

Minutes – February 13 – 3:05 p.m.

Online through WebEx

CCSU Faculty Senate Meeting

Present: Acharya, K.; Al-Masoud, N.; Amaya, L.; Andreoletti, C.; Baratta, C.; Barrington, C.; Benoit, D.; Bigelow, L.; Boone, N.; Bray, A.; Broulik, W.; Chakraborty, S.; Cole, E.; Duquette, J.; Elfant, A.; Emeagwali, G.; Farhat, J.; Farrish, K.; Foshay, J.; Foster, P.; Gamache, J.; Garbovskiy, Y.; Gardner, P.; Gonzalez, K.; Hazan, S.; Hernandez, R.; Horrax, S.; Jackson, M.; Kean, K.; King, A.; Kulesza, M.; Langevin, K.; Love, K.; Martin, K.; Matthews, S.; Matzke, B.; Meng, P.; Mitchell, D.; Moriarty, M.; Nicastro, M.; Ning, W.; O'Connor, J.; Ofray, J.; Orange, M.; Oyewumi, Y.; Paolina, J.; Phillips, E.; Rahman, M.; Ruhs, T.; Savatorova, V.; Schenck, S.; Schmidt, S.; Smith, J.; Smith, R.; Spinelli, A.; Styrzula, S.; Sylvester, C.; Tellier, A.; Thai, N.; Tudisca, B.; Villanti, S.; Zadi, S.; Zhao, S.; Zhou, B.

Ex-Officio: Blitz, D.; Burkholder, T.; Frank, L.; Kostelis, K.; Minkler, S.; Mulrooney, J.; Olamuyiwa, O.; Wolff, R.; Toro, Z.

Parliamentarian: Dimmick, C.

President of the Senate: Latour, F.

Guests: Bantley, K.; Bucher, L.; Byrd Danso, K.; Chen, E.; Cintorino, S.; Claffey, G.; Gendron, M.; Kirby, Y.; Kirk, B.; Jarrett, J.; Larsen, K.; Maurer, S.; McGrath, K.; Merenstein, B.; Moore, N.; Mooreland, D.; Mulcahy, C.; Nedela, M.; Palmer, J.; Pincince, T.; Robinson, C.; Tucker, P.; Votto, S.; Wright, C.; Wu, S.

I. Minutes

- a. The minutes of the meeting of January 30, 2023 were approved as presented.

II. Announcements

a. AAUP (T. Burkholder)

- i. T. Burkholder called attention to an email blast that was sent out earlier in the day regarding the Appropriation Committee's meeting on Wednesday at the Legislative Office Building (LOB.) There are two things that AAUP needs from faculty: (1) people to show up wearing their red T-shirts from 11:30 – 12:30 while President Cheng is presenting (Room 2C); and (2) participation in the public hearing that starts at 7:30 p.m., which AAUP hopes will include a number of faculty giving testimonials. Written testimony is also welcome. Anything AAUP members can do to speak to the importance of the university to the State is welcome. The governor's budget is bleak, and it will be painful if it passes.
- ii. AAUP will have a Politics & Pizza event on March 1 from 1-3:30 p.m. in the Student Center (Semesters area). There will be a few elected officials present.
- iii. T. Burkholder said he has questions for D. Blitz regarding the program approval process at the BOR.

b. SUOAF-AFSCME (L. Bigelow)

- i. SUOAF leadership and members will be attending President Cheng's presentation to the Appropriations Committee on Wednesday as a show of support for CSCU 2030.
- ii. SUOAF is also hosting a Sign & Dine grab-and-go lunch on February 21. This will be an opportunity for members to sign customized letters to the Appropriations and Higher Education committees requesting more funding for the CSCU system in the upcoming biennium budget.
- iii. There will be a lunch for new members on February 22 to cover contract provisions and answer any onboarding questions they may have.
- iv. SUOAF will be co-hosting a workshop for all SUOAF members on Work Stress and Intolerance with the Office of the Vice President of Equity and Inclusion on February 24.
- v. SUOAF is hosting a workshop on Emotional Intelligence and Stress Management for thirty SUOAF members on February 27.

c. SGA (O. Olamuyiwa)

