**For**

**Academic Senate**

**October 31, 2017**

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

**Excused**: Mayer, Montero Hernandez, Randol, Garcia, Webster, Morgan, Demers.

**Proxies:** Keith Nainby for Bill Foreman, Diane Katsma for Diane Crayton.

**Guests:** Shawna Young, Amanda Theis, Sylvea Rodriguez, Ronald Rodriguez, Gitanjali Kaul, Lauren Byerly, Betsy Eudey, James Tuedio, Stuart Wooley, Martha Cuan, Helene Caudill, David Evans, Tomas Arias-Gomez, Umar Ghuman, Martha Cuan, Michele Lahti, Tim Held and Ellen Junn.

Isabel Pierce, Recording Secretary

First Reading Item moved to a Second Reading: 18/AS/17/AS CSU Stanislaus Strategic Plan Resolution 2017-2025. Unanimously passed without abstention.

Second Reading Item: 17/AS/17/UEPC General Education (GE) Area and Outcome Alignment. Passed.

Discussion Item: XX/AS/17/FAC/UEPC Amendment to 11/AS/89/EPC – Policy Regarding Final Grades

**Next Academic Senate Meeting:**

**November 14, 2017**

**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 September 26, 2017 (distributed electronically)**

Approved.

**4. Introductions**

Shawna Young, Amanda Theis, Sylvea Rodriguez, Ronald Rodriguez, Gitanjali Kaul, Lauren Byerly, Betsy Eudey, James Tuedio, Stuart Wooley, Martha Cuan, Helene Caudill, David Evans, Tomas Arias-Gomez, Umar Ghuman, Martha Cuan, Michele Lahti, Tim Held and Ellen Junn.

**5. Announcements**

a. CSU Stanislaus Representative to the Academic Council on International Programs (Umar Ghuman)

**ACIP Report**

* **Resident Director applications**
* **Ghana Symposium, and Paris the following year**
* **Including IP program courses into the GE curriculum to align with the graduation initiative**

**Resident Director 2019-2020 and 2019-2021 Applications**  
  
The Academic Council on International Programs (ACIP) invites applications for the role of Resident Director for 2019-2020 and 2019-2021.  
  
Resident Directors will serve in France, Spain or Italy.   
  
Deadline: December 1, 2017  
  
Follow this link to download: [Resident Director Application-2019-2020 and 2019-2021](http://csuip.calstate.edu/_customtags/ct_FileRetrieve.cfm?File_ID=040F7B74734F7706720570010F021C04080C0014757800006E06040274000104067477747406027272)  
  
Please review the Resident Director Handbook Sections 1-5 prior to your submitting your application.  
[Resident Director Handbook: Section I General Administration](http://csuip.calstate.edu/_customtags/ct_FileRetrieve.cfm?File_ID=040F7571714F00730D070775000A1C04080C0014757800006E060203067304760170077D7A77017207)  
[Resident Director Handbook: Section II Academic Affairs](http://csuip.calstate.edu/_customtags/ct_FileRetrieve.cfm?File_ID=040F7571774F00730D02760172771C04080C0014757800006E060277737C04020302717271010B7B76)  
[Resident Director Handbook: Section III Student Affairs](http://csuip.calstate.edu/_customtags/ct_FileRetrieve.cfm?File_ID=040F7571744F00730D75037400031C04080C0014757800006E06027572777C06020702010077020675)  
[Resident Director Handbook: Section IV Health and Safety](http://csuip.calstate.edu/_customtags/ct_FileRetrieve.cfm?File_ID=040F75717A4F00730D710671050B1C04080C0014757800006E06020E7205700200027377777B710207)  
[Resident Director Handbook: Section V Fiscal Affairs](http://csuip.calstate.edu/_customtags/ct_FileRetrieve.cfm?File_ID=040F75717B4F00737505007606741C04080C0014757800006E06020E06077174010401737301070106)  
  
In-Person Interviews will take place the CSU Chancellor's Office March 1-2, 2018. Appointment announcements will be made in April 2018.  
  
