental By-Laws vary in terms of what Chairs can vote on. So a second suggestion would be to send it back to individual units to have them review all voting privileges. Yin supported Rozeboom’s summary of the inconsistencies across the various department By-Laws. Latimore responded that FW is currently working on these issues to clarify them. Harrigan indicated that BAE is also working on their By-Laws to clarify these issues. Latimore commented that she likes the flexibility of departments structuring who can vote on what. Loveridge thought that limiting it to how Chairs can vote on promotion and tenure could be done on the college level without impacting departmental flexibility in other areas. Rozeboom brought the discussion back to the issue of the Chair voting on promotion and tenure. El-Gafy raised the point about the Provost Office having final say regarding the promotion and tenure process. The question was raised should this be brought to Faculty Senate. Joshi was unsure if that would be the appropriate process or not. Matuana commented that it should be done at the unit level first with an emphasis that people should not be able to vote twice. Loveridge summarized the process and pointed out if Chairs vote it would be the fourth time they had input into the process. Rozeboom commented we should investigate further if it is a Provost purview but favors unit having the flexibility at the department level for most voting issues other than the Chair participating in promotion and tenure. Loveridge will make inquiries. The subcommittee agreed there were inconsistencies across departments.
2. Loveridge was seeking input and comments from CAC requested regarding ‘Criteria for Promotion of Fixed Term Faculty.’ [Criteria for Promotion of Fixed Term Faculty.docx](https://michiganstate.sharepoint.com/%3Aw%3A/r/sites/CollegeAdvisoryCouncil617/Shared%20Documents/General/CAC%20Fall%202022%20-%20Spring%202023/Criteria%20for%20Promotion%20of%20Fixed%20Term%20Faculty.docx?d=wa39605ad70844867a2e24f02ec39559c&csf=1&web=1&e=rWAxgs) and [FAQs Promotion for Fixed Term Assistant and Associate Professors.docx](https://michiganstate.sharepoint.com/%3Aw%3A/r/sites/CollegeAdvisoryCouncil617/Shared%20Documents/General/CAC%20Fall%202022%20-%20Spring%202023/FAQs%20Promotion%20for%20Fixed%20Term%20Assistant%20and%20Associate%20Professors.docx?d=w21273f7210cc4a2886654c03c4d8c650&csf=1&web=1&e=pkDQld). Rozeboom thought they were clear and informative. Loveridge indicated that CANR was leader in this area across the university. Latimore liked the way they looked and the caveats of how these appointments differ. Matuana thought they were informative. Miesel commented that in PSM there was a great deal of voice across the department in supporting fixed term faculty including mentoring. Wise commented on perhaps a need for one sentence regarding start-up funds for these faculty. Joshi asked about being on grants and graduate committees and could it be clarified. Loveridge appreciated the feedback.
3. CANR committee officer month-by-month job descriptions - function and typical timeline, with goal of new CANR committees being more effective. Goal with committees being more efficient. Rozeboom has been working on one for CAC and needs input from Ustunol and Raven. He will send to both of them for their input.

New business

1. DEI statement in annual evaluation discussion was moved up the agenda to prior to Old Business in order for everyone to participate. John Wise brought this to the CAC because of ENT faculty concern about having DEI efforts being used in annual review. Eighty-eight percent of ENT faculty did not think it should be included. Overall concern is risk of implicit bias at the administrative level, being misused and other assorted concerns. Rozeboom asked if DEI statements were included in peer review in ENT. Joshi commented that AFRE requires DEI in the annual review this year. Two-thirds did not support inclusion of DEI. Unclear of how it would be defined and other assorted concerns. Matuana surveyed PKG and received 14 responses. Half did not support and 40% had no opinion. Runkle surveyed HORT and got 18 responses. Ninety-four percent did not think it should be part of the annual review. Miesel surveyed PSM got 21responses and two-thirds did not think they should be included. Concerns were how would this information be used and who will be doing the assessment. Latimore surveyed FW and got 25 responses, half were opposed, 36% thought it should be included and remainder had no opinion. Concern being too subjective to evaluate, implicit bias, and what will be done with the information. Ustunol surveyed FSHN and majority (56%) opposed it and one-third had no opinion. Yin was unaware of any discussion on this last year. Asked Wise what would be a way forward with this issue. Wise responded ENT thought an overall survey gathering this information would be good but including in annual review raised a number of issues. Harrigan surveyed BAE and 50% did not support being included. BAE thought it should be a cultural issue, not a performance issue. Members wanted others to share these reports and will be placed in the CAC Teams files for members to review. El-Gafy did not use the survey for SPDC and there were no major concerns in SPDC. ANI faculty were not surveyed. Rozeboom ask Tyler if he had questions or comments. Tyler appreciated the comments and voicing of concerns. Tyler responded that it is up to administration to alleviate these concerns. This year was to set the baseline and perhaps they didn’t do a good enough job of communicating the purpose of the reporting. Concluded that they need to improve the process. Wise commented on the Provost Office’s perspective of how it should be used in promotion and tenure. Concerns about it being weaponized against faculty and/or First Amendment rights. Loveridge commented that these surveys results help bring clarity to faculty concerns and he will take it to D&D for further discussion and bring it back to CAC. Rozeboom has created a folder for the various survey results in Teams.

Reports

1. Subcommittee Report – CANR (College of Agriculture and Natural Resources) (College of Agriculture and Natural Resources) Annual Meeting. Jo Latimore, Satish Joshi, Erik Runkle  - They have sent a draft agenda and are looking for feedback. Joshi was seeking next steps. Rozeboom commented that he will take it from here and work with Loveridge and Dean Millenbah. From there will work with those who have been identified as having speaking parts.
2. Update Elections Officer – Zey Ustunol. Ustunol has identified positions that need to be filled. The call has gone out for nominations to fill these positions with a due date of 2/24/23.
3. Ustunol brought up a concern about Academic Specialists having to request permission to advise graduate students every time they have a new student. Perhaps there might be a possibility this might be relaxed given there is a new Graduate Dean. Ustunol and Wise will draft a letter for Loveridge inquiring about the possibility of this requirement being modified.
4. Next meeting is scheduled for Friday, March 10th, 3:30 PM but this is Spring Break so Rozeboom will check on it.
5. Meeting was adjourned by Chair Rozeboom at 4:55 PM.