

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA FACULTY SENATE

Wednesday, April 7, 2021 at 3 p.m.

The Session was held entirely online.

PRESIDING: Professor Mark Cooper, Chair

1. Call to Order.

FACULTY SENATE CHAIR MARK COOPER called the meeting to order via the Blackboard Collaborate Ultra platform.

2. Corrections to and Approval of Minutes

o February 3, 2021

o March 3, 2021

The minutes were approved.

3. Invited Guest: Professor Melissa Nolan, Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Arnold School of Public Health

Prof. Melissa Nolan: Last March, I was asked by President Caslen to put together a team and help provide insight to the executive leadership team because they had to make some very difficult decisions.

We have run thousands of different scenarios from variety of different tools to address needs including whether we should have visitors during this summer, whether we should have spring break, and how we might anticipate moving forward throughout this past year.

I'm going to present the latest modeling that we have, a S.I.R. model which means: Susceptible, Infected, Recovered, a standard modeling technique we use for outbreak response. There are a variety of different variables that go into each of these models we run. The SIR model employed assumptions based on the following variables:

1. Number of people accessing campus
2. Basic reproduction numbers
3. Variant prevalence
4. Immunity
5. Variant transmissibility
6. Vaccine uptake

I'm going to show you three themes today:

First, we examine multiple factors, including thinking about the number of people that are accessing campus with the new governance that came down from the governor. We anticipate that while not everyone might be back on campus, we would have greater access to campus in that people will be coming in for small periods of time. So having an idea of what that might look like, and then staggering that out over the spring versus summer months informs the basic reproduction number. We anticipate about 1% of the infections are going to be due to the variant. We also estimate the number of people vaccinated, etc. We have a great amount of data from the campus over the last year that then gave us an idea of what the infection patterns could look like.

Best case scenario, including increased vaccination access, we're going to continue to see a slight increase in cases until mid-May when the vaccination rollout really peaks. Best case scenario is that after that vaccination peaks then we would have very few cases after that and that variants would have very little impact on campus.

Worst case scenario: we could see for the rest of the spring semester going into the summer months that the variants spread very quickly. This would be inhibited by the vaccination as we see more and more people getting that second vaccination. Then we would see a small peak or flare up over the summer months. That could be due to travel. It could be due to people getting back out there in the community again. So again, this is our worst-case scenario.

When we think about our college students that have been previously positive, if they're not getting vaccinated with the assumption that they have immunity, they could certainly be at risk for continuing that transmission again. Even if we continue with an increase in cases, they should certainly go down once we have a higher number of people that are continuing to get vaccinated.

I can certainly tell you that even our worst-case scenario is well within the capacity of what we can handle and would be less than what we saw at the beginning of fall semester. So, I feel great that we do have the infrastructure in place to handle what we might see. I would say almost every scenario projection that we have been doing up to date has been showing that by August it should be smooth sailing, so we're hopeful.

There's a question of whether we will require vaccinations on campus in the fall. That is still something that we're discussion. I will defer to President Castle in a moment. What I can tell you is that right now, vaccinations are not fully vetted by the FDA and are still under an emergency use authorization.

PRESIDENT CASLEN: My position right now is, no, we're not going to require vaccinations. We're going to strongly encourage vaccinations, but knowing that we're not going to get there. Let's say 80% of the community has vaccinations, you really create herd immunity. Which really means that you just run out of possible host for the virus. We're going to encourage everybody, because ultimately, we want to get that herd immunity.

SENATOR ROBERT DAWSON: Do we test for the variants on campus?

PROFESSOR NOLAN: We test for variants through the wastewater. We also test through saliva tests.

SENATOR SOFIA LIZARRAGA: What COVID restrictions will be in place for summer and fall, specifically in labs?

PROFESSOR NOLAN: We anticipate mask usage will continue into the fall. This will likely be a transition year. Social distancing will probably decrease in the fall.

PROVOST TATE: Social distancing in some form, and masking for sure must exist.

4. Reports of the Officers

o President Robert Caslen

PRESIDENT CASLEN: I want to say thanks to the faculty for their incredible integrity in conducting our mission, which is to deliver education to the highest standards.

I do want to give a special thanks and appreciation, not only to Prof. Nolan and her college, the Arnold School of Public Health, but also to the Pharmacy and Medical School faculties, all of which were just fantastic through all of this.

The accomplishments of the University during the pandemic have been amazing.

We published the strategic plan, and we're now assessing our goals and objectives and modifying them.

- We started building partnerships with some of the HBCUs during our strategic plan like Claflin and Benedict.
- We kept tuition the same
- Our enrollment applications for the next year's freshman class increased by 21% at a time when the national average decreased as much as 10 to 15%
- We work with this SRNL and other partners for the \$3.8 million contract with SRNL.
- We established the South Carolina's cyber partnership with the state of South Carolina.
- We're fixing to launch Carolina Online you'll see more on that next week
- We have determined the university has a \$6.3 billion impact on the South Carolina economy with a strong credit rating.
- For what it's worth we're going to open on campus Apple Store.

Thank you very much for your partnership in and doing all that.

There are a few updates I want to give you today. I do want to talk a bit about SACSCOC, which will lead into the Title 9 Task Force and then faculty, staff misconduct, Boeing instability and the Benedict College Partnership with Apple as well and talk a little bit about the Excellence Initiative funds and where we are with our budget for this year.

SACSCOC, when they had the virtual on campus for accreditation visit a couple weeks ago, it was an excellent visit. The onsite team praised our QEP. So, we're pleased to see that, but efforts do not get you re-accredited, outcomes do, and we remain not up to standard in two areas. The first is standard 13.5, which is related to the control of sponsored research and external funds. The issue with that is that it requires an external audit, and the external audit was not complete when they visited. We anticipate and plan that it will be complete before the August response report and that we will be up to standard. The more concerning standard is 6.2 A which is related to faculty credentialing and qualifications. We must make sure we have the correct record of the faculty credentials, and when they're not correct, have a process and procedures in place. We've got to make the case that we are compliant with credentialing. We must respond to those two concerns in August. We will get the official word January of 2022. overall, it was a great visit, but we still have work to do.