Send all application materials to: CSU International Programs, 401 Golden Shore Drive, Long Beach, CA 90806

**GHANA SYMPOSIUM**

**International Faculty Partnership Seminar, Ghana 2018 (Tentative Dates: June 9-16, 2018)**  
  
The International Faculty Partnership Seminars sponsored by the California State University through the Academic Council on International Programs (ACIP) are designed to provide international experiences for faculty of diverse disciplines from all CSU campuses. The mission of the CSU International Programs (CSU IP) is to foster opportunities for students and faculty. In order to increase opportunities IP is launching a series of seminars in collaboration with partners abroad. Planning is already underway for seminars in Paris, France in 2019 and Tübingen, Germany in 2020.  The seminar themes are broadly based and comparative in nature.  
   
In addition to interacting with colleagues about the conference themes, participants will learn more about CSU International Programs and the experiences of students who participate. By visiting the university, one of the goals of the seminar is to acquaint CSU faculty with the opportunities available to their students.  
  
The theme for this year’s seminar is “Ghana Calls.” In 1957 Ghana declared independence from the United Kingdom and Dr. Kwame Nkrumah became its first Prime Minister. This seminar will examine the evolution of Africa and Ghana in the years since independence. To frame our discussions, the seminar will be structured along five tracks. We will be asking CSU participants to choose between a “presenter” role or a “participant” role as a part of the application.  All sessions will include presenters from both the CSU and the University of Ghana in order to grow opportunities for the cross-fertilization of knowledge and create synergies between our institutions.   
   
The broad theme will be comprised of the following five tracks:

* Economics, Development, and Governance
* African Diaspora
* Teaching Africa
* African Art, Image, and Literature
* Africa and the United States   
  Through participation in an International Faculty Partnership Seminar, CSU faculty will:
* Have an opportunity to explore the theme with colleagues in their own and related disciplines;
* Learn more about international opportunities available through IP for themselves and for their students;
* Establish professional connections and contacts with colleagues from the host institution;
* Familiarize themselves with international partner institutions.

Seminar Costs  
   
As seminar hosts CSU IP and the University of Ghana will support the cost of on-site expenses for lodging and meals.  
   
CSU IP will contribute $1000 to the cost of airfare.  Campuses may support of international travel for CSU participants.  The Office of International Programs will inform the appropriate campus officials of participants’ selection.  
   
Other incidental expenses and additional travel will be the responsibility of the participant.  
   
Participant Eligibility and Selection  
   
Faculty members from all CSU campuses and all disciplines are encouraged to participate.  Participants must hold a full-time tenured or tenure track appointment at a CSU campus.  Faculty members who will be participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program on or before July 1, 2017 or earlier are not eligible for selection as participants.  
   
Selection of CSU participants will be the responsibility of the Faculty Affairs Committee of the ACIP.  Approximately 20 faculty members will be selected to participate.  The Committee will seek a broad distribution of disciplines and participation from across campuses.   
   
Those applying in the “participant” pathway are expected to show how participation in the seminar will directly impact their work on campus as a teacher and faculty member.    
   
Those applying in the “presentation” pathway should submit an abstract of a presentation proposal that is relevant to one of the tracks identified in the seminar announcement.  Final presentations will be due no later than May 15, 2017.   
  
The application deadline is December 1, 2017.   
  
The Seminar Selection Committee will meet during February and announcements of the participants will be made on March 1, 2018.

Letter of Application must include the following information:

* Name
* Department
* Campus
* Address
* E-mail
* Telephone
* Current CV
* Form for the path to which you are applying (either teacher participant or presentation)
* Statement addressing the following:
  + Why do you wish to participate?
  + What contribution will you make to the seminar?
  + How will the seminar contribute to your effectiveness as a teacher?
  + How will you disseminate the results of the seminar on campus?

Apply online at: [CSU IP Ghana Faculty Partnership Seminar Application](https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSdbSIef_R5CAYHdNjQ80v3fy1-0KXf25pZlh9ERVgwSCw6IYA/viewform?c=0&w=1)  
   
**Deadline for receipt of applications: December 1, 2017**  
  
Faculty Partnership Seminar  
Office of International Programs  
The California State University  
401 Golden Shore  
Long Beach, CA 90802

**This is the (terribly complicated) link to both the issues, but if your faculty member is interested in either I’d be happy to direct them to the website (Umar Ghuman, ughuman@csustan.edu)**

