**For**

**Academic Senate**

**December 5, 2017**

**Present:** Alvim, Ashmun, Bernard, Bettencourt, Carroll, Chvasta, Crayton, C. Davis, DeCure, Dorsey, Espinoza, Filling, Foreman, Gerson, Gibson, Frost, Hall, Hight, Hudspeth, Jaycox, Johannsdottir, McNally, Mokhtari, Mayer, Morgan, Nagel, Petratos, Petrosky, Randol, Renning, Sarraille, Stephenson, Strahm, Strangfeld, Thompson, Weikart, Wellman, Williams, and Zong.

**Excused**: Geer, Davies Demers, Drake, Erickson, Garcia, and Montero-Hernandez.

**Proxies:** Kimy Liu for Karen Webster.

**Guests:** Ellen Junn, Amanda Theis, Gitanjali Kaul, Carolyn Martin, Betsy Eudey, Darrell Haydon, Jake Myers, Julie Fox, Sarah Schrader, David Evans, Helene Caudill, Nina Palomino, Michelle Lahti, Lauren Byerly, Jovonte Willis, Stuart Wooley and Tomas Arias-Gomez.

Isabel Pierce, Recording Secretary

Second Reading Items: 19/AS/17/FBAC Budget Priorities Resolution, Passed.

20/AS/17/SEC Revisions to Procedures for 37/AS/13/UEPC -Policy for Student Internships, Passed.

21/AS/17/SEC Revisions to procedures for 36/AS/13/UEPC – Policy for Service Learning Student Placements, Passed.

First Reading Items: 22/AS/17/GC Resolution Post Master’s Advanced Practice RN (APRN) Certificate Program, moved to a 2nd Reading and Passed.

23/AS/17/FAC/UEPC –Amendment to 11/AS/89/EPC – Policy Regarding Final Grade Reports. Will return after review by FAC.

**Next Academic Senate Meeting:**

**January 30, 2018**

**2:00-4:00pm, JSRFDC Reference Room 118**

Minutes submitted by:

Gerard Wellman, Clerk

**1. Call to order**

2:00pm

**2. Approval of Agenda**

Approved.

**3. Approval of Agenda Approval of Academic Senate Minutes November 14, 2017 (distributed electronically)**

Approved.

**4. Introductions**

Ellen Junn, Amanda Theis, Gitanjali Kaul, Carolyn Martin, Betsy Eudey, Darrell Haydon, Jake Myers, Julie Fox, Sarah Schrader, David Evans, Helene Caudill, Nina Palomino, Michelle Lahti, Lauren Byerly, Jovonte Willis, Stuart Wooley and Tomas Arias-Gomez.

**5. Announcements**

Stephenson noted the current show is open at the University Art Gallery, John McNamara reception at 5:30pm on Thursday, December 7th.

Morgan – The holiday craft fair is tomorrow, from 10-2pm in the South Dining. Library book sale with proceeds to the food pantry.

Frost – Alisson McNally is the faculty liaison to Service Learning. For questions about incorporating service learning into coursework or internships, please e-mail or call her or the office of Service Learning at 667-3311.

Julie Fox – We still need coloring books or crayons or unwrapped toys for ages 4-12. We’re on the cusp of making our goal.

Strahm –There has been an increase in the number of white supremacy stickers on the north half of Turlock. They’re getting more creative ideas and using stop signs to communicate messages. If we’re damaging street signs by peeling off the stickers, we can get in trouble. My request is that a group is working with the chief of police who wants to remove the stickers, but if you see something that looks like a white supremacy message, take your phone and snap a pic and send it to me so that I can forward that to the folks at the city. They can also track the locations things are being posted and look for trends.

**6. Committee Reports/Questions (FAC, FBAC, GC, SWAS, UEPC, other)**

**FAC**: Foreman - FAC met last Wednesday and are considering the range elevation policy for all FT faculty and looking to make it permanent. We’re hoping to get it finished in early spring.