Title 9 Task force. This is a popular topic on campus nowadays, and I'm glad it is. We did form a task force, an interdisciplinary team of faculty, staff, and students to work on Title 9 processes, policies, communication, training, and historic activity across campuses. The group is led by Audrey Korsgaard and Kirsten Kennedy. I asked them look at this from 5 lines of effort: 1) prevention and training; 2) reporting; 3) investigations; 4) adjudication; and 5) advocacy. They are in the process of bringing an external consultant so that we can take an outside view of all of this. Our Board chair Dr. Smith has tasked Pam Dunleavy, in Compliance, to review each of the four cases that are in the news and to assess whether they were Conducted in accordance with existing policies and procedures, and then there may be some recommendations for changes coming out of that as well.

A student protest occurred on Friday, and I just published a letter in response. It doesn't address all the detail we would like. But we wanted to write a letter so that it addressed to the level of detail that we can, given the ongoing due process investigations that are still taking place. I want to be as expeditious as possible. I also offered the opportunity to talk to them in person, which they declined.

All of this leads to the issue of faculty and staff misconduct, bullying, civility, and accountability. Sexual harassment really emerges as a serious area of concern. I am aware that you all have organized and formed an ad hoc committee on Professional Conduct. I commend you for that. To address these issues and related policies. I understand that your work is going to be complete in the fall. Sooner is better in my opinion, because I think we have an issue that really needs to be addressed and addressed soon.

I've been looking at the policies on whether it's faculty on faculty, or faculty on staff, or staff on staff, or faculty and students. We have some gaps, and how do you handle that, and how do you address this is very confusing and even people that have responsibility for some of these processes are unsure what qualifies what doesn't qualify. Pam Dunleavy put out the employee standards of ethical conduct. It's a great book. It's a summary of policies, but it doesn't have the

teeth necessary to hold people accountable. I've heard from a lot of faculty, staff, and students, now is the time to take action to fix it.

I told you little bit about the Benedict College and Apple Partnership. This is really a good news story. So, we recently announced a collaborative effort with Benedict College and the Governor's Office, and Apple to provide technology infrastructure to support students and communities throughout South Carolina. The strategic plan calls for academic units by 2025 to develop a partnership with an HBCU. The J School has already done that with Claflin. I commend them for doing that, but I think this is an important effort on our part to be able to improve our diversity. We still have some work to do, as you know.

Excellence Initiative funds. I learned from Mark Cooper that the faculty have continued to ask questions about the excellence and issue funds. You may or not may not recall that the initiative was formed in 2017 when the former Provost and the Board of Trustees committed funding in support. Over three years \$5 million per year would be to be in place to support faculty projects and about \$12.5 million for future initiatives. The health campus was determined by the Board of Trustees to be the future initiative.

Last meeting, I was asked about fall furloughs and whether they should be reinstated. When the pandemic hit, we dropped academic unit budgets 5% and staff units 10% because we anticipated that revenue was going to drop accordingly. The revenue did not drop. And as a result, we now have \$55 million. Of that \$55 million, \$19 million will go to colleges; \$5 goes to mandatory increase in expenses; \$18 will go to reserves; and \$14 million will also go back to colleges [support units] in response to the blueprints that they presented to me. So, the total of \$19 and \$14 is \$23 million that will go back to the to colleges and other units. The 5% cut that was imposed on academic units will remain in place until 1st of July. The cost saving measures to pay for that 5%--hiring freezes, furloughs, no pay increases, and other cost measure--was the way to help academic units to pay for that 5%. When the redistribution of the \$23 million goes back to the units, frankly it's going to be up to the deans to use whatever is apportioned. They can use it to reimburse the furloughs.

I was asked if there would be a COVID bonus. We all are getting COVID bonuses through the Federal CARES Act. If deans want to use money for that purpose, they can do that as well, but it will not come from the University administration level.

I'm very grateful to work with you. Thank you again for the work and the time that you have put in over this past year. I'm excited about the Carolina Online that's going to continue to grow in momentum. We're going to make a major announcement later this week.

SENATOR CLINTON WALLACE: I wanted to ask about the governor's return to physical presence order. It applied to state agencies that were supposed to be under the authority of the governor, and that's quote from the order. Your administration's response called into question for many of us, some of the issues of institutional independence that were unfortunately part of the SACSCOC review and the previous finding of undue influence from the governor.

I'm on the faculty at the Law School so we have some people have taken a particularly finetooth comb to this. Our understanding, and our reading of the law, which I think is not controversial, is that the Board of Trustees is the governing body of the University. So, an order from the governor and particularly one that attempts to preempt our well-considered public health concerns and plan for increasing physical presence on campus. There are several on the faculty who are concerned about the accelerated return, and particularly its impact on staff who have been closed out of this process and this was sprung on them, and potentially vulnerable faculty. I was hoping you could speak to your interpretation of the governor's order and what you are doing or what you can do to maintain institutional independence, which is import for SACSCSC, but also is important for institutional integrity concerns more generally.

PRESIDENT CASLEN: I want to commend the 99% of our staff that were able to return and a lot of them went through some great measures to make that happen, and I applaud them. Those that are unable to mostly had to do with daycare facilities that were just unavailable for children under kindergarten, because if schools are open that relieved the other problem. We want to help them and do all we can to help them find adequate daycare to resolve the issue that is really preventing them from coming back. We're not going to force someone to come back. We went to the Commission on Higher Education, all the presidents did, asking them to help us extend the return timeline for those that are having challenges. They are helping.

Your interpretation of undue influence, really rests on the definition of public institution and where your finances come from. A significant portion of our revenue comes from taxpayers. The governor and the and the state Administrative Office were very clear that we would comply. We fall under their directive on this one. We can file lawsuit otherwise, but I do not have an intent to do that; because I this we found a way to work through this.