[**http://csuip.calstate.edu/index.cfm?fuseaction=abroad.viewlink&parent\_id=b5fb7fe2-5056-ba1f-7464cfb766a28a1d&link\_id=6e667d70-5056-ba1f-72aab439e6bb0b17**](http://csuip.calstate.edu/index.cfm?fuseaction=abroad.viewlink&parent_id=b5fb7fe2-5056-ba1f-7464cfb766a28a1d&link_id=6e667d70-5056-ba1f-72aab439e6bb0b17)

b). Nagel – First, CFA members are voting on the tentative agreement this week. Voting ends Thursday at 2 pm. CFA faculty will be walking the halls and reminding folks to vote. We’d like a large turnout to work as a show of force. Please vote in this election. Second, I’m presenting a talk on Vertigo and the Phenomenology of Embodiment on Friday at 4pm, in Science Rm. 137. There will be some technical philosophy, but I hope this will be accessible.

Guichard - The door hangers on offices, and the link on the bottom doesn’t seem to be working. Nagel – we will investigate this.

c). Davis – SEC has one announcement that we’ve been discussing the IDEA evaluation instrument. The company is going to a fully online platform. We have decided to use this as an opportunity to discuss potential replacements, which arises frequently. We have formed an ad hoc committee to begin looking at potential replacements, or looking at a fully online platform. The group was nominated by COC, and we look forward to a report soon to SEC, and SEC will report to the Senate. We want to discover is if there is an instrument that would be helpful for RPT purposes and knowing what you’re doing in your classrooms. There will be updates on that.

Strahm – What would be helpful is to know where the students are at – are they caring for children, for adults, how many hours a week are they working? There’s demographic information that would help us understand our students a bit better.

Carroll – Who are the members?

Pierce – The Ad Hoc Committee on Student Evaluation Instruments to find an alternative to the IDEA consists of Chris Nagel, Steven Filling, Steven Wood, and Betsy Eudey.

Carroll – Is the committee convinced of the idea of a single instrument versus a departmentally-based instrument?

Nagel – We haven’t met yet.

Davis – They are exploratory and not committed to anything.

d). Hight – Please vote Yes on Measure S. Our students are heavy users of the public library, and I urge everyone to vote for that and continue that funding.

Wooley – You can ask your students additional questions on the IDEA form. They can bubble in their answers, and you can get those results on your IDEA form.

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

**FAC** – Nainby representing Foreman. Three things are relevant. One is on the agenda which we’ll discuss today. Second, we’re interested in exploring how to most effectively communicate to university faculty how voting rights have changed, if at all. We’re reviewing a document that itemizes key issues regarding voting rights. We’re trying to redesign that document and understand how best to frame an understanding of these rights. We’ve invited Nagel to comment on how those voting rights might make sense to lecturers. Third, FYI, we’d like feedback. This academic year, we are operating under a bridge policy regarding salary ranges for lecturer pay. We are developing a permanent policy for range elevation procedures for temporary faculty. If you’d like to provide input on this, we are interested in your input.

**FBAC:** Weikart – Our agenda was mainly discussing the budget priorities resolution and we came very close to finishing it. We will be meeting tomorrow, and hope to have it as a resolution soon. Tomorrow we’ll be looking at the fiscal implications of enrollment management as well as the new budget items for AY 2018.

**GC**: Dorsey – Steve Wood was elected as the GC representative on the RSCAPC. The Graduate Council approved a certificate for the nursing program, which will go to SEC for review. Discussion will continue on co-authored dissertation, co-authorship of culminating assignments, program assignment of director, course time module policy, graduate education assessment plan, among others.

**ASCSU**: Strahm – We will be traveling to Long Beach tomorrow for our plenary. Twenty-one out of 23 campuses have all put forward resolutions against 1100 and 1110. Some of the campuses are seeing students walk out and we continue to engage with the CO about these issues.

Davis – If you want to see resolutions, CSU-East Bay Senate office has compiled them on their website. Some campuses are required to make more changes than others.

Nagel – At the state assembly this past weekend, the CFA unanimously passed a resolution opposing EO 1100 and 1110 and will be forwarding those to the CO.

**UEPC**: Thompson – At its 10/26 meeting the UEPC reviewed and revised the GE alignment policy that is on the agenda as a second-reading today.

The committee discussed the Batch Recertification process for GE courses and is still working on the form and requirements. Currently, recertification would follow an expedited process with departments assembling lists of courses to be recertified then providing materials (packets) that demonstrate how each course meets the outcomes selected and how the outcomes could be assessed. College curriculum committees can decide the degree to which they review packets which would then follow a path through deans, to Academic Programs, to the GE subcommittee for review and approval.