- i. The SGA additional scholarship program has rolled out and applications closed last night at midnight. There was a good response from the student body. In addition to the scholarships program, the SGA has been supporting more funding for higher education. SGA leadership believes it is their duty to do so. SGA will be submitting written testimony to the Appropriations Committee this Wednesday.
- ii. As part of Black History Month, the SGA will be hosting a panel presentation *Breaking Barriers: A Panel on Police Brutality and the Path to Justice*, from 3-5 p.m. on February 22 in Torp Theatre. SGA leaders hope this will lead to a meaningful dialogue about this important issue. Faculty were asked to encourage students to participate. President Cheng has also been invited. The first 100 people to register will receive some swag. An email publicizing the event will be sent out by the end of the week.
- iii. The SGA is committed to fostering a positive and supportive for all of our students and members of our community. SGA is equally committed to working together with other campus organizations to achieve this goal.

d. FAC to the Board of Regents (D. Blitz)

- i. A presentation depicting the gap between the CSCU 2030 proposal and the Governor's proposed budget was shown and discussed.

The FAC is concerned about the difference between the Governor's proposal and the CSCU 2030 request for the next biennium. D. Blitz walked through the documents shared with the agenda. One striking detail is that the proposed budget for the community colleges is larger than the budget for the universities. In general, the significant increases – 71% for the System as a whole and 66% for the universities – have

not been explained in any detail. This will likely be noted by the Governor and his staff. A reader might reasonably ask: what is all this money for?

The \$15M for the PACT program will extend to more students at the community colleges. The PACT+ program extends the PACT program to the universities, but only to students in programs identified as important to the state economy.

ii. A graph showing State Funding & Enrollment Per Biennium was shown and discussed.

The graph shows declining enrollment and state support going back to FY15 and supports the governor's position that the System readjust its finances to recognize the decreased enrollment.

The graph showing the unrestricted reserves was highlighted. Because of the influx of federal money, reserves have actually increased at the universities and Charter Oak, and there is also a significant reserve held at the System Office for the universities. The reserves in 2013 were \$145M (down to \$126M in 2020), but because of the federal monies, the reserves of the universities have increased to \$201M.

Dr. Toro offered that Central's reserves were \$58M as of June 30, 2022.

On the last page of the document were more recent numbers from the System Office Chief Financial Office. They show the difference between what the governor has proposed and what CSCU 2030 seeks. Even if you just look at the PACT+ line item, the gap is over \$85M. Those are significant differences.

There are some very interesting things in the 300+ page proposal the governor has put forward. Those who like reading spreadsheets should take a look.

- iii. Program Assessment: the System Office Provost is very open to working with the FAC. His priority at this point is related to program assessment. He would like a common schedule for the whole system showing the dates when specific programs will go through an assessment every 7 years, a common form, and common indicators so that comparisons can be made between different institutions. D. Blitz suggested differences be allowed for the community colleges, the university, and then at the universities, differences for undergraduate, graduate and doctoral programs. The Provost has said he will forward the draft assessment form to members of the FAC inviting comments. The document would then go to the universities for consideration by their curriculum committees before any procedure or form would be approved.
- iv. Situation at Western – Most of the majors will not be cut (exception – Social Science minor), but Economics will be moved from Arts & Sciences to Business. That was of concern to the Economics faculty who see their program as in line with other disciplines in Arts & Sciences.
- v. Quite preliminarily, and based on tentative modeling, the line in the 2030 plan that talks about consortia degrees: after questioning senior administrators at the System Office after the FAC last week, they have modeled for 30 programs

within the next 5 years, which would eventually be graduating, by 15 years from now, 3000 students per year. These programs would be “revenue positive”. Full time faculty who would be hired to do this (up to 4 per each of the 30 programs) would be paid under the AAUP contract, but it is not clear whether these programs would be housed within the universities. D. Blitz will report back on this at a future meeting. He said it may be a positive development, or it may be a fiasco. That remains to be seen.

1. Question in the Chat: who would offer the consortia degrees? Answer: that is all up in the air right now. Some factors to be considered are funding and faculty availability, union contracts, Senate feedback, etc.

e. President’s Announcements (F. Latour)

- i. There is going to be an open forum hosted by the Senate President and University President at 3 p.m. on Thursday, February 23 in the Constitution Room. Virtual attendance will also be accommodated. An email about this was sent out by the President.

III. Elections

- a. University Planning & Budget Committee (UPBC) – There will be an election to elect two members to the UPBC. The Chair of the UPBC is here today. The next meeting of the UPBC is on February 21. The goal is to hold the election in time for the new members to attend the next meeting. Once the ballot is finalized, the Elections Committee will send a ballot out. Only Senators vote in this election.