**FBAC:** Weikart – We will be discussing the budget priorities resolution later today

**GC**: Dorsey – The revised resolution for coauthored dissertations and culminating MA assignments has been deferred. Approved changes to the appointment of program directors. Discussed graduate education action plan and approved it. Discussed grad education assessment plan and discussions will continue.

**ASCSU**: Filling – The executive committee is meeting with Tim White on governance issues to help him understand that policies that start in the CO can’t end there. There was a hearing on student success hosted by a state senator. You might find it quite instructive to hear that our legislators talk about our students.

Thompson – Is there an update on intellectual property?

Filling – Within our extension of the contract agreed that we’d form a workgroup to address these issues. That workgroup will meet for the first time in January. Everyone here should have seen a draft of the policy that came out last year. We can agree that CFA won’t accept that.

**UEPC**: Thompson – The UEPC has not met since the last Senate. We will meet this Thursday

**7. Information Items**

* 1. Use of University Aquatic Facilities Policy

Morgan – Will the limited hours remain, and will it stay separate from the Rec Center fees?

Davis – I’m not sure about the Rec Center. They’re looking at the hour and seeing when the pool is being used. The pool fees pay for the lifeguard, which doesn’t need to be there if no one’s there. They’re thinking of creating seasonal hours. Please forward additional questions to Isabel.

* 1. Protection of Minors Policy

Deferred.

* 1. Drug-Free Campus and Workplace

Deferred.

**8. Second Reading Items**

a. 19/AS/17/FBAC Budget Priorities Resolution

Weikart – FBAC took comments last time and removed the fifth bullet. We couldn’t see how to make it better, so we removed it. Other changes were minor.

Sarraille – Is the copy that was mailed out the same as what was attempted to be included in the packet?

Bettencourt – Moved to amend to include language on the third bullet, to include “(currently the percentage of tenured/TT faculty counselors is at 15% for our campus)”. Davis – is there an objection to that amendment? No objections, taken as approved.

Morgan – I appreciate the concern over the awkwardness of lecturer status, that’s the only addressing of lecturers as a component of the budget. Everything now is focused solely on TT with no priorities for lecturers mentioned at all.

Weikart – This didn’t give priority to hiring lecturers, it just stated how they should be hired when they are hired.

Morgan – This is explicitly focused on other types of faculty, and we’re completely removed.

Weikart – Is the concern to hire more lecturers? Morgan – increasing the density of TT faculty would rely upon the loss of support for PT and FT lecturers. I hope there’s a counter-balance to that. I do not have a proposed amendment.

Sarraille – ACR 73 says that the ratio of TT faculty should be increased but that should not result in any lecturers losing their jobs. It also emphasizes that maximizing the effect of converting the lecturers to probationary appointments. ACR 73 addresses lecturer issues.

Results of the Vote: 32:3:1. Resolution passed.

b. 20/AS/17/SEC Revisions to Procedures for 37/AS/13/UEPC -Policy for Student Internships

Davis – Academic Senate was added to the Resolve. This takes the procedures from the policy and places them in a separate document so we don’t have to see it every time the state makes procedural changes.

Results of the Vote: 35:1. Resolution passed.

c. 21/AS/17/SEC Revisions to procedures for 36/AS/13/UEPC – Policy for Service Learning Student Placements

Davis – The words Academic Senate was added to the Resolve.

Results of the Vote: 36:1. Resolution passed.

**9. First Reading Items**

a. 22/AS/17/GC Resolution Post Master’s Advanced Practice RN (APRN) Certificate Program

Dorsey – moved, Weikart seconded.

Dorsey – This is the resolution to allow students who have graduated with a masters to return and receive their FNP certificate to allow them to become PCP and faculty. There is a need for both of those. I move to a second reading. Seconded by Strahm.

Nagel – Normally we’d reserve that for things that are matters of time or that are uncontroversial. Is there a timeliness issue? Is there any reason no one should go to their depts. as a first reading?