The committee discussed the approval of Structured Exploratory Emphases, formerly known as Pathways. SEEs are intended to group courses around specific interests to highlight possible paths through GE for students. SEEs will also require additional learning goals for courses or sections to be included as well as assessment of those goals. The committee has already presented a process for creation, approval, and modification of SEEs, and now is considering a resolution to approve having SEEs.

The committee continued discussion of the draft General Education Assessment Plan, and will review a revised draft at its next meeting on 11/9. The Plan focuses on the core competencies of critical thinking, information literacy, oral communication, quantitative reasoning, and written communication as demonstrated through the anchor outcomes in the alignment policy.

The UEPC considered feedback from the senate and revised the alignment table to change the D1a anchor to 1.3 as requested by the history department. Additionally, the consensus was to delete the "allocated units" column because we could discern no need for it. Finally, in consultation with departments of English and communication studies, the committee added anchor 1.5. to areas A2 and A3.

**7. Information Item**

a. Structured Exploratory Emphases (SEE)

Thompson – There was confusion last time about the relationship of pathways and SEEs, and my understanding is that there’s not a difference. The discussion intensified after the folks from CSU-Northridge presented their SEEs. There was a FLC. We have a process in place and a model, and UEPC is discussing approval. Betsy knows more than I do.

Eudey – This was something that was funded by a Compass Grant, and we had partnering activities with MJC over time. There were conversations about pathways, or themes, within GE coursework. This was in the GE APR and culminated in a Faculty Learning Community to explore what it would be like if we created pathways. Because pathway terminology is being used in other contexts, we chose a different name. There were initial conversations about those leading toward a minor. MJC was interested in these, but having heard feedback from some departments that a GE minor would take away from the discipline-specific minors, the FLC chose to make them thematically based organizations of courses to help students identify courses they might be interested in. There was a hope that it would draw attention to majors and minors students might not have otherwise thought of. The FLC was tasked with coming up with an organizational structure, and that’s what’s now before you. Many CSU campuses have such pathways, some are mandatory, some are optional. Ours is optional.

Weikart – Are these SEEs courses exclusive to students in the SEE or open to other students?

Eudey – They’re completely open to all students, but there will be a special designation in the course schedule and on the GE list of courses.

Davis – If departments have questions, please pass those on to UEPC.

**8. Second Reading Item**

* 1. 17/AS/17/UEPC General Education (GE) Area and Outcome Alignment

Thompson – UEPC considered feedback from Senate and we revised the table to change the outcome anchor as requested by the History department. Our consensus was to delete the allocated unit’s column. In consultation with English and Communication Studies, we added anchor 1.5 to two areas. Because of that consultation we added language to clarify on the table on the second page, inserted an asterisk to clarify that the outcomes were based on consultations with departments but they’re not limited and can pick any outcomes from the table. On the third page we added an explanatory note to change attachment to addendum to make it easier to know what you’re voting on. The third page is not under consideration for amendment.

Carroll – Thanks to UEPC for making the changes. 1.3 remains the anchor and the secondary for D1a. Davis – That’s a typo. We’ll correct.

Results of the Vote: 37:1:1

Thompson – This was a lot of work for UEPC, so thanks to the committee for that. But it was also a lot of work for GEAC, so thanks to them too.

**9. First Reading Item**

a. 18/AS/17/AS CSU Stanislaus Strategic Plan Resolution 2017-2025

Nagel – moved, seconded by Thompson

Nagel – This is the last page of the packet; this resolution simply recommends the strategic plan for the approval of the president. The rationale reflects the truly consultative process, one might say model process, that was undertaken. We hope you approve it.

Davis – The plan is available on the website if you need to refresh your memory of it.

Strahm – Motion to move this to a second reading. Seconded by Nainby.

Strahm – I think the process was consultative, it was deliberate, and it ensured there was a lot of opportunity to make voices heard and actively participate. If we have no need for conversations, and we had it as a discussion, I suggest we move it forward

Nainby – There might be a time issue is that the sooner we get it approved, the sooner it can guide us with respect to responding to the EOs.

Weikart – In general I oppose moving things to second reading because it doesn’t give adequate time for moving beyond departments consultations. We should give people the opportunity to see it.