IV. Committee Reports

- a. Curriculum Committee (N. Moore) – N. Moore presented the report distributed with the agenda, highlighting several items:
 - i. New program: B.S. in Business Analytics, using mostly existing courses;
 - ii. New Certificate: Spanish for Health Professionals;
 - iii. New Program in Electronics Technology – only listed as new because they used the new form; it is a course change, not a new program;
 - iv. Variety of changes in SEPS, all minor changes (i.e., cycling or title changes);
 - v. Art is making some popular courses general education;
 - vi. Pair of new courses from Theatre;
 - vii. Athletic Training is cleaning up a few things;
 - viii. Civil Engineering is replacing a common fluids course with their own fluids course;
 - ix. The big change is in Skill Area IV. All incoming first-year students were funneled into PE 144. The Undeclared students often dropped out. A substitute course, CCSU 103 has been developed and is now on par with PE 144.

- x. A committee has been formed to follow up on the course archival process brought to Senate a few weeks ago.
- xi. Dr. Toro has charged N. Moore, through the Enrollment Management Council, to look at how Gen Ed has been structured. Meetings with knowledgeable people and stakeholders have been scheduled. This is all that is known on this topic at this time.

Sen Farhat asked for several items to be removed from the consent agenda: the new B.S. program in Business Analytics, BUS 270, BUS 399/MIS399, and BUS 470.

MOTION: to divide the motion on the floor to handle the consent agenda and the items identified by Sen. Farhat separately. MOTION passed by consent.

MOTION: To accept all items on the Curriculum Report, except the items identified by Sen. Farhat. Motion passed.

Discussion of items removed from the consent agenda by Sen. Farhat.

- Sen. Farhat: Since Fall 2019, when the Math department put through the Data Science program and early 2020 when the School of Business put through the Business Analytics program, everything has been on hold and President Toro made it clear that the two programs needed to work together. J. Farhat supported that position based on data. That was clear for the previous provost (Dauwalder), the interim provost (Kostelis), the previous deans of SEST (Kim and Jarrett) and J. Farhat. The concept paper put together had very clear expectations. The IPC required a longer process. The concept paper was based on a solid foundation where data science needed to be part of the core, in the form of 3 credit courses. What we have today at hand is entirely different from what the IPC approved. Did it go back to the IPC? All the Data Science courses have been eliminated from the Business Analytics, being replaced by new classes. All the Data Science foundations have been moved to electives. In other words, students can finish the degree without any data science courses. The result is just a mimic of another program we have in another major. Why did we wait for three years to get to this point?
 - Dr. Toro said that the process is that once the program leaves the Curriculum Committee, it goes to the UPBC and then to the IPC. So, this now has to go to the IPC. She expressed appreciation to Dr. Farhat for bringing this up.
 - J. Farhat said resources have been allocated based on the concept paper. Departments have used the concept paper to get new lines, and now they are not in the program.
 - Dr. Toro said that the issue is that it now has to go to the UPBC, then to the IPC, then to the System Office.
 - Dr. Moore said that he will shepherd this new program through the process once asked.
 - Dr. Frank said that because the proposal was on hold because the Math Department was not able to change the courses from 4 to 3 credits in time to make the January deadline and now the BOR process is even tougher than it was before. When we redesigned the curriculum we checked in with N. Moore and S. Minkler to see if we could move the courses around. We still have the

data courses in the curriculum. Even while the data courses are 4 credits, students can take 3 of the courses to meet the 12 credits of electives. The original proposal required three new courses. The new proposal requires only two new courses; one is cross-listed with an existing course (MIS 399). The nature of the proposal is the same, except where the data science courses reside. This was intended to be consistent with the spirit of the original concept paper approved by the IPC. This allows us to move forward while the Math Department is still working on adjusting the courses to 3 credits and when they are, the students will be able to take them and we will move them around again.