CHIAR COOPER, I do see your question in the chat, and I believe that that's related to an agenda item that we have on the agenda later and that the Provost may comment on it. I'm happy to call on you to ask your question of President Caslen.; I'll just suggest that you may wish to defer for the later discussion. What's your pleasure Senator Marcus? OK. Are there other questions of the president? Thank you very much, President Caslen. We appreciate you joining us. Provost Tate.

o Provost William Tate

PROVOST TATE: I'd like to begin first, with what's going on with respect to the University's response to ongoing concerns around sexual harassment and sexual assault. There was recent protest to that effect by students and members of our community who are deeply concerned and seeking us to make some changes to be a more effective University with respect to this. In the case, the students are concerned about faculty. My responsibilities involve making sure the learning environment of the University is not only effective in terms of teaching and learning, but also in terms of being safe places where students can engage and not be concerned about things at this sort. There is a clear firewall between the office of the Provost and how matters

associated with sexual assault and harassment are adjudicated. I'm not involved in any of the decisions that are made related to innocence or guilt. But I want to be clear about something. Where these matters are brought to my attention, and there is sufficient evidence given to me, I will act. And I'm saying this at the Faculty Senate because it's important that you understand as faculty members, why I would. I don't think we can have a community where students can be cognitively engaged if this is not dealt with an immediate fashion. And so, in the first case that came before me, I did within 12 hours, and I will continue to do so when I believe there is sufficient evidence. As the President articulated, due process and the rule of law is an extremely important part of not only University community, but the United States of America, and so as such, and we do not fire individuals who have been accused. We can't. It is against the law; we would be breaking the law. Everyone is required to have due process. But should we find that an individual has been accused and found to be falling short of the standards of our community in this regard, I just want to commit to you that I will do everything in my power to make sure those individuals are no longer part of the community. Now the only way that can happen is through faculty governance. Point of fact, tenure revocation and things of that sort come through you. So, I am just asking you to be a partner with me in this regard, during my tenure as provost, that we take the position that it this is just something that will not be tolerated at this institution. I promise you that I will be vigorous in that.

I also want to acknowledge a couple of things as well. I said this to the Steering Committee. The engagements I've had thus far, with individuals who have been in leadership roles in the faculty on this matter over the last few months, have been exemplary. I know when you read in social media, and I know what people think, but I've engaged with people and faculty members who have been quite vigorous in their pursuit of making sure that students were kept safe. I have great respect for that. I ask that we continue to vigorously pursue individuals who are not aligned with our standards.

SACS report, section 6.2, which is the credentialing aspect of what we do in SACS. On that standard we did not pass. That did not mean it that the University is not going to be accredited or anything of that sort. It just means they want us to have response. And largely it's not because our full-time faculty members aren't qualified. You are. What it means is really, that for adjuncts we need properly document their background, or if they come from alternate background, it is properly documented. We need a better process one in which you, as faculty members, are the key evaluators--over and above HR. HR is a great secondary evaluation strategy, but faculty must be the primary evaluators.

With respect to the budget, there are some differences in what we've done in the budget process. This is the first year that the RCM budget has been fully implemented. Prior to that, it was the old model and now we're in the full RCM model. I will only comment on the transparency aspect of it. There are faculty representatives, deans, staff, on the flow chart is quite elegant. What I would say is in my 30 plus years of engaging with budgeting processes in higher education, this one is one of the more transparent and more engaged processes. It's

quite clear how money is flowing. You can see the processes around how people voted for things and the allocation process are clear. Not everyone will be happy. This is will never change, because we have a bounded amount of money.

Carolina Online. I want to emphasize that Carolina Online as a process and as an enterprise is going to be driven by faculty governance. Faculty will determine what the curriculum will be, what the assessments will be and will have input on the admissions function. It extremely important to me that people don't think that's an enterprise that is set aside and not engaged in the faculty governance function.

CHAIR COOPER: Could you could just describe for folks briefly where we are in the budget cycle? I believe the president's remarks referred to recommendations for the next fiscal year budget. Partly accounting for the recurring portion from this year surplus, and they may have heard folks may have heard through their deans that the surplus from this fiscal year was flowing back to the colleges. So, if you could talk about where we are and the difference between this fiscal year's surplus and how that's expected to recur. It gets confusing.

PROVOST TATE: The deans received a letter explaining that the amount of tuition revenue over the budget, all of it, would going back to the colleges. So the deans have that one time amount this year. In the RCM model, the philosophy is for money to be returned tuition back to the schools. For next year, we're working through the balance of what's going to happen with the amount going back to schools, and the amount going to be centralized, and the amount put in reserve. Money over the what was budgeted this year will not necessarily return to colleges next year at the same scale. I think that's the difference. Mark wants me to make sure it's clear so that you don't think that everything that happened this year will be replicated exactly next year. It will be different. RCMS are not pure, they are modified to meet the needs of what whatever is happening in the institution. There are centralized requests as well as the things that happen at the school or college level, and so that will be the big difference in terms of next year. We're getting very close and must have a new budget by June.

SENATOR MIHALIK: Is it possible that since there is such a large surplus, that those who received a furlough in the fall might receive our salary back?

PROVOST TATE: If you heard my explanation about what happened with money that was generated over and above the budgeted amount, that money went back to the colleges. In HRSM and other schools with an interim dean cannot spend the excess money. I sent the memorandum out saying that interim deans can spend whatever was normally budgeted, but the excess money will not be spent. I suppose if you're dean wants to use the money to do that they could, but I'm not going to be a part of that decision. If they were to ask me, I would say, I think you should work with the faculty and figure out where you are going from strategic point of view.

CHAIR COOPER: Any additional questions?

PROVOST TATE: One more thing. I have no position on the academic freedom discourse and discussion beyond the following. My best experience in the academy was when two colleagues with completely opposing views and similar scientific backgrounds and went on a tour and had a discussion around embryonic stem cell initiatives in the state of Missouri and modeled for the rest of the state what it looked like when colleagues disagree from an ethical point of view but have a very similar scientific background. They showed how you can engage in that kind of disagreement in a principled fashion. Wherever we land, in terms of what we advocate for as a faculty, I would hope that everyone can agree that this is the kind of thing we need to be about. Is extremely important, and I don't want to be a part of the rest of the discussion because it's not for me to be a part of, but I did want to say that it is extremely important to me as an intellectual and the person charged with taking your case to our Board of Trustees, to the President, and others, that that's the kind of community we want to have.

CHAIR COOPER: Thank you.

5. Reports of Faculty Committees

o Senate Steering Committee, Professor Korsgaard, Chair-Elect

CHAIR-ELECT KORSGAARD- The steering committee made a couple of big decisions to constitute ad hoc committees on professional conduct and freedom of expression. The Professional Conduct Committee is one that I will be chairing; it does flow somewhat out of what's going on with the Title 9 Task Force that's currently operating but will be broader than that. It's going to look at everything from bullying to sexual harassment as sexual assault.

The Freedom of Expression Committee will looking at freedom of expression and how it fits in with what the faculty manual currently says around academic freedom. The charges and composition of both committees will be available on the Senate website.

We voted today also to create another ad hoc committee. This one is on sustainability, to fulfill the request of the resolution on fossil fuel disinvestment to examine how that resolution may impact the research/funding of educational enterprises.