Strahm – The lack of communication appears that this is not an issue of controversy. There is something that they need to be certified, because they’re considered something that doesn’t automatically give students opportunities for financial aid. I would love to see that move faster.

Martin – It needs to go to the education department to receive financial approval. It is having to receive approval from the California Department of Education. That can’t happen until this is approved. Schrader – the Department of Education can take up to 6 months. They’re looking to implement in spring 19. It can take longer than 6 months sometimes. It’s good to have a cushion. Carroll – The next senate will be in late January? Chvasta – we discussed this in our department since we have elective courses. We support this and think it’s a strong program.

Vote to move to a second reading: 26:10:1. Moved to a second reading.

Results of the Vote on the resolution: 32:3:1. Resolution passed.

b. 23/AS/17/FAC/UEPC Amendments to 11/AS/89/EPC – Policy Regarding Final Grade Reports

Foreman – Moved, Filling seconded.

Foreman – This is a slight change from when it was a discussion item. We’ve been more precise in the moment at which grades are due. This does not change procedures, it institutes them. The current policy is inappropriate for the catalog because it doesn’t inform students when they will receive their grades. This does not alter practice.

Morgan – The last academic workday is 3 days after the last final?

Foreman – yes. There can be more, but no less than three.

Strahm – The three days does not include graduation? Davis – yes. The way the calendar works now, it’s not encoded the same way as those three academic workdays.

Thompson – Would it make a difference if it started with “Instructors”? I don’t know if that would change the meaning, but it would read better. Chvasta – would this apply for winter and summer? Foreman – we discussed this, but we felt that since pay is contingent on submitting grades, it would not be necessary to mention this. It’s been brought to our attention that there has been at least one issue on this. But there’s also a question about whether this should cover UEE functions and we’re outside the normal scope.

Myers – A faculty member has not submitted grades in summer. I think we need policy language that gives us a clear deadline for winter and summer terms. That’s my recommendation.

Chvasta – Is there a reason not to include UEE courses in this resolution? Foreman – there are no academic workdays associated with Summer and Winter as such. Chvasta – we couldn’t have language for those extra terms? Foreman – the contract that governs that work is not our CBA, so there’s a question of purview.

Myers – I agree that academic workdays would not be appropriate language, but you could craft language on this. I offered a suggestion to use “business days” that could craft a deadline for UEE. I’m not familiar with any reason with why we couldn’t craft a policy for UEE deadlines.

Caudill – We have language in our contracts with each faculty member that ties pay to submitting grades. It would be wonderful if we had universal language for deadlines.

Morgan – I’m intrigued why we’re beholden to three days, for a cushion. I agree with Jake’s point about business days to get around vagueness with things occurring on non-academic workdays. Students taking courses in winter sometimes run into trouble when grades aren’t submitted for prerequisites.

Foreman – Every semester we receive a message about how to submit grades. It reflects catalog language and policy language. The catalog says 72 hours after the final is submitted. There’s also language in the same message that they’re due 3 days after the last final. So this is in keeping with the existing policy.

Sarraille – I’m not aware of any reason why we can’t make a policy that covers UEE. UEE has provisions in the contract that lay out salary ranges. It’s covered by the CBA. It’s something we should research. As far as I know, we’re free to create a policy on UEE grades.

Thompson – I’m concerned about policy creep and go back to whether this conversation started with problems of enforcement. I recall it as addressing different language between policy and catalog.

Davis – It started with someone not turning grades in, and then FAC found we have three different messages on this.

Thompson – Is it one or two people and we’re expanding policy on that?

Myers – It was one person. Davis – It’s a policy from 1989, and FAC found we need to fix and it’s confusing. Clarifying it seems appropriate.