- J. Farhat respectfully disagreed with L. Frank. He discussed the case of BUS 399. The change done there replaces two data sciences courses. If the Math Department needs more time, we can keep it in the core as was proposed and later on it will be 3 credits, not 4. Right now this goes beyond what Hanover did for us. We do not need two classes on data visualization. Right now, as this is structured, we are not giving our students a Business Analytics degree. This will backfire on us when our students get to the job market and do not have the required skills that the Hanover market study is telling us they need. And, we are cannibalizing other programs we have.
- Dr. Frank clarified: this proposal has the same courses that were in the original proposal, they are just grouped differently so that the students can enroll in the program without going over 120 credits while the courses are being changed. The one difference is BUS 470 because we wanted the capstone to be specific to the Business Analytics students and we added Data 301 and Data 311.
- E. Chen contributed that the reason we didn't use the data courses in the core is because they consulted with a task force consisting of multiple faculty with a business analytics background and their response was that the data courses were good if students had the math background, however those courses are too math-oriented for this program and cannot perfectly serve the demands of the business students. That is why we created two more business analytics courses and moved the data courses to the electives. The program is now more business-oriented, and flexibility is there for students to make a choice.
- F. Latour shared that he is in the Math Department and has not heard anything about these courses to be moved from core to being electives. He also strongly suspects the Data Science faculty have also not heard anything. If Math's Senators were to go back to the department after this meeting and report this was approved, that is going to create some very bad relationships between faculty in two schools. He proposed that his be postponed to the next Senate meeting.
- L. Frank noted they have been working with the Math Department on changing the courses to 3 credits, but they have not yet put it through Curriculum. She also noted that they are aware of the new grouping that would allow students to complete the program in 120 credits, taking three 4-credit courses.

MOTION: To postpone this agenda item to the next Senate meeting. Motion passed.

b. Council of Academic Chairs (S. Maurer)

i. Response by Executive Committee and the Council of Deans

F. Latour invited S. Maurer to review the report from the Council of Chairs shared with this meeting agenda as well as the agenda for the last Senate meeting.

S. Maurer said it is unusual for their group to have an interim report. She said she is the elected leader of a larger group of people, who all had the opportunity to provide input to the report. She said the content was timely in the fall, but they are now ready to move on. The group felt it was important to submit an interim report because they felt they had finished the work.

Sen. Jackson thanked S. Maurer for the report and said that many of the concerns raised in the report were done with sufficient detail, but he believes that some of the concerns raised provided insufficient detail for the Senate to make meaningful conclusions. He reminded the Senate of his experience with the Curriculum Committee. He cited the concern raised in the 4th bullet point under the Additional Violations section referencing action under then-dean Farhat: "Programs and concentrations created/changed with little to no faculty input." He said that no evidence was provided to support this comment and requested that any specific details regarding curriculum changes without faculty input be provided. He said he is asking for this for two reasons. First, if this statement is correct and accurate, the curriculum processes in place have failed. He then outlined the individual steps in the current curriculum process, including that regarding the source of the changes, which could be proposed by a dean, any curriculum proposal would need to go back to the faculty – through both the school subcommittee and the full Curriculum Committee for approval, and then come to Senate. The system of shared governance and curriculum is designed to provide multiple opportunities for significant input from faculty for all curriculum changes, even if they originated from the administration, and curriculum is one of the areas where the Senate has approval authority. Returning to the section of the Council of Chairs report, he said if the referenced statement in the report is accurate, the Senate and the faculty have failed in many areas. Second, if the comment is not accurate, it raises many concerns that need to be addressed. Specifically, the report under the heading of Administrative Continuity expresses the opinion that there is a lack of vision across the schools and that the long-term relationships between faculty and administration, the types of relationships that help an organization to innovate and involve are impossible to form and develop since one of the roles of the dean is to provide vision and leadership for a school, it doesn't seem unreasonable for a dean to initiate a curriculum proposal and to share that with faculty, as long as there is evidence of review by all departments in that school. When he was chair, he found that some deans took this responsibility more seriously than others. In conclusion, Sen. Jackson asserted that the Senate should be consistent in what it considers a collegial relationship as well as the Senate's own role in shared governance. If the concerns raised in this report are true, he is more concerned about the failures of the Curriculum Committee and Senate in not recognizing that.

F. Latour asked if anyone had more information to provide in this area.

J. Farhat raised an objection to the section of the report that addressed the School of Business curriculum. More specifically, he objected to being the only person named by

name in the report. He stated that the Council of Chairs report was based on opinion and personal agendas and that he could provide documents to be shared with the meeting minutes that would show the facts of the matter. He stated that the curriculum changes in the School of Business under his deanship went through the processes. With regard to concentrations, he shared a table that showed enrollment in the School of Business over the last four years, noting that the largest program lost one-third of its enrollment. He stated there are two departments that have a concentration, Management and MIS and he met with both chairs and their Departments. He noted there is a concentration in Human Resources which is actually a hidden major. He met with the Management Department several times. They lost 55% of their students and classes were offered with a very low enrollment that is not sustainable. Still, they chose not to listen to him and still have the same problem. The same with the MIS department, the smallest major in the School of Business; it has 65 students in the general major and 35 students in 5 concentrations. It was not sustainable, and they decided to change their curriculum.

