

<p>Academic Senate March 12, 2013</p> <p><b>Present:</b> Bice, Broadwater, Burroughs, Crayton, C. Davis, Deaner, Eudey, Espinoza, R. Floyd Garcia, Gerson, Gomula, Gonzales, Grobner, Guichard, Hartman, Hidalgo, Johnson, Lore, Jasek-Rysdahl, Leyva, Littlewood, Manrique, Martin, McGhee, Mulder, Nagel, O'Brien, Park, Peterson, Petratos, Petrosky, Poole, Regalado, Salameh, Scheiwiller, Silverman, Strahm, Strong, Vang, and Werling.</p> <p><b>Proxies:</b> Jennifer Helzer for Steve Arounsack. Elaine Peterson for Dave Colnic.</p> <p><b>Excused:</b> Steven Filling and Nhu-Y Stessman.</p> <p><b>Guests:</b> Lauren Byerly, Dennis Shimek, Kevin Nemeth, Oddmund Myhre, Annie Hor, Marge Jaasma, James Tuedio, Brian Duggan, and John Sarraille.</p> <p>Isabel Pierce Recording Secretary</p>	<p>Deferred the Second Reading of 16/AS/13/UEPC-Policy for Academic Field Trips to a future Senate meeting.</p> <p>First Reading of 18/AS/13/UEPC General Education Goals and Outcomes to a future Senate meeting. Returned to UEPC.</p> <p>Resolution on Increased Student Evaluation of Classes deferred to a future meeting.</p> <p>The Campus Workload Policy was discussed and referred to SEC</p> <hr/> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting: March 26, 2013 2:00-4:00pm, JSRFDC Reference Room</p>
---	--

**1. Call to order**  
2:05pm

**2. Approval of Agenda**  
Approved.

**3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of February 26, 2013.**  
Approved.

**4. Introductions**

Speaker Grobner welcomed the following guests: Lauren Byerly, Dennis Shimek, Kevin Nemeth, Oddmund Myhre, Annie Hor, Marge Jaasma, James Tuedio, John Sarraille and Brian Duggan.

**5. Announcements**

Jackson announced that the ASI Board of Directors has two openings. They're looking for a graduate student and a student from Stockton to serve. If you know of any students who are interested, please send them to ASI.

Provost Strong said that the women's long distance relay team did very well and came in second. They broke the current record by 12 seconds.

Regalado announced that History student, Alexandra Vicknair, won third place at a student research paper competition recently and will be going to Cal Poly for the statewide competition.

Speaker Grobner noted that a student, Reema Shakir, from the College of the Sciences won first place at the Emerging Research National Conference.

**6. Committee Reports/Questions**

None.

**7. Second Reading Item**

**a. 16/AS/13/UEPC- Policy for Academic Field Trips**

Johnson noted that UEPC has made some revisions to the policy that is coming forward after considering the comments from the Senate. They tried to make the definition of a field trip clearer, though it is difficult to address every situation. They added the word “accompanied” and also added a statement that if a faculty member is uncertain if an activity is a field trip they should contact Risk Management. UEPC also included a statement on the retention of documents. Documents should be retained for one year after the end of the semester but the field trip liability forms have to be stored for at least 3 years.

UEPC tried to make it easier to comply with the emergency response plan. The first step would be to call 911 and care for injured individuals. The response plan should name nearby hospitals. Faculty should remain with any injured student until help arrives. Once everything has stabilized then the faculty will call the college dean. The faculty should have to make 2 calls: 911 and one other person. VP Espinoza said the college dean would be an appropriate contact. It would be the Dean’s responsibility to contact Student Affairs and make sure that any family contacts can be made. The person on site can focus on the situation. There should also be a field trip participant who would be responsible for carrying out the plan if the faculty member is injured or in jail.

McGhee noted that b2 (location of hospitals) is a little vague. If the field trip requires traveling a long distance, would the faculty member have to identify every hospital between here and there, or just at the location? Johnson said that UEPC can change that language.

McGhee asked if any one checked to see what is the policy for riding along with the patient. He also questioned what would be expected if people go to different hospitals. Johnson noted that the policy can’t account for every situation.

McGhee asked what the procedure should be if someone is injured but not going to the hospital, or if a family member never shows up. He noted that students might be both on site and taken to a different location. He also asked if the deans would be reachable (by private phone number) nights and weekends.