Strangfeld – Agreeing with Thompson. I think a policy can’t compel you to do anything. It puts out what the sanctions are for not doing it. We should have this distinction. If I don’t turn in my grades, then we need a policy for what does that mean. If I’m okay with that sanction, then you still can’t compel behavior. We need a policy for the regular academic year that says this is a responsibility of faculty, but UEE is different because the sanction is written in the contract. If I decide that I don’t care, this policy sanctions are not going to change the fact that I didn’t turn in my grades. It’s redundant and unnecessary. A policy is just a policy.

Panos – Submit grades to ES includes physically submitting grades and online? Yes.

Junn – At other institutions, there are instances where faculty don’t comply with the final grade reporting. Writing it into policy doesn’t compel behavior. It is difficult to have policies written in stone because every case is different. The range of consequences should be determined by the consequences of what happened. Most faculty are very conscientious, and some circumstances are explainable and some are not.

Carroll – I think the conversation will move quickly if we separate consequences from the policy itself. The sticking point seems to be the relationship between UEE and stateside courses. I wonder if a clue is whether students who enroll in fall and spring UEE courses are covered by this policy?

Sarraille – I agree with Carroll, and the question of the penalty is getting us into the weeds for various reasons. Discipline comes under the CBA and it’s very specific about how and forms of discipline. When I suggested a policy on when to turn UEE grades in would be primarily informational. If it’s in the catalog, then students can read the catalog. It’s public information that way, and we don’t have to rely on something in someone’s CBA. It’s useful info to have. It’s worth thinking about having it out there for info purposes. I don’t think this it’s a good idea to list the range of punishments in the catalog.

Davis – Our current policy says nothing about consequences and the revision says nothing about consequences.

Jaycox – I worry that students will not read the catalog. We’re not going to know what an academic workday and you don’t find that unless you go to the HR calendar, but students don’t normally do that. We see “the last day of the term.” Could we switch it to that?

Davis – We considered that, and we discussed adding a date that grades from instructors are due. This policy creates that date.

Foreman – If we need a policy for courses covered by UEE, could the contract be changed to include that language? And if it’s necessary to have policy ratified by governance, should that be a separate policy? That would make this policy subordinate to the academic calendar.

Davis – I vaguely remember there being a UEE policy that covers those things. FAC should investigate that.

Junn – With respect to that, courses in UEE are not required to adhere to the 16-week academic calendar. It gives us flexibility to work with returning students. They’re not necessarily on semesters. It makes sense to have a separate policy if we decide to pursue this.

Carroll – I understand that a lot of students don’t read the catalog, I’m not sure we should accept this as a basis for creating our policies.

Davis – The underlying question is how do we make sure students know the actual rule, rather than just having it in the catalog. They might look at the catalog, but people who don’t use that calendar don’t understand it.

Foreman – I suggest we place a link to the academic calendar in that place in the academic catalog.

Junn – I told Julie Johnson, Suzanne Espinoza, and Gitanjali Kaul, we should put the links into the catalog. Whatever you decide, we can make sure the information gets out appropriately.

Davis – This will return as a second reading. Please make sure you share it with your departments. Send suggestions or comments to Bill Foreman, and they meet the first week in February. It’s possible this won’t be back as a second reading at our next Senate meeting.

**10. Discussion Items**

a. Draft Batch Recertification Process & Forms

Thompson – We have approved GE Goals and outcomes. Recently we approved the alignment for recertification of GE courses. This presents a process because we’re going to be recertifying all of our GE courses. This is trying to do a batch recertification. This is not what UEPC is necessarily putting forward as a recommendation, we just thought we had it in good enough shape for early response from the Senate. We appreciate feedback from departments on figuring out a reasonable timeline. That might vary for different programs. The first page, #3, the dean reviews packages, we had a question about the actual role of the dean, and we’ll be discussing that. On #4, we had a question about why the clarification process is set up the way it is. On #5, it’s says GE Sub forwards approved packets. So that’s where the line of approval ends with GE Sub. On the third page, area A, I’ve gotten a suggestion that down where it says “assignment activity that will be used to assess core outcome” that a representative assignment be added to that. The fourth page is an example of what a program would get for A1, then the second attachment on p. 5 is a list of our GE learning goals. We’ll be talking about this on Thursday.