J. Farhat said he is not sure what is behind this and is the only dean named by name, and it is all based on misinformation. He asked F. Latour to ask the Council of Chairs for their notes. He is concerned that because his name is out there and could now impact future career opportunities. He feels it is sad and wrong that this report is now out there as a public document. He again asked for the notes and the minutes, because this is a big issue for him.

S. Maurer indicated that she is not sure they have notes, but they do have minutes. J. Farhat clarified that the report stated it was based on minutes and notes, and both are public documents that need to be provided. S. Maurer said she has reviewed the written materials she has and that she did not find reference to this matter in the minutes. She explained that the document was circulated to the committee and people were allowed to make specific claims to be included in the report. She said she would try to get answers for Sen. Farhat but did not have them now. J. Farhat said that if there are claims, they have to be supported. S. Maurer said that there are about 20 of the 44 members present for meetings and that to her memory, there was no one from the School of Business present at the meeting on the day that this matter was discussed.

F. Latour said that according to his read of the document it was pretty clear that the chairs were discussing issues of concern including issues that they had with management. He asked S. Maurer whether the Council of Chairs investigates whether things happened, or rather, hear issue that people have within their department dealing with management or other issues and that it is part of the work of the Council to discuss issues like that and try to find solutions. S. Maurer confirmed that to be true. Fred said that one thing that could be done is to clarify that this a result of discussions about issues chairs are self-reporting about the university and that the Council heard those issues, but that does not mean there is not another side to each story. He said he was not exactly sure how to proceed.

J. Farhat acknowledged that chairs could talk about anything they want behind closed doors but should be more careful when putting out a public document like this. This is opinion, and not based in data.

Sen. Al-Masoud noted he is a chair and a member of the Council of Chairs. He said that uncorroborated claims should not be in a report. If something cannot be proven, it

should not be in this report at all. He said he expressed a concern in the report (an item about electrical engineering) but has no idea whether what he has read in this report is factual or not. There are some claims being made, and he feels we should deal with facts.

C. Dimmick offered that the Senate has received the report and unless the report is asking for Senate action, none is required.

Chat from Sen. Jackson: I cannot vote to accept a report to the senate unless I can (be) assured the document is accurate in all details. I believe that if we are accepting a report from a committee, we are putting the document into the public record, therefore we have an obligation to ensure accuracy, not gossip.

Chat from Sen. Phillips: Hear say should not be used as evidence. We teach our students that data are needed to support statements.

Chat from Sen. Bray: I agree with Dr. Jackson and Dr. Al-Masoud - we have a commitment to all our faculty to ensure accuracy.

Chat from Sen. King: Agree

Chat from Sen. Martin: Can we refer the report back to the COC

Chat from J. Jarrett: What body should be investigating these claims?

Chat from Sen. Emeagwali: Accuracy is crucial. There is no place for gossip in a report.

Chat from Sen. Duquette: The item being discussed is part of a list of issues "that were not discussed during the Council of Chairs meeting but were shared in other contexts."

Professor Wu asked to speak about the Electrical Engineering program that was mentioned in the report. Dr. Al-Masoud mentioned the program by name and she wanted to say that if data is needed, she is a data person, too.

Chat from Sen. Jackson: We usually vote to accept a report. I propose to vote on acceptance, and I will vote no to accept

Comment from Parliamentarian Dimmick: voting to accept a report is not in Robert's Rules.

Sen. Jackson said he is concerned about having an inaccurate report sitting around and in the cloud for the next 15 or so years.

Sen. Smith asked of the report could be amended? Or can it only be amended if there is a motion to adopt.

Parliamentarian Dimmick said you may make a motion for some kind of action based on the report. You could move to exclude the report from the minutes.

MOTION: to exclude the report from the minutes.

S. Hazan asked what would be removed from where if the report is excluded.

Sen. Farrish stated that her understanding of FOIA is that now that it has been transmitted to the Senate, it is a public record. C. Dimmick agreed that the Senate cannot now deny it was received.

Sen. Blitz said it commonly happens that an article is published in a journal and then revised, but the original still lives on. He suggested that the Council of Chairs take back the report, fact check, and revise the report. He noted there is a crisis of shared governance across the system. There is an elaborate report on shared governance issues at Eastern. At Western there was a significant issue related to program closures. We need to put this in a broad perspective and determine who has priority and predominance in what matters. He hopes we do not lose sight of the general problem that we face on a continuing basis.