Helzer inquired about a situation where cell phones don't work. Johnson suggested the language be changed to “contact the college dean as soon as possible.”

Helzer thought that maybe the focus should be on the destination. If the location is a half day or full day away, faculty might not know where all the hospitals are along the route.

Johnson will change that language to “at your final destination,” and noted that faculty should use their best judgment. Faculty should also use their best judgment about waiting for family members. Once faculty have been told someone is on the way, staying at the hospital may not be reasonable.

Provost Strong asked if the language “until a responsible family member arrives” is language from the executive order. No, per Johnson, it’s language that was recommended by the Stanislaus work group. It does not come from the executive order.

Nagel noted that under item E it is not clear if there is a difference between possible components of an emergency plan and elements that must be in the plan. Some of these seem to be directives.

Johnson said that these all are things that need to be in the response plan; some are directives and some are categories that must be addressed in the plan. Suggestions for other wording would be welcome. Johnson returned to the issue of remaining with an injured student, and asked if the Senate would want language such as "to the extent possible" or "as circumstances permit."

McGhee’s suggestion is that UEPC might want to add that given these directives, someone should make an emergency response plan. It should also include how take care of the students who aren’t injured.

Johnson replied that there should be a plan for the rest of the students if something happens during travel. They’re adults and should be able to take care of themselves, but there needs to be a plan.

Regalado noted that in section E.3 ( a faculty member has to remain until a responsible family member arrives), it is possible the family member isn’t responsible. He asked if the faculty member could be sued.

Johnson replied that a faculty member can be sued at any time for any reason. She doesn’t have an answer for this.

Clerk Davis noted that, per the Standing Rules of the Academic Senate, we can’t revise the policy, only the resolution, unless someone makes a motion to send it back to the committee. We can only change the resolution today as we are at a second reading.

Gerson said that in her CPR training, she was taught that she was only responsible for an injured person until emergency personnel arrived. Unless that student is being released from the hospital, once a faculty member has handed them over their responsibility is over.

Nagel moved to table this back to UEPC until the next Senate meeting to address the Emergency Response Plan. He suggests that components of item E. be distinguished from directives. Also the policy should state this section on the Emergency Response plan is an attempt to lay out reasonable expectations and is not an exhaustive list.

O'Brien seconded.

Leyva asked that the Senators please review this document and let UEPC know if there is anything else they should revise before it returns to Senate.

Results of the vote on tabling to the next meeting, 36 yes, 6 no. This item will be tabled to the next Senate meeting.

Provost Strong commented on the issue of suing as we talked about this before. Shimek discussed the issue of legal counsel. The purpose of policies is to protect faculty so that there are guidelines and procedures to follow. All employees are thus protected by having an appropriate policy in place to mitigate, not eliminate risk. Anybody can sue anybody, so the question is how far it goes in the legal process. It's important that we understand some of those points.

Concerns and comments can be sent to the UEPC.

**8. First Reading Item**  
**a. 18/AS/13/UEPC General Education Goals and Outcomes**

Johnson moved 18/AS/13/UEPC. She noted that senators should have a copy of the resolution, distributed at their seats. The GE subcommittee and the faculty coordinator of GE have worked for a long time on these goals and outcomes along with other groups. Both the chair of GE sub and the faculty coordinator of GE are here to answer questions. Executive order 1065 requires that the University align the GE goals and outcomes with the central goals. What you have before you are the result of lengthy conversations among the subcommittee and various other groups taking a look at our current goals and objectives and talking about what we actually want our students to know and be able to do.

Johnson noted that the proposal is comprised of three goals with a variety of outcomes. The structure of GE is going to change substantially. Currently, we have 7 goals and all of the classes are expected to address the first 5 and one of the last two. It would be better to have goals distributed among the courses. Courses would each be identified as having one goal as a focus, rather than expected to address all of the goals. There is also a mission statement that was approved in 2009-10 as part of the academic program review, seen on the attached document. UEPC wanted the Senate to see what was previously recommended in the interest of full disclosure. The GE subcommittee wanted to adopt a mission statement that aligned with goals and outcomes.