In addition, Steering directed InDev to consider the question of whether we should discuss revisions to Carolina Core, and, if so, by what process. It's been 10 years since we last examined the core, it's something that should be examined regularly, and this is a faculty responsibility.

Finally, I want to make an appeal for Senate Secretary. We do have a vacancy right now, we are accepting nominations, including self-nominations. It is a position that has some influence and is crucial to the operation of the Faculty Senate. So please nominate yourselves or your friends.

SENATOR MARK MINETT: Is InDEV the committee that's going to be looking at revisions to the Carolina Core? Is that right?

CHAIR COOPER: They will consider the question of whether we should re-examine and if so, by what process. This falls into the one of the two historical areas of responsibility for the

Instructional Development Committee. We think of it as the online approval committee, but that was a task added onto this other task, and if you recall our faculty manual revisions that went through earlier this year, there's an intent by the Senate to refocus InDEV's task on such questions. So, this is this is really the right committee for that consideration.

o Committee on Admissions, Professor Brandon Bookstaver, Chair

CHAIR COOPER: Professor Bookstaver is not available to join us due to an unavoidable conflict, but he gave me a detailed report, which I will summarize for you. This concerns the two proposals that relate to the Carolina Core. The committee wants you to know that they approved these proposals after extensive discussion, and that they made recommendations to revise. Carolina Core leadership supported all those recommendations. The committee met once with Diana Mitchell and Trena Houpp for about an hour and a half to discuss the proposal and learn more about Carolina online. At that time, a lot of questions focused on the screening questions for infractions. That's the second of the two policies. Then there were two additional meetings with the committee, with extensive discussion and a vote following that approved both proposals. They really spent quite a lot of time on this issue in the last month.

The criteria for admissions were discussed in the context of a targeted audience of primarily adult learners who may have completed some college. The committee felt that it was appropriate not to mandate standardized testing. Many of the admissions candidates may be years removed from high school, and the standardized test scores could be expected to be less representative of qualifications. There was also extensive discussion of the non-degree seeking criteria, that discussion resulted in a change to specify the six hours mentioned in the proposal, as required to become eligible for degree seeking status, that those six hours need to be in the Carolina core or applicable to a major. So not just any six credit hours, that's a contribution of the committee.

There was discussion of possible effects of admissions in Carolina Online for other incoming students—for admissions statistics overall. There is no expectation that the one will affect the other, but the committee also noted the need to track the data to determine how, if at all, overall admissions may be affected in the future. Carolina Online will have its own section in the bulletin. Policies will fall in that area so as not to confuse the two populations of students.

With respect to the screening criteria for prior pre-admissions infractions, you will notice if you review that that for Carolina Online the screening will include academic infractions but exclude questions about behavioral or criminal infractions unless the degree program requires it. So, there was a question earlier about do degree program specific requirements still apply. I think there's your answer. Anyway, there was extensive discussion of this difference.

Ultimately, the decision to support was based on the following five factors: 1) the students will be in an online environment and not on campus; 2) existing criteria may negatively affect applications from applicants including underrepresented minority applicants; 3) experts in online education supported excluding those criminal and behavioral questions; 4) the questions

are and have been under consideration to drop from in-residence admissions as well, so there's an open conversation about whether those are appropriate questions for in-residence admissions; and 5) finally, experts in criminal justice and student services did not express any concern about dropping those questions.

If the on-campus involvement changes in the future for Carolina Online students, alignment with current in-residence admissions may need to be reconsidered at that time. So, this is a policy that will need to be reviewed periodically to see how it's all working.

SENATOR STANISLAV MARKUS: In my department there is a concern that the local schools or degree programs might lose control over admissions within the Carolina Online framework. Can we just be very clear in terms of how much control over admissions is retained by the schools and by the degree programs?

SENIOR ASSOCIATE PROVOST DIANA MITCHELL: Not every school is part of Carolina Online. That's certainly true of the Darla Moore School of Business. Schools are certainly involved in setting the admission. We are asking those that are participating to agree to the same kind of metric for entries. Certainly, I think that the Moore School is an outlier here, and that's a separate conversation.

DIRECTOR OF UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS MARY WAGNER: The proposal does change the minimum requirements to the lowest minimum standard of 2.25 for transfer admission. So, this policy would change the minimum transfer requirement, but it also assumes that the student participates exclusively in the online environment.

SENIOR ASSOCIATE PROVOST MITCHELL: Carolina Online requires that they only participate in the online environment, so it's not as though it's a choice. Otherwise, the consideration in going to that 2.25 is understanding that these are adults who have been out of school they have other life experiences that they're bringing to bear in the classroom, contributing in rich ways.

SENATOR MARKUS: School specific admissions is not really part of the model. It is more standardized admissions criteria that apply .

SENIOR ASSOCIATE PROVOST MITCHELL: Yes, that is generally true.

SENATOR SHEMSI ALHADDAD: I'm at the Lancaster campus, part of Palmetto College, and I'm just kind of confused about how this is different from Palmetto College. When you said that you look at the impact of Carolina Online on other colleges and departments, did that include Palmetto College? Will this affect us?

SENIOR ASSOCIATE PROVOST MITCHELL: Carolina Online has been in conversation with Susan Elkins, as well as the president. Carolina Online is really a four-year program. We are in conversations with the three comprehensive universities about joining Carolina Online and offering degree programs. Palmetto College's degree completion programs were created at a time when the four-year institutions did not have that front end of programs online. What is

different here is that COVID of course push a lot of Carolina Core online. It was approved by faculty, and so now we're able to offer the bachelor's degree. That in and of itself, of course, is different than Palmetto College, although certainly what this does do is expand the opportunities for students that graduate from Palmetto College. You want to transfer from any other comprehensive four-year schools because we now have many more offerings for online than we did before. The magnitude is quite different, particularly for Columbia. Palmetto College trains and continues to be a two-year brick and mortar experience for those students who do want it and those who want to continue or transfer to four-year institutions certainly are welcome to do so.

SENATOR MIHALIK: Arizona State University advertises on CNN reaching a global television audience. How can Carolina begin to compete at that level with that kind of investment Arizona State's already putting out there?