Nagel – Is this coming back as part of a resolution? Thompson – Yes.

Carroll – Do you have any idea when we can expect this to come to us for approval? Thompson – it’s not necessarily in final form, but we felt it was close. We’ll talk about it on Thursday and perhaps after that we’ll be ready to move. Carroll – I don’t think our department has a meeting before then. if you had different instructors submitting those. We’ll be discussing this further on Thursday, and we welcome feedback.

b. Draft GE Program Assessment Plan

Thompson - Once our courses are recertified under the process we adopt, for the GE program assessment, we’ll assess the core outcomes, and that’s what this document is about. I’d like to point out on p. 3, people need to notice in the numbered list that the idea is that it should be minimally intrusive for instructors, who need maximum freedom for decision-making. It should not be part of RPT review. Also, it should be in working concert with our working principles of assessment. In the para on the bottom, only anchor outcomes will be used for GE assessment, which you can see on p. 4. On p. 5, scrutinize the outcomes assessment process. This is saying there will be a sampling of GE courses by area. Faculty will submit assignments and artifacts that will be used in a norm-scoring session to do an assessment and report out. The question has come up on 2A, why not send it to department chair. There are good reasons to do that, but people didn’t want it to seem like this was a process imposed by the Chair. Whenever it’s the year for that outcome, then it would be done both in Fall and Spring. Wooley – the assessment will be done in summer, the artifacts will be collected in fall and spring. Thompson – on p. 5, on 30 artifacts, note that those 30 artifacts would likely be distributed among 6 different assignments if you had different instructors submitting those. We’ll be discussing this further on Thursday, and we welcome feedback.

Filling – I appreciate the intent on footnote 11 on p. 5, but I’m curious how you will anonymize the GE courses that are single-section. Thompson – I’m sure the committee can resolve that on Thursday. Wooley – this would be by area, not by course. That will help that particular issue. That will just be in the shuffle for that area, not by course. Davis – because we haven’t done this, we don’t know what all the issues will be, and we won’t know until we do it. This will be a continuing, and as we figure out where the bugs are and fix them, we’ll get better at it. If your department teaches GE and you don’t meet again until next semester, circulate this in some form and get feedback from them instead of waiting for the next meeting so UEPC can get feedback and move forward on this.

c. Support of Hiring Tenure-Track Psychological Counseling Faculty

Davis - The conversion of incumbent temporary counseling faculty into TT positions. Currently, there is one TT counseling faculty member on our campus. This creates issues for things like peer review, involvement in shared governance, the temp counts faculty can’t always do their work effectively. This is in support of the counseling center who want to see more TT count faculty hired for the work of their center. Are there issues or concerns we should consider?

Bettencourt – I appreciate this effort. It’s much needed. Additional factors are that we should aim for permanence. In the state labor contract, the university needs to provide counselors the opportunity to become permanent employees. We previously had 4 counselors who were tenured. We currently have 5 counselors in temporary positions. This will help us invest in the long-term health of our center.

Carroll – Wants to remind the body, a while back the senate passed a SOTS to pass a resolution to encourage the hiring of more TT counseling faculty. I find it regrettable that we’re still having to address this. Perhaps this new administrative will be more responsive.

Morgan – The current PT would be switched into TT lines? Is there a protocol for how that works, and is it part of ACR 73? Or would it require a different approach for those part-timers to qualify for a TT position? Nagel – as currently drafted it is silent on specific mechanisms for this. That’s something we should be considering moving forward, not just for counseling faculty. Bettencourt – two of the counselors have requested in writing to be moved into TT positions. Nagel – that was one of the impetuses for bringing this back to the Senate. If it is the will of the faculty to support them, we should lend our voice in support.

Chvasta – To whom do you make the request for this type of hiring? Bettencourt – VP Espinoza. Nagel – as a POI, officially the president is the one with the authority to hire.