Eudey stated that she wished to encourage us to adopt some new GE goals and outcomes so we can comply with the executive order. She noted that this has been an inclusive process with many forums to provide input. We need to recognize that this was a multiyear process, not just three people in a room for an hour. It's important to implement the new GE goals before WASC returns. It's important to remember that even as we redefine our goals, we aren't changing our GE categories; we're going to certify them differently. She also noted that there have been many revisions based on input from the campus.

Jasek-Rysdahl asked if it's possible that we've gone from one extreme to the other, with only one goal that is essential. This may be too narrow, as he can't imagine a GE course only looking at one goal as essential.

Thomas replied that the GE subcommittee does not expect that any GE course would be so narrow that it would only address one outcome. They are looking forward to assessment, when only one goal would be identified as essential and thus faculty would only have to do paperwork on that one goal for approval of the course. In the recertification process faculty would address what other goals are met. GE classes should have an emphasis on integration and opening student's eyes up to the world. Faculty will have to write a description of how the course fulfills the mission statement. But when it comes to assessment, we want to narrow to one essential thing. If we say that one lower division class is essentially teaching this, then we know which classes are doing that. It doesn't mean that other outcomes aren't included in that course. We are not limiting what one class is doing, we're just identifying order of importance.

Peterson suggested the statement would be clearer if it said "at least one."

Thomas replied that GE sub wants to identify the difference between essential and important, and avoid a class identified with 9 essential goals. She suggested possibly saying one essential goal plus other important goals.

Jasek-Rysdahl agreed that it would address his concern.

Nagel referred to an extensive list of comments (regarding terms that seem to be evaluative but not operationalized) sent to him by a colleague. The full list had been forwarded to UEPC. He shared two examples with the Senate: The mission statement includes the concept of enhanced citizenship, and maturity, and there is a question as to the meaning of mature, and whether there is a hidden class system in these terms.

Nagel stated he worried that critical thinking and ethics are deemphasized and hidden or diluted in these GE goals. He also has concerns about goal #3, in relation to the LEAP goals. The current goals identify "social responsibility." The LEAP goals refer to more than an "ability" for self-reflection, but also "action." The draft GE goals imply that as long as someone is capable of self-reflection about ethics that suffices – not attempting to act ethically.

Speaker Grobner reminded the Senate that this is a first reading.

Johnson requested that any comments be forwarded to her so that UEPC can discuss them. She'd like to address as many of them as possible before bringing it back to the Senate. UEPC is meeting on Thursday.

**b. XX/AS/13/FAC Resolution on Increased Student Evaluation of Classes (will be shared prior to the meeting)**

Deferred to a future Senate meeting.

**c. XX/AS/13/FAC/SEC -- Amendments to the General Faculty Constitution (Revised Governance Committee Memberships/Charges will be shared prior to the meeting)**

Littlewood moved the amendments, seconded by McGhee. These changes are due to a reduction of the number of colleges from 6 to 4. The language in the current constitution needs to be changed to meet the current structure. Everyone made the appropriate revisions and these are the recommendations to be adopted.

McGhee noted that this is housekeeping that needs to be done so that the constitution conforms to what's actually in place.

Jackson and Salameh asked that, in the Assessment of Student Learning Subcommittee and the Technology and Learning Subcommittee, the ASI Vice President be the one who assigns members. Also in section 4.0 of the FBAC membership it should be the ASI Board of Directors, not the ASI Senate. Isabel Pierce to make these revisions.

Thompson asked about the new language on the charge of the subcommittees within the UEPC charge/membership section 2.3.

Johnson said that's clarifying current practice as the charge of the subcommittees is not in the constitution. UEPC approves the charge of the committee. It's usually brought to the Senate for consultation. UEPC thought the constitution should state that UEPC approves changes to the UEPC Subcommittee charges.

Petrosky moved to waive a first reading and move to a second reading since the proposed changes are of a non-controversial nature.

Thompson would like to speak against that. He's not sure how changes to subcommittees have been made in the past and would like to discuss that issue.

Jasek-Rysdahl asked if there is a reason why we need to get this done quickly.

Speaker Grobner noted that the changes need to be voted on by faculty before we can do elections for next year.

McGhee noted that we can't submit something to the general faculty for a vote if we haven't agreed on it ourselves.

Result of the vote on moving to second reading, 12 for and 30 against.

Littlewood asked if anyone had objection to the suggestions from ASI or committee structures.

No response from the floor.

Thompson noted that for a first reading we're giving advice to the committee. Either we can change it on the floor because the language in the first resolved says the below or we're giving advice to the committee but we haven't made any changes here.