President Toro said that the Provost was prepared to respond with a lot of specifics but that is not important at this time. We need to focus on the larger question of shared governance and define that better: shared governance v. shared decision-making. About the principles and values that guide her and her team, President Toro said that the greater good is at the top of the list. It is not about following the most vocal and loud individuals, it is about looking for the decision that will be the most beneficial for our students and the communities we serve. Do we have a perfect process? By no means. Is she implying this? No. Is more communication needed? Sure. Do we have differences of opinions? Sure. It is important to recognize this. She found the report by the Council of Chairs very frustrating. The information included in the report is one-sided and does not include the whole picture or all the information. If we as an institution of higher education make our decisions on incomplete information or what one individual wants is not serving our students or ourselves.

F. Latour proposed a motion as an alternate to the motion on the floor to exclude the report from the minutes: he proposed moving this to the Steering Committee so they can meet with the Chair of the Council of Chairs. Motion seconded (D. Blitz).

K. Martin asked why the Steering Committee and not the Council of Chairs.

Interim Dean Mulrooney said he disagreed with this motion and is in favor of sending it back to the Council of Chairs.

F. Latour amended the motion to say it should be referred to the Steering Committee and sent back to the Council of Chairs.

Sen. Amaya said she does not see the point of sending the report to the Steering Committee.

Sen. Farhat shared concern about sending it only to the Council of Chairs. He would like a body outside the Council of Chairs to look at the evidence and weigh it against the claims.

Sen. Bigelow spoke in favor of sending it to both the Steering Committee and the Council of Chairs. She also said she feels there are two issues: one very specific to Sen. Farhat and another, broader issue and that is the issue of bullying. She paralleled this report with a different report that she had written and said that the report should not be wiped from the record because some people do not like what was written, as long as what was written is factual. If there are inaccuracies, they should be corrected, but she feels the report should not be struck from the record.

MOTION: to send the report to the Council of Chairs and the Senate Steering Committee. Motion passed.

- c. Task Force on College of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences (K. Bantley)
- i. Thanked her committee for their hard work.
 - ii. The Task Force is deliberating on what programs will and won't be affiliated with the new college.
 - iii. An email will go out to the 17 programs who have indicated they want to be affiliated.
 - iv. Draft recommendations will go to Senate after Spring Break for the April 3 meeting.
 - v. Final report and recommendations to be submitted by end of the semester (May 15 is the target date.)
 - vi. With regard to Senate action, she emphasized the Senate has advisory opinion on this matter. The report will indicate why the committee accepts or rejects Senate's advice.
 - vii. She reiterated that the Committee's charge is to identify the programs that are to be housed in or associated with the College. It is not within the Committee's charge to determine whether there is to be a school created or to create an organization chart, or to provide a budget. Their charge is only to come up with the academic programs to be housed in or associated with the College.

Dr. Blitz asked about the building that was mentioned that would house the new college and the clinic. He said it is not mentioned in C SCU 2030. What is the status of a potential building and what is the status of what is going on in the basement of Copernicus?

K. Bantley said one of their objectives is to provide assistance on a new building if one is to be built. If there is a "go" for a new college, there is the thought there will be a new building. One of the discussions they have had with faculty and departments is what would they want to see in a new building? What would be needed? With regard to the community clinic and the new college, they are two independent things. We can run a clinic with the programs we have. If a new college comes of this, the community clinic would be a part of it, but the community clinic can stand independently. She also added we are hoping to pilot the community clinic in the second half of this semester. After the pilot, there will be assessments.

K. Kostelis indicated that the community clinic pilot was put forward to the UPBC.

J. Jarrett asked "Has your task force already made recommendations on the clinic pilot? Is it documented somewhere?" K. Bantley: The answer is no, it is too premature, ever-evolving, and based on what we can do this semester with our students and our community.

J. Jarrett asked whether the Task Force recommended that a pilot be undertaken. Does he understand that correctly? Did the Task Force make that recommendation? If so, were there any guidelines or boundaries for that clinic set? K. Bantley: we are still working on that. There are so many questions that need to be answered. If we do not do this right from the beginning, the clinic will fail. We need to do this slowly and

thoughtfully. None of the nuts and bolts have been hashed out. The Task Force is doing their best to get something on-ground this semester. There are Task Force minutes that include there will be a pilot, but the specifics are day-by-day and week-by-week.

V. New Business

- a. None.

VI. Adjournment

MOTION: To adjourn (D. Blitz). Motion passed. Meeting adjourned at 5:21 p.m.