Dec 8 Chestnut Food Services Meeting Minutes

Present: Eliza Davies-Greenwald, Mustafa Nalwala, Colin Porter, David Kim (Dave), Michael Lawler (Mike), Katherine Li, Doyun Kim

Start: 2:06PM
End: 3:02PM

Pre-discussion:

Colin: The Innovation Hub is being brought in to head the town hall for subject matter expertise

- Their proposal was shared via email

1) Discussion on meeting minutes amendments (carried forward from email conversation thread)
   a. Mike: Action Item: Pushing these amendments forward
   b. Mike: Action Item: Focus on provision of data which was not previously forthcoming
      i. Sub-point: meeting minutes turnaround restored to under 3 days, rather than 2.5 weeks
   c. Colin: No problem with the proposed amendments
   d. Dave: Suggestion for In/Out of camera moments for open discussion

2) Consultation report
   a. Mike: How does the Innovation Hub proposal fit in with that report? Request for early access to report (for himself and other members of the committee), considering the New College presentation happened recently.
   b. Colin: Report could be provided after it is presented
      i. New College needs to come up with a date for the report release first
      ii. Proposal: half of the January town hall could be the report presentation (assuming 1 hour of presentation)
   c. Mike: Reiteration of request for early access to report (for committee members); keep the town hall and the report presentation separate to keep the boundaries between them in scope.
   d. Dave: Proposal: Provide a sneak preview of the report to students at the January event; to solicit feedback from students, report on that in February as a potential date and provide an update on what emerged from the January consultation
      i. Separating the two makes the content more digestible without trying to cover too much information in one go
   e. Mustafa: Get the Innovation Hub on the roll (amendment to planned January town hall) and then get answers from food services + consultant presentation
   f. Doyun: Proposal: move overall timeline of both the town hall and report presentation earlier in January for sake of student engagement
g. Colin: New College leadership are sharing the report internally and have been advised that Food Services intend to circulate the report broadly with stakeholders and students in January- we await their suggestions on how to proceed in this regard.
   i. Don’t want to release/publish, circulate broadly, before New College returns with their suggestions
   ii. Don’t want to skew, perceptions, interpretation of the report prior to the town hall. Consultants should be afforded the opportunity to present their report in the same manner as was delivered to New College
h. Dave: Inquiry about sharing internally just for food committee?
   i. Colin: Need to check with consultant as they own the report.

i. Mike: Action Item: establish timeline for conversation with New College and checking their timeline + decisions on disseminating the report
j. Colin: Action Item: New College will get back to us on that

3) Meeting with Michael Classens (with Mike Lawler), Town Hall updates
   a. Mike: Classes was available on December 4th as a preferred date, miscommunication?
      i. Colin: had not circled back with Professor Classens at that point; next meeting was scheduled for the week commencing on Monday Dec 6th after communications leading up to Nov 29th.
      ii. Other dates: January 8th/9th (Sat/Sun), around lunchtime
   b. Colin: Innovation Hub proposal offers late January to allow for due process and time for the recruitment of students student recruiting process
   c. Mike: inquiry about status of leadership of town hall (student-led by the Chestnut body or not?)
   d. Colin: co-led, with the Food Services team showing good faith in bringing in Innovation Hub and Michael Classens
      i. Moving the date back: due to student move in being finished later. January 8 and 9 not suitable dates; majority of students may only be returning to campus on these dates following the winter closure- timing does not allow for due process
      ii. Will speak to Michael Classens about working with the Hub.
   e. Dave: Other bad dates: Saturdays the 15th (SPARK) and 22nd(in-service training), as well as Sundays the 16th and 23rd as this would take up an entire weekend for participants of SPARK and/or in-service training
      i. Colin: proposed weekend of January 29th/30th
   f. Mike: initial idea was for students to run the event; unclear when Innovation Hub’s involvement entered the process
      i. Inquiry regarding Michael Classens- will he be a moderator or attendee? Initial approach was for Classens to moderate (seconded by Katherine)
      ii. Colin: This will be revealed in time.
   g. Katherine: the executive decision to shift to Innovation Hub taking the lead was communicated in an unclear manner.
      i. Mike: This conversation shift reneges on previous discussions, plans, and agreements (e.g. Mike with Mustafa)
ii. After meeting: Colin noted that the Nov 22\textsuperscript{nd} meeting involved Innovation Hub discussion; the Dec 8\textsuperscript{th} meeting was the first opportunity to discuss Innovation Hub taking the lead on the community event.

h. Dave: Suggest moving forward with IH proposal to ensure consultations take place and pause committee meetings pending results and recommendations from the consultation process (as their process also identifies design/implementation of an ongoing student feedback program)

i. Mike: Willing to review the Innovation Hub proposal, cannot concretely commit to anything beyond, due to student voices being disregarded in the executive decision making process.

ii. Katherine: possibly willing to meet with Innovation Hub.

iii. Inquiry regarding conversation with Julia/Innovation Hub moving forward

1. Colin: Julia needs the proposal to be accepted first

iv. Action item: Colin will reach out for exploratory conversation with Julia next week

v. Inquiry for student engagement in a timely manner

vi. Inquiry for recommendations that may be enacted earlier in the process.