Panos – A lot of departments are currently at the maximum of lecturers possible.

Morgan – Is there an estimate on how many TT lines you will request? Davis – I’d say go back to the historical. But even if we got 1 to start with. Bettencourt – 60% TT density would be huge. Davis – SEC will consider whether we want to add those specific numbers. Morgan – going back to the budget priorities resolution and saying that 15% are currently TT. Talking percentages obscures it’s actually only one TT position there currently.

Strahm – I’d like to add that the continuity of care for our students is incredibly important. Anecdotally I have seen the results of a lack of continuity of care. We had a counselor who specialized in eating disorders and she was very effective. When she left, some of the students actually had great difficulty connecting with the people who replaced her or who they got moved into. One student lost it so badly that her physical and mental health degraded so badly she’s still not allowed on this campus. We can see what happens we don’t have a stable, competitively paid, TT counseling faculty, and what that does to our students as well.

Davis – This will return next semester. Please send additional comments and questions to Isabel.

**11. Open Forum**

Junn- The Chamber of Commerce issues awards annually. I have nominated the CFA for the humanitarian award. This is an award that usually receives many nominations. I was thinking about how much our faculty care for our students. I was thinking that CFA represents that with their various donations to all the worthy causes. The coach from the Sonoma basketball team was very moved. I also got a personal message from the Sonoma State president because no other campus has done what we’ve done for them.

Lahti – Julie Fox won a similar award 4 or 5 years ago. We occasionally in Advancement receive opportunities to nominate individuals for certain things. When we saw the humanitarian award, we talked about what the CFA has done. The criteria calls for going above and beyond. The care that the faculty have shown is above and beyond, and we were honored to nominate CFA.

Junn – I also want to the region to understand the incredible job our faculty are doing and how important this campus is to the city and the region.

Filling – Thank you for this nomination. It was a surprise. Junn – it was the first time I heard you speechless. Filling – I’m proud to be part of an organization like this.

Junn – Please stop by at 4:30 at the reception. We’d like to have everyone, even if you didn’t RSVP. We’d love to have everyone attend.

Thompson – I apologize – this is something UEPC and Technology & Learning Subcommittee have on their agenda regarding Learning Management Systems (LMS) for the university. I’ve spoken with the Provost and Stan Trevena, and he suggested I bring this to the senate. In the next couple of years, the contract will be up for Blackboard and there will be a decision about what to adopt for our LMS. I think the president will ultimately make a decision. One problem I see is that it feels like the board will be the next LMS, and I question what kind of support there’ll be for other LMSs on campuses. If we don’t say anything then we can adopt a new a LMS and saliently lose support for anything else faculty want on campus. We need to have a discussion about what other LMSs will be supported and which ones won’t. The other question is about the kind of support that is provided. I hear differences when I have discussions about Moodle and Google Classroom. It seems that Moodle gets more support on campus. In English, more people are starting to use Google Classroom, and the level of support has not been good. There’ve been issues with document sharing, and people being told they couldn’t get onto Google Classroom, and being told it will be going away in a couple of years. The messages aren’t positive. Both those questions are being we going to support other platforms, and at what level?

Strahm – For me, the LMS issue, and IT issue, is part of the bigger that support programs are supposed to here to assist us. Decisions get made without faculty input/pedagogical concerns. Just like the problems we’re seeing with the CO with no faculty input, the same thing is with our support services. If you don’t find out from faculty what our needs are, and what our students’ needs are, the decisions won’t work out well for anybody. I think it’s indicative of a broader problem that we’re not a bank. We’re an educational institution.

Morgan – I investigated switching LMSs and there’s only one person on campus who can set up a GC. You still have to get permission to use it. One thing that worries me is that when they made the server switch there was no warning, and many people lost all their work and their information. At another campus, the LMS switch was test-piloted for one year in advance and there was support staff specifically for that switch. We need to make sure that any switch overlaps with the existing LMS and is slow and steady.