Sarraille noted that's his understanding as well. The changes would be suggested at the first reading to return to the proposers as advice. Then they would make changes based on input. Even in a first reading the changes are not actually put in place.

The Clerk read from the constitution article VII section 3:

**Section 3.0** *For amendments proposed by the Faculty Affairs Committee, by petition, or by the President, the Academic Senate shall have the opportunity to make a recommendation. For its review and possible recommendation, the Senate shall have up to three consecutive meetings from the time the amendment is submitted to the Faculty Affairs Committee. Regardless of any Senate recommendation, amendments proposed by the Faculty Affairs Committee, by petition, or by the President shall be submitted to a vote of the General Faculty unless withdrawn by the proposer.*

Thompson asked about the time constraint, that this has to be approved before we can do elections. Does a two week delay mean that we won't have elections for next year?

Isabel Pierce said that Committee on Committees should be meeting in mid-March. The hope was that this would be approved so we can forward it to the president for approval. Then we would know what the composition of the committees would be, and we could start asking faculty to be on the spring ballot for the elections.

It would seem appropriate that Committee on Committees meet and construct a ballot under the assumption that this will go forward and not have to wait.

McGhee said that section 2.3 in the UEPC charge allows the UEPC to oversee any changes a subcommittee wants to do. The purpose of the additional line about changes to the charge is to control what subcommittees are doing. To him this seems like a reasonable procedure. He doesn't think a subcommittee should be able to make changes without approval of UEPC to have consistency and some sort of control over changes.

Thompson agrees with McGhee and that wasn't his concern. His concern was in the other direction, if a change could be made in a charge to a subcommittee that could change work for all faculty without approval by the Senate. Could one subcommittee gain control over something and all faculty have to submit information to that subcommittee. When something comes to the Senate, we could say that one subcommittee has oversight and all programs are represented here.

Sarraille noted that if UEPC is responsible to the rest of the Senate, which he presumes it is and the subcommittees are responsible to UEPC he would hope that the subcommittees are responsible to the Senate. He can't think of an example by which this could happen.

Jasek-Rysdahl thinks that in that situation they would have to change policy and any policy would have to make its way to UEPC and to the Senate. He doesn't think it's necessary that changes to the UEPC Subcommittees have to come through the Senate because policy already comes to the Senate.

Thompson mentioned some concern about a possible change to the Assessment of Student Learning charge.

Johnson said that the change we were talking about is not a change in policy. She and Thompson had a conversation about the item noted under today's discussion items, Assessment of Student Learning Charge. UEPC would like to get input on a change that would create as part of their charge the responsibility for providing some sort of review over the annual assessment reports. The requirement for those reports comes from the APR's and ASL is given a role for providing feedback. The question is whether that should be something that UEPC would decide on its own.

Thompson noted that this takes care of half of his fears. He just wanted to raise the issue.

Petrosky made a motion to move to a second reading, seconded by Jackson who asked for the editorial changes by ASI to be approved.

Results of the vote, yes 35, no 5, and 2 abstained.

No more comments from the floor. The amendments with the ASI editorial changes moved to a vote.

Results of the vote 36 yes, 3 no, 3 abstained. The amendments to the governance committee membership/charges passed and will be sent for a vote of the general faculty.

## **8. Discussion Items**

### **a. Campus Faculty Workload Policy**

This item was brought to the Senate by John Sarraille. Sarraille is here only partly as CFA chapter president. The rules and regulations that govern CSU provide for CFA to consult with the Senate, which is what he is doing today. There are a number of faculty members who are active in CFA and have a matter they want to bring before you. He underscored that this is not CFA trying to enter into a negotiation of terms and conditions of employment. We have that sole right but this is not about that principle. This is coming before you regarding a matter of University policy. The policy that we are addressing has to do with faculty workload. He wants to initiate a conversation with the Senate and the general faculty to make a modest change that they hope to bring as a first reading to the next Senate meeting.

The following is a draft of the proposed resolution that Sarraille hopes that SEC and the Senate will approve.