SENIOR ASSOCIATE PROVOST MITCHELL: Arizona State University has a lot of partnerships with corporations and certainly can cover those sorts of moves. At this point, Carolina Online is still at the beginning, but by 2025 online education is estimated to be a \$319 billion industry. Certainly I think there's room for a lot of people. It is incumbent upon us to do the marketing necessary to see those returns. Surprisingly, it doesn't take a lot of students to generate quite a bit of revenue from the online environment, especially since you can reach a lot further beyond just our local state or regional level or even nationally, you can reach internationally.

SENATOR REBECCA STERN: Criminal infractions include misdemeanors, felonies, or other crimes more serious than minor traffic violations. For example, speeding, driving without a license, etc. And I do not know if you mean that those crimes include speeding and driving without a license or not. So, in terms of things that are going to be considered about people's admission it would be good to get the language clear so that people don't take issue.

DIRECTOR WAGNER: We did an edit to punctuation and thought we'd just go ahead and fix that here. So really, the major changes that are being proposed here are the ones that are highlighted in yellow below the Carolina Online programs area. There are questions about criminal infractions asked on the application of all students. For in-residence programs, they will continue to be asked until the admissions committee or others decide to remove those. There's been some discussion of whether it's appropriate to continue to continue asking them.

CHAIR COOPER: I believe Professor Stern has a point that it could be clearer and crisper, and so maybe in the context of that policy review, at least look at the language as well.

SENATOR STERN: I have a question that is whether Carolina Online will be in competition with say, the College of Arts and Sciences.

PROVOST TATE: It is not in competition. We're working with the faculty and the Dean in Arts and Sciences, to make sure we have programming that augments and goes into a completely different market space than you traditionally would, and we're extending it out to people who

historically would not be here in residential status, and moreover, the revenue stream comes back to the college. We don't keep it. It goes to advance the research and teaching mission of the entity which is supporting it. You only win; you do not lose.

CHAIR COOPER: I'd like us to go ahead and move to discussion of the proposals and will take them one by one. First is a proposal to establish admissions requirements for Carolina Online. As a motion from a standing committee, this needs no second. Is there discussion of this proposal?

SENATOR MARK MACAUDA: I notice that an application essay is not listed, is it just under the general category of completed application, or is it not there?

DIRECTOR WAGNER: Are you asking whether an essay will be required for students applying to Carolina Online? We don't require an essay of all applicants; we do require it of freshman applicants, but for the purposes of Carolina Online, my understanding is that they're not planning on requiring an essay.

CHAIR COOPER: Further discussion? The motion carries by a healthy margin, almost unanimously. The next issue has to do with the policy on behavioral and criminal offenses. Discussion? That motion carries by a substantial margin.

o Committee on Curricula and Courses, Professor Marianne Bickle, Chair

COMMITTEE CHAIR BICKLE: The committee this year tried to provide faculty and proponents with information to make the process go more smoothly with fewer frustrations. We developed some information on what requires a letter of concurrence. There are really four bullet items. If your proposal checks any of these four items, you know that you need to get a letter of concurrence. It is also noted that if your course is a Carolina Core Course, we do not deal with that. The Carolina Core Courses are a separate entity. This document will be included on the C&C website so you can always check it over.

It is important to know that the Palmetto College is represented. They have two representatives right now on our committee, and we really try and have a diverse units represented on C&C. We really try to make sure every college has representation.

SENATOR MINETT: Carolina Core Courses, don't need letters of concurrence, is that so?

COMMITTEE CHAIR BICKLE: There is a Carolina Core Committee that handles that before it gets to C&C, so they're going to make sure everything is fine with that course.

SENATOR MINETT: That would include all AIU classes, correct? Because we did just have a bit of an issue with duplication. Will the Carolina Core Committee require letters of concurrence to reduce duplication?

COMMITTEE CHAIR BICKLE: I can't speak for them.

CHAIR COOPER: I can take that I can take that as an action item and find an opportunity to bring the Carolina Core Committee into this discussion. At what points can Senators chime in? You had some note to that effect in a prior draft. Maybe we lost it, so clarifying that seems like a great idea.

This is a report of standing committees and needs no second.

COMMITTEE CHAIR BICKLE: There are 28 proposals: 7 are from Arts and Sciences; 6 from Business; 2 from Education; 4 from Engineering and Computing; 1 from Information and Communications; 5 from Music; and 2 from Nursing, and 1 from Undergraduate Studies.

COOPER- The motion carries.

- o Committee on Instructional Development, Professor Ramy Harik, Chair

CHAIR COOPER: Professor Harik is unable to attend. There are several proposals here. I would read the top, but you're all scrolling through them. As a motion from a standing committee this needs no second. Is there discussion of any of these instructional development proposals? They were circulated in advance with the agenda.

And while you're voting on this, I will convey some thoughts from Professor Harik who wants me to let you that know all courses submitted to InDev will be considered before they break for the summer; the committee will not leave before it is all done. The Chair received a mandate from the committee due to these unprecedented times. Instructional Development is approaching 235 reviews this year so we can anticipate approving more courses for online delivery in the June meeting.

The motion carries.

- o Bookstore Committee, Amber Cook, Chair

COMMITTEE CHAIR COOK: As many of you know, the implementation of Barnes and Nobles AIP textbook adoption program has had a very rocky rollout, fraught with many difficulties. It is the result of two different technical teams, one from the University, one from Barnes and Noble, each working on a section, and lots of miscommunication, but I am assured that today everything is working as expected. Two things to note. They have delayed the deadline for adoption and turned off the notices that you may have been getting within that. And secondly, you may absolutely email textbook@mailbox.sc.edu with your course number, your section number, and the ISBN number of materials that you would like requested and that will count as fulfilling your textbook requirements with the bookstore. I am assured that the University will hold Barnes and Noble as they do all contractors responsible for their deliverables and the bookstore committee is working with the bookstore and with the University to make sure that the issues are ironed out. There is a support system feature with any AIP that you are encouraged to use if you have technical difficulties, as this issue is larger than just our campus

experience. That is, there is a phone number and there's an open chat function. Otherwise you are allowed encouraged to contact Tim Barnett at the bookstore with questions or concerns.

CHAIR COOPER: Is it worth mentioning what the expected improvements of the AIP might be?