Gerson – I’ve been aware of a number of faculty who can’t use Google Drive suite. I’m happy to have new technologies available. But last spring, it came time for student group presentations, all they had to do was share it with my e-mail account. They would share it with my personal g-mail account. Suddenly, students’ permission to share with non-Stan State accounts was turned off with no notice. It was a nightmare without us receiving any warning that the ability for students to share was affecting our pedagogy. One faculty member has been told no you can’t access Google Drive. There’s a standard that’s not being applied uniformly. We need to be able to collaborate with each other and with students, and things that affect our pedagogy, we need to be involved in that.

Greer – We just signed a 2-year contract with BlackBoard. We wanted help finding a way to open this process up to as many faculty as possible. We have three options, systemwide. And we want to create opportunities during this time to have faculty experiment, test, and provide recommendations. I’m sure it’ll be impossible to get complete agreement, but we’d like to open that up as wide as possible. I think we can invite some IT folks, and I’d be happy to come, and start that conversation. If there’s a better way to access as many faculty campuswide who’d like to help us test it out, that would be great.

Thompson – I think I said in the previous meeting, that I was assured that faculty would be involved in testing any new LMS. I was in the group that first started with Moodle and BB, and what we had was support. Looking at it a different way, it’s amazing how well GC is doing without support, and what if it was embraced by OIT and given support. If I had to go back to BB, I’d go back to pencil and paper instead.

Filling – Support is a rather imprecise term. I think it’s abundantly clear that the reason some of these issues arise is that we’re trying to customize these things to the environment in which our students learn best. Some of the things BB is trying to monetize arose from faculty innovation to serve students. Motion 1 for us should be that we can choose what works best for us and inform OIT they can’t constrain what we do.

Hight – I personally have concerns about using Google because of how they mine data. I avoid it as much as possible. While I agree that OIT needs to be better communicators about their decision-making, I propose we ask they be more open about what going on, and why they make the decisions they make.

Thompson – I agree, and my understanding is that the Google is data mining on our server, but I suggest that OIT talk with public schools, because if there is a leak in privacy, how is it that K-12 schools are embracing those systems?

Strahm – Blackboard is notorious for being able to look at what a classroom is doing and take the entire thing as a package that a faculty member is doing – all assignments, lectures. I think any of these services, we have to be aware of – it’s the same as Facebook content could be accessible to an employer. Anything in this digital era that you put anywhere, someone can capture it and mine it for info on you and what you’re doing. I don’t think there are differences between the LMSs regarding what they’re taking back for no- or low-cost services.

Strangfeld – I teach a UEE class at the high school. They register in UEE, but they are high school students. They have GC through TUSD. I have GC through Stan. Those two systems don’t communicate with each other. The only we can do that is that UEE has to input every single student’s paper registration, which takes a couple weeks. By the time we can all communicate, we’re 8-9 weeks into the semester. I’m sitting in this classroom, they have Chrome Books, and I can’t do a thing with it because our systems don’t communicate.

Davis – Other questions, comments, ideas, please forward those, and talk to your depts. We need to know what are the problems, and what people like about other LMSs.

Eudey – While at this meeting, department chairs got an email from AVPAA Young tied to our graduation initiative. We have been providing special support for our cohorts, but one we hadn’t provided support to is transfer students on a 4-year path. We’re identifying the students who are close to graduation. ES is in the process of doing grad evaluations and making those available. You can go in and look at the list for your department There is no expectation to do anything with that data before the end of the data. However, if you recognize that a winter class might help one of those student’s progress to graduation, students may be eligible for a waiver, or a reminder to turn in grad applications. There is no obligation to do anything with it, but this needs to be made available, and you’re allowed to use it. This is just there because we have the data and we wanted to share it. If you have questions, let Shawna know, but department chairs got those lists while we were in this meeting.

**12. Adjournment**

3:18pm