*Be it Resolved: That CSU Stanislaus adopt the attached Policy on Assignment of Workload to Full-Time Faculty; and be it further Resolved: that the policy be effective immediately after gaining approval by the Academic Senate and the President; and be it further*

*Resolved: that, upon approval by the President, the policy be incorporated as soon as reasonably possible into the Faculty Policies section of the Faculty Handbook (any and all printed and/or online versions), and that the policy be positioned there together in close proximity with all other faculty policies or Collective Bargaining Agreement excerpts contained in the Faculty Policies section of the Faculty Handbook that relate to full-time faculty workload.*

*Rationale: The Collective Bargaining Agreement (18 September 2012) governing terms and conditions of employment for faculty defines 24 WTUs as a maximum teaching load for full-time, tenure-line faculty, but does not define a minimum teaching load. Reasonable FTES targets and appropriate educational objectives can be met by programs, departments, and colleges through a variety of different WTU counts, section numbers, and class sizes. Departments and programs are in the best position to determine how such balances should be struck.*

*The proposed policy is as follows:*

*Faculty are generally very familiar with the workings of their academic departments and programs. Therefore faculty are usually the individuals best qualified to determine optimal strategies for assigning department and program workloads. The assignment of full-time faculty teaching loads shall be characterized by a principle of flexibility, in that programs, departments, and colleges shall be permitted to meet their reasonable full-time-equivalent-student (FTES) targets and appropriate educational objectives by determining weighted-teaching-unit (WTU) counts, numbers of sections, and class sizes, without imposition of minimum teaching loads, such as required minimum numbers of WTUs or similar units.*

Sarraille provided a little bit of background on this request. There was a forum about a month ago where Jake Myers asked President Sheley if there's something in the contract that says full time faculty have to teach a minimum number of WTUs. The reply from President Sheley was "no" and that at Sacramento State the average WTU is less than it is here. He said that this should be something that is discussed at the college level. Sarraille noted that he is paraphrasing information others had given him regarding Sheley's statements. This resolution is based on President Sheley's statements. We'd like to get President Sheley's signature on it to get policy and clarity on this principle. Sarraille would like to head comments and suggestions from senators to take to those who are drafting this resolution.

O'Brien thanked Sarraille for bringing this forward to Senate. He asked if senators should take it to their departments.

Sarraille would like senators to take this to departments. The authors of the resolution will be presenting it to SEC at the next meeting and it should come to you as a formal resolution at the next Senate meeting, Then Senate would vote on it and forward it to the president for signature.

O'Brien requested that the statement Sarraille read be sent to ASnet. Sarraille will do so.

Thompson asked what policy Sarraille is referring to.

Sarraille said that it may not be a change and it may be an initiation of policy on how we assign workload. There has been an effort to foster a manner of assigning workload on campus, and a methodology has been promulgated that everyone who is full time should teach 24 units. He doesn't know whether that was written down as an official policy but people have been made to feel it was a policy of the administration. What we're trying to do is get a statement that has the weight of a policy that clarifies what the rule should be.

McGhee asked for clarification that that the reason a policy on minimal work load is being proposed is because the contract has a maximum. This is the link to the current faculty contract: [http://www.calfac.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/cba\\_2012-2014.pdf](http://www.calfac.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/cba_2012-2014.pdf)

Sarraille said that we're trying to assert this policy because we're trying to get clarity on what the actual rule is. There is no minimum WTU load in the contract, but there is a rule that 24 WTU's is the maximum, in effect.

Eudey is very pleased this is coming forward and that it includes tenure-line faculty and [full time] lecturers. In 2010 we had a workload agreement that expired which had a lot of good ideas of categories that could be included in workload outside of direct instruction. There was a Workload Task Force that included members of CFA and administrators. It may help to look at that agreement.

Sarraille said that they have referenced that workload agreement. He will send a link to ASnet.

Thompson has an information request. He has been told directly by senior administrators that the policy says 24 WTU's. He'd like to see the policy the administration refers to. He'd like clarity on the issue if it does come to the Senate.

McGhee thinks the important part of the policy is that trying to follow a hard rule of a teaching load of 24 WTU's limits the flexibility on approaching workload in departments. There needs to be flexibility on how to assign resources to get the FTE results. It may not be an arbitrary WTU assignment to make the University more efficient and adaptable as needs change. He thinks that a policy like this would be nice if it works as it gives Deans and Department Chairs the ability to do their jobs better.

Regalado said that it might be well worth while to tap into President Sheley's experience from Sacramento State. He may have been party to adopting policies there and he could be helpful. It would be nice to see a President contribute to an important approach to the issue.