COMMITTEE CHAIR COOK: It should be able to retain books that you've requested from previous semesters within that system, so that you can easily re-adopt anything that you had. It should also give you a turnaround time of 48 hours for books that you're adopted to show-up on the bookstore's website for students to be able to see. The functionality is not available yet, but that is coming in January 2022. You should be able to access the AIP through Blackboard.

o Faculty Advisory Committee, Professors Charley Adams and Liam Hein, Co-Chairs

Faculty Manual Proposals

COMMITTEE CO-CHAIR HEIN- We have a couple things to talk to you about today. We have two items requiring action by the Senate, and that's to conform the manual to the current organization of the Board of Trustees. One is to revise the language of the Athletics Advisory Committee. It's the Standard get rid of "shall" and use "will" and remove references to committees such as Intercollegiate Activities Committee, that don't exist.

CHAIR COOPER- I think we should take these manual changes that are related to Board changes together, unless someone wants to make a motion to divide, just for the sake of time. The rationale is the same in in both cases. We have Faculty Manual language that references committees of the board that no longer exist.

COMMITTEE CO-CHAIR HEIN: At the same time, we're getting rid of the Faculty Liaison Committee to the Board of Trustees, because again, it doesn't exist.

CHAIR COOPER: Right, the Academic Affairs Committee with which this committee met no longer exists, and those who did serve on this committee think it was not very effective at providing a faculty voice on the Board. This is a motion from a standing committee and needs no second. Is there is their discussion?

The motion carries. Almost unanimously.

COMMITTEE CO-CHAIR HEIN: Next is to add language about the System Faculty Leadership Council, and this is going to be inserted right after the Steering Committee. It's a way for faculty from different campuses to have a united voice on things. It does not usurp authority given to the different campus faculties right now. It's. primarily a communication tool.

COOPER: This is another Faculty Manual change. It's how we implement the draft bylaws which you've seen in the last Faculty Senate meeting and has been reviewed by several committees. So, this is just to provide our representation to the System Faculty Leadership Council. And then there's a related Senate Bylaw change, about how we would do that practically, but it wouldn't

be voted on today. It requires two readings, and this is the first reading. This is the Faculty Manual change only, is there discussion?

The motion carries.

COMMITTEE CO-CHAIR HEIN: How we would go about electing the folks to the System Faculty Leadership Council would be become Article 5 of the proposed bylaws.

CHAIR COOPER: Exactly, so if there are questions about this now, happy to take them, but it's perfectly fine to reserve our discussion for the June meeting when we would vote on these changes.

- Ad Hoc Committee on Social and Racial Justice, Professors David Crockett and Meir Muller, Co-Chairs

PROFESSOR CROCKETT: The Ad Hoc Committee on Social and Racial Justice has primarily been engaged in an advisory role with the Presidential Commission, there's not a lot to tell you that's not already public. They've been doing a great deal of work, and most of it is published on the University website already. I do want to remind folks that there is a town hall on April the 12th from 5:00 to 6:30 PM and that's in a Q&A only format.

Our committee has just been assembled, but we're certainly exploring opportunities to continue in this role, even as the Presidential Commission sunsets. You know there are other issues on campus and entities that we've spent some time liaising with even during this process, and we think it's important that we continue.

6. Report of Chair

I don't want to tempt fate, but I think we're going to finish this semester in style. There are many times this past year when that would have felt like a Pollyannaish statement, so I think well done colleagues.

I want to make a note about the provost's blueprint meetings. All of these except one college concluded last week. I want to let you know that in each of those meetings if your college does not have bylaws or if it does not have bylaws that are publicly accessible the dean was asked by me or another member of the Budget Committee about that about the plan to create bylaws in the unit. You will recall this as a recommendation of the Ad hoc Unit Level Governance Committee. I just want to let you know that we followed through on that and each of the deans had a plan or was willing to engage in planning. So, if your college does not have bylaws, I hope you will take advantage of whatever opportunities are afforded to create them.

I will also mention quickly that the Board of Trustees Governance Committee will have a round table discussion of shared governance at its meeting on Friday. They asked Faculty Senate chairs from all system campuses plus our chair elect and the AAUP chapter president here to participate. We were asked to provide written answers to two questions. First, what would you most like USC Trustees to know regarding the day-to-day work of shared governance at your

institution? And there are a lot of very thoughtful answers there which I would summarize as there's a lot of shared governance work going on, and it's very consequential and adds a lot of value. And the other question was, what is your vision for shared governance at the level of the University of South Carolina Board of Trustees? Again, here several thoughtful answers. If I had to characterize them, I would say there's a kind of consensus that we would like faculty representatives to be more involved in Board deliberations, and we'd also like the Board to be sure to respect faculty autonomy in teaching and research. We'll see how this conversation goes on Friday, and I expect to report back to you about that in June when the chair of the Board and the Vice Chair of the Board may be able to join our Senate meeting.

UTCP. University Committee on Tenure and Promotions ballot is coming. We need to get one or two more commitments for the slate. It will be sent electronically again this year through your units. Basically, it will be the same procedure that you used to vote for T&P cases in in your departments and then each department will forward its results to the Senate office.

On April 27th, which is Reading Day, the University Committee on Tenure and Promotions will offer two orientations, one for candidates at 9:00 AM and a second for committee chairs at 11. All pre-tenured faculty members are welcome to attend the orientation for candidates, which will also be helpful if you're in the process of preparing files, so look for additional details about those. If you're interested, mark the 27th on your calendar for that, and also for the General Faculty meeting, which will happen that afternoon at 3:00 PM in the Koger Center. It will be live streamed, but remember that the General Faculty makes no provision for electronic meetings, so you need to be in person to present motions or vote just like the fall General Faculty meeting. It will be in that very large room with great social distancing, and I think you'll feel comfortable in there.

7. New Business

- o Recommendation for the University of South Carolina to Fully Fund the Cost of Health Insurance Premiums for All Graduate Student Workers

SENATOR MATCHIN: I believe attached with the agenda for today's meeting is a resolution that speaks for itself. It's a recommendation for the University of South Carolina to fully fund the cost of health insurance premiums for all graduate students. So, the resolution reads as following. [Reads resolution circulated with agenda.]

Seconded by SENATOR CHARLES ADAMS.

SENATOR CAROLINE NAGEL: What calculations have been done about the overall cost to the University?

SENATOR MATCHIN: We've done some informal calculations just given the number of students and the costs that they are currently paying. So, if most pay for full year coverage a little over \$3000, it should be \$5 to \$10 million to cover that cost.

SENATOR MACAUDA: I realize this is mostly a position rather than, something that we're trying to make actionable currently. Are there unintended consequences to pushing for something like this to occur? I think it's a long time coming, and we start talking about money and allocations, especially when resources are limited are we concerned about there being, you know resource reduction in some other area to cover these costs? What happens if they are covered, and then they're not covered. Who's then responsible for taking over that cost, very often it's the grants. If you're talking about a research project, then you know it must be rated in as part of the budget. I'm not saying those problems need to be solved right now, I just was curious whether there we need to take a pause and consider them before we vote on something like this.

CHAIR COOPER: As somebody involved in budget discussions, it's clear to me that there are not \$5 or \$10 million just lying around. So, if you funded this, you would not be funding something else.

SENATOR JUSTIN BYARS: What are other universities expending? I know two or three were mentioned by the presenter, and I was just wondering if this is something that most public universities were doing. And if they are, what is the cost? Because like you said, \$5-10 million is not small, and is not laying around, so where do we stand with other universities?

SENATOR MATCHIN: We've been looking at peer and peer aspirant institutions. So, for example, other public universities in the Southeast, like University of Tennessee, University of Georgia, University of Virginia. Other public universities like the University of Maryland have been able to do this, we don't have full information, but my assumption is that the costs are relatively similar. So, some of the universities provide health insurance benefits that are more equivalent to what staff and faculty would have, but that would be even of course more expensive than their current student plans. So, we are exceptional among other public universities. We don't have a full set of like every single public University in the country.

CHAIR COOPER: They figured it out somehow.

SENATOR RUTVIK DESAI: Is there is a substantial number of students who are covered under their parents' health insurance plans or are most of them are responsible for their own healthcare? And if that is the case, would it be better to increase the stipend of the students instead of directly paying for health insurance in that way, increasing the stipend will benefit all students regardless of their situation.

SENATOR MATCHIN: These are all the important questions to ask, so obviously we don't have comprehensive data on the number of people that are on other plans. I do know that some graduate students must already go outside of the student health insurance plan because it doesn't cover a lot of the things that they need, so there's obviously some proportion of students that will not be covered by this, and so I don't know how that would affect the financial outlay, but my assumption is that would only make it easier to do that coverage because people could opt out of the plan if they needed to.

This seems to me like this is a very reasonable way for University to address issues of stress and retention. To make sure that those resources are available at minimum, regardless of what other sources of income or stipends students might be getting.

SENATOR DESAI: I do think that the stipend is too low and is not competitive.

SENATOR MACAUDA: If we vote yes what comes next. Is this something that we're just saying is our position, or are we actively engaging with our administration to make something like this happen?

CHAIR COOPER: The resolution says that we want them to do something; it does not specify process.

MATCHIN: That's right, I would be fully in favor of all those actions to be following this, but this resolution is limited to the official recommendation that this policy, but not specifying follow-up actions. I am really in favor of mobilizing in that respect to it accomplishing that.

SENATOR MIHALIK: Many of us have worked at other institutions and the University of South Carolina is one of the least funded in terms of assistantships for PhD programs I've ever been at.

Right now, if we raise the stipend, it is coming out of existing college or grant budgets. And what we really need is a step back and say OK if we're going to be in R1 institution, then we really need to increase our funding from the Graduate School. I was at Virginia Tech and 100% of the assistantship fees were paid out of the Virginia Tech Graduate School budget, not unit budgets. Although there were funds paid out a grant, of course. We need that commitment to an independent Graduate School that has the funding resources as compared to how we have been traditionally looking at it. I mean historically we've been a teaching University; now it's another one we really need to invest in graduate education.

SENATOR REBECCA JANZEN: I would like to speak in favor of this motion. I know for the graduate students in my department, most of our graduate students are over 25, and it is absolutely an issue of equity of access to further study. I'm really pleased to hear about wanting to make education accessible.

You know all the emails been getting since the pandemic started about self-care? if someone cannot take care of their basic medical needs, all of those other things become completely irrelevant, and so I think that adopting these basic recommendations would encompass all of the discussion that we're saying about our showing our graduate students that in addition to all of the mentoring and teaching that we do with them, that we want them to be in a place where they can really learn and basic health is key for that.

CHAIR COOPER: We've heard several positions in favor and some great questions asked? Is there anyone who wishes to speak against the motion to adopt this resolution?

Very good. It sounds to me. Then, like we're ready to do a poll.

The motion carries.

o University Commitment to Freedom of Expression

CHAIR COOPER: A resolution related to the Freedom of Expression was circulated with the agenda. Is there anyone who wishes to rise to introduce that motion?

SENATOR KATHRYN LINDEMAN: I am the other senator from the Philosophy Department, and I was not involved in drafting this. I'm not a signatory, but I will step up on behalf of my colleagues. This is a statement supporting freedom of speech. It is modeled off a similar document that has been adopted by many universities, including University of Chicago and Princeton. It's been adapted by the signatories that you can find to be specific to our institution.

CHAIR COOPER: Is there a second? There is a second in the chat. So, it's been moved and seconded.

SENATOR GEORGE KHUSHF: These principles that are being proposed really a single principle, reaffirming the significance of freedom of inquiry and debates for the mission of the University.

I wanted to briefly address what is and is not being confirmed by means of these principles and to illustrate this I use a bold example: the University of South Carolina's commitment as an affirmative action, equal opportunity institution. I think this is one of the more controversial types of examples because of the way the principles affirm that we might openly question in one setting, say in a classroom, what we must comply with in another setting.

The principles of academic freedom affirm the ability of those in a junior course on contemporary moral issues, for example, to discuss the pros and cons of affirmative action policies. I should say, I strongly support affirmative action, and I embrace the University's commitment to promote diversity. The proposed statement on academic freedom has no implications for whether we, as an institution would comply with affirmative action or any other policy that we have. Freedom to question such a policy in class, or for students to question it outside of class does not imply lack of support for such a policy or lack of compliance with it. To the contrary, I believe the best way to sustain such a policy is to foster open debate on the topic, especially in classes designed to foster such ethical inquiry. For its by means of that debate that we best clarify the reasons to support a given policy. Without such free inquiry, all drifts into ideology and we lose the capacity to justify the policies or the beliefs we affirm. We only gain and sustain that if we can fully explore all sides of issues. As Provost Tate pointed out wonderfully, the University should be a place where we model how opposing views can be openly and honestly addressed in a context of mutual respect and academic freedom is crucial for this modeling. I should also note that discussion and dissemination of these principles have been advanced prior to any formation of a University ad hoc committee to address these questions. Further, the principles integral to the University commitment to academic freedom are stated in the most general way, and I would hope that any ad hoc

committee addressing academic freedom would be informed by such principles. I must support the acceptance of the University Commitment to Academic freedom.