#### **b. Assessment of Student Learning Charge**

UEPC has been working with the ASL subcommittee to make two changes to their charge. The Program Assessment Coordinators are no longer identified but assessment is the responsibility of the chairs as follows:

2. ~~Consult with Program Assessment Coordinators, as requested,~~ **Review and make appropriate recommendations** regarding the mission and scope of assessment plans to promote and improve student learning and the implementation of those plans within the University's academic programs.

This is not really changing what they're doing other than removing consultation with PACs.

The last item they added as follows:

5. **Periodically review annual assessment program reports providing feedback and recommendations as deemed appropriate.**

When we went through the last WASC review (not the special visit) it was clear that there is an expectation that someone looks at the submitted annual assessment reports and take some sort of action. This was an issue when Johnson was an Assessment Coordinator; it was like submitting something to a black hole. We recognize that there should be a way of acknowledging the reports and providing feedback. Faculty in the Assessment Council felt that rather than have that role be designated to an administrator it should be a faculty function. UEPC is recommending that ASL periodically review the reports to provide collegial feedback. They will share good ideas with programs that are having difficulties and share with programs what they see as positives, etc.

Eudey said that as someone who attended meetings on this issue, she would find it very helpful for programs to get feedback from peers. It's also important for ASL members to see the assessment report. It helps that committee to understand assessment so that they can better meet their other responsibilities. Reviewing those reports provides feedback to programs in a non-threatening manner. It's a nice addition and doesn't require that extensive reporting go on, but there's a little bit more information being shared.

Nagel said that this is one of the things that comes up in his department. Discussion of assessment is how assessment is assessed. It would be interesting to have a study beginning with the idea that assessment does not improve student learning and then developing a research project to prove that null hypothesis is false. It isn't clear to him who can have the view of whether or not assessment activities have an impact. He raised the question of who assesses assessment.

Johnson believes that the programs themselves assess assessment. The point of assessment is to help the programs understand better how their students are learning and what attitudes are being attained. The programs themselves see if the information they're gathering is useful information and if not they need to consider better ways to help them improve programs. She thinks that all programs should be concerned with effective assessments and consider ways that would better attain information to help them improve the program. All of us should be concerned and to the best of our ability try to see if we are meeting our own expectations.

Provost Strong thinks that this is partly why the College of Business did so well with accreditation. It was because they were doing an excellent job of “closing the loop” in assessment. They addressed it, it made a difference, and they measured all of that.

Jasek-Rysdahl is uncomfortable with the language “make appropriate recommendations” if they want to develop policies that they would review. What do appropriate recommendations mean?

Johnson said that this was to avoid every program having to be assessed every year.

Sarraille said that one of the questions he has about assessment is whether faculty and students are assessing the administration. He also asked if that would be a good thing.

Thompson had a question related to Jasek-Rysdahl’s question. For GE recertification, is the GE subcommittee setting up that process on its own. Will ASL then set up its own process and information requests? What’s the procedure once they get a charge like this?

Johnson said, in reference to information requests, each program is already expected to provide annual assessment reports, for the last 5 years. All this is saying is that part of what ASL will do will be to look them over. It helps them to have a feel of what’s happening on campus and what programs are doing. The reference to feedback and recommendations isn't intended to be a formal process. The feedback goes back to the program. If they see positives they can say so. When a program comes up for APR, there may be some issues that arise at that point; ASL can make suggestions, based on what other programs are doing. It’s not intended to be a directive; it’s only going back to the program, and just a means of trying to offer helpful support. It says "as deemed appropriate" because the kind of help that would be useful will depend on the situation.

Jasek-Rysdahl noted that someone could read that very differently, and suggested using the phrase "consult with departments." The current language is directive and can be interpreted differently.

Thompson noted that what is currently described is an idealized version. He sees the process and use over time as much more fluid.

Johnson stated she understood his concern. She noted that we also need to have a mechanism in place under which those reports will be reviewed. She thinks it would be better for faculty rather than administration to do this. if ASL doesn’t take on the role, it will be delegated somewhere else. She stated she appreciates all comments and UEPC will consider the wording.

## **10. Open Forum**

Johnson thought that the ideas provided about the field trip policy were good. She asked for further suggested to be sent directly to her.

## **11. Adjournment** 4:00pm