SENATOR DESAI: I'm asking these questions to those who are supporting his resolution. So, one question is whether there are any limits to this type of freedom that is being advocated and could this type of resolution be used for example to support, say, sexist or racist speech for example? And you could argue that is illegal. So, is anything that is not harassment and not illegal "good?"

We already have freedom of speech through the AAUP and the Faculty Manual. So how is this different? Or what would it add to that? And if there is an issue, whether it's the AAUP's language or we would follow this resolution's language?

SENATOR KHUSHF: First regarding limits, there are limits already recognized in law regarding speech. Certain things are ruled out, you know the classic examples: yelling fire in an auditorium or whatever regarding behaviors. Sexist, racist? And how that would be manifest. Here I would simply highlight what I said earlier regarding policy.

The freedom to explore, for example, what should count as racist speech and what policy we should have, exploring these in broad scope, that would be included in freedom of inquiry, but the liberty to explore these issues would not imply that we could equally question compliance with the policies University of South Carolina would have on how we are to interact with one another. The wording of the document is crafted in such a way that it seeks to provide broad scope for academic freedom while recognizing these limits that you speak about.

SENATOR EMILY MANN: Because David Fuente's mic isn't working, I want to introduce his comments on behalf of him. So, he is suggesting that it would be useful for us to refer this issue to committee. It is quite complicated, and it's very important. We've been on this meeting for 2 1/2 hours almost and so would really benefit from careful analysis and review because a lot of the interpretation of the principles that are being put forth.

CHAIR COOPER: Would you refer to the Ad Hoc Committee on Freedom of Expression or to some other committee? I would wait for David to clarify what he was suggesting. I think there are two options. Probably there's this committee we've specifically tasked with this area, which makes most sense to me, but you might also refer to the Faculty Advisory Committee, which is the committee that deals with policy matters generally, what seems right to you?

SENATOR MANN: The ad hoc committee I think is the way to go here. I am introducing a motion to refer to this committee.

SENATOR MACAUDA: I think that what Doctor Mann said was well spoken. I just think of the classic case of a faculty member who wants to bring someone who's known as a white supremacist to speak on campus. This has become one of the issues that brought these types of statements to the forefront, and I think because there's a dark side to this, and the road to hell is paved with good intentions, it is something that we need to look. How can we have this free

dialogue without allowing the darker past to come for us? I am in favor of this motion as presented by Doctor Mann.

SENATOR KHUSHF: I simply raise the concern in its reference to committee; it's a very broad and general statement affirming academic freedom and its significance for the University. A question I have is what do we want a committee to take as given? These kinds of commitments reaffirm the significance of academic freedom, and then there are always boundary questions which the committee could discuss. Why wouldn't we have a general statement supporting these principles? I am against the motion to table.

SENATOR STERN: I want to make clear that this version of the Chicago Principles is much broader than that embraced by many other universities. It cedes faculty governance to the Constitution. In fact, this version equates, academic freedom with First Amendment rights repeatedly in a way that does not appear at other institutions versions. I've done some research on this.

The group that has been championing this set of principles which has caused some consternation at Chicago itself in recent years. Recently, on Friday in fact, filed against the Psychology Department for a Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Initiative. So, I think there are, as my colleagues have suggested, some very complicated issues here. And I think this merits some careful attention to the language because it will become binding.

SENATOR NAGEL: I was just going to confirm some comments that are in the chat bar right now. Which is, that we have language around academic freedom within the Faculty Manual, and then there are of course commitments to freedom of expression in the Carolina Creed. So, I think that we want to be able to specify why this is needed. Are we're having free speech crisis on campus? I would certainly like to know. Why this is being specifically brought forward, and whether there's having a statement like this is somehow different how it's different from what we currently have, and what purpose is served by "affirming it"?

I'd also like to mention that one of the signatories on this resolution tried to block an event that I was planning a few years ago, that dealt with the Israeli occupation of the Palestinian West Bank. So, I'm just a little bit wondering what counts an academic freedom and freedom of expression is, when at least one person who is signed on to this has demonstrably indicated that certain types of speech are not to be tolerated. So, I think that there needs to be more discussion about this.

SENATOR KATE CHAPPELL: I am in support of the motion to refer to committee. I do think that committee could look at our current policies and determine whether there are indeed any gaps that need to be addressed, but that we are not bound to go off an origin document with potentially an organization who has a mission that may not align with our Carolina Creed.

CHAIR COOPER: Does anyone wish to speak against? Seeing none, Senator Thorne.

SENATOR THORNE: I'd like to support the motion to refer. I think this would benefit both from discussion, but also from some delay. So, it strikes me that this comes as an awkward time in the University has come under very public criticism for, from what I could understand, not dealing with cases of abuse at all now, I don't know what happened behind the scenes, but that's what's being alleged. Somehow it feels natural to resolve those issues first.

SENATOR MATCHIN: I don't really have some of issues that other people may have with it. I think it's an unconditional statement and I do see Senator Khushf's point in maybe using this as a starting point for discussion, but my concern is just that people come at this with different objectives and different ideas of what they view as infringements on freedom of speech, and I think there may be a lot of people that are in favor of this that will be satisfied that such resolution is passed and then won't be engaged in further discussion, but I think it would be useful to just hold off on passing it now to get everyone who's invested in this to actually sit down and sort those issues out, and maybe include some specific examples which I think would be actually useful in terms of guidelines, so I just think to keep everyone engaged it might be good to table it for now.

CHAIR COOPER: Very good. Any against? I'll set a poll.

The motion carries. I note several abstention's here, which may itself be an argument for some more thought needed on this topic. We will refer to committee and have it brought back before the Senate after some consideration and review. Thank you all for a lively debate.

8. Good of the Order

PROFESSOR ANDERSON: Thank you. As a non-Senator, I must be admitted to the room. I am Christian Andersen, president of the AAUP chapter. On Wednesday we will have the final meeting of the semester and of the year, in which we will elect new chapter leadership. We would invite everyone join us.

If you're interested in joining AAUP, you can do monthly payments, which is what I do.

9. Adjournment – Next Meeting: Wednesday, June 2, 2021 at 3 p.m.