Davis – I’m inclined to go to discussion because the discussion two weeks ago revolved around people being happy with the process. Hopefully everyone’s seen the plan by now, and if it can guide our response to EOs and the budget process, we should do it. This will require a 2/3 vote.

Results of the Vote: 32:6:1

Davis – We will move to a second reading. Any comments on the original resolution?

Thompson – Two things. One, voting on an attachment that’s not attached makes me feel like a real Senator. The other is we’re about to pass this and I think it’s good to remind people that when we were arguing about this a couple years ago, the way this has happened is the way the faculty said it should happen. There’s been a full process, with consultation, and approval by the Senate, just as the faculty said. And to be clear, I want to thank the president for guiding the process in this direction.

Junn – Thank you so much to the Senate and Senate leadership because they were meeting every week. There were campus forums, it’s been on the website, and people have responded. Last week the city, the mayor, my office, and TUSD – we meet quarterly – and it got the attention of people on that council. They found it thorough and inspiring to read. Ours is beautifully written and the goals are tremendous. They asked their divisions to bring a copy of their strategic plan because they wanted to discuss it together. It’s gotten the attention of our local officials and others in the CSU have said it’s a well-crafted document.

Davis – We will move to the vote.

Results of the Vote: 39:0:0 (applause from the room). Passed unanimously and without abstention.

Davis – This is what happens when we have true shared governance

**10. Discussion Item**

a. XX/AS/17/FAC/UEPC – Amendment to 11/AS/89/EPC – Policy Regarding Final Grade Reports

Davis – This is a policy from 1989. There is confusion because in 1989 we passed this policy that gave the time limit for turning in grades. This is pre-computers and it was done on paper and delivered to Enrollment Services. The policy and the catalog language now doesn’t match. FAC is trying to come up with a description that matches the policy.

Nainby – This has to do with prepositions which individuate who the policy was written to. The catalog indicates grades will be submitted within 3 days of the final exam. The resolution on record from 1989 states that grades will be delivered at least three days from the end of final exam period. The catalog policy seems more like a promise to students about the last day grades will be posted. We tried to write a different statement that wouldn’t change the policy but would reconcile the two.

Davis – There was confusion about whether it should be interpreted three days after *individual’s* finals, or three days after the *week* of finals. In SEC discussion, we looked at the calendar, and the way the calendar interprets this, those three days with the black triangle are designated as work days for grade preparation, so the calendar interprets this as three days after all finals are over. So this policy is designed to be clear and updated, and match practice. We brought this for questions, comments. We’ll be working with Jake Myers once we’re in agreement on that language.

Nainby – The phrase three academic workdays came up for discussion. We debated weekdays as an alternative, but that could create confusion as well. We wanted to be clear that it is academic workdays. I’m speaking as FAC chair elect, there’s been additional conversations about a way that could still be interpreted by students in ways that lead to confusion. Students especially don’t always know where to find the academic calendar. One thing we’d like to recommend is that the calendar be made available in a prominent way to people who want to see it.

Guichard – Who has the authority to interpret this policy? The memo that is usually sent near the end of the semester states “You give the exam on this date and your grades are due three days later,” but this policy would contradict that memo.

Davis – Yes, and this language will be shared and this policy will require that memo to be updated.

Eudey – It would be helpful to affirm what the end of the workday means – 5 pm or midnight? That’s confusing. Also, in some years, that last of the three triangle days ends up being a day the governor gives a half day off. We need to be careful that that doesn’t make the next workday in January, or be careful that we’re being intentional when it does.

Petrosky – When you’re writing policy and you like your boss, it becomes easy to be lax in specificity. If we don’t specify in the policy, the repercussions for not following through and turning in grades becomes someone else’s interpretation. Today, that might be okay. In the future, that might not be. Our president 6 years ago had wild interpretations.

Junn – Every campus can interpret their consequence differently, but it needs to be a reasonable standard.

Nainby – We’ll inquire on that and contact the necessary administrators. In direct response to Eudey’s point about the UEPC drafting the calendar process, we were sensitive to this in FAC, and we reached out to Sarah Schrader’s office to confirm that this would need to be included as UEPC constructs calendars. We will return to the language regarding the impact of the policy.

Junn – It is the case that the CSU stipulates that the last work day is often a half day. What used to happen is that the Chancellor’s Office would call each president’s office one-by-one, and we’d say we’d dismiss at noon. Now it’s done by e-mail, but it’s still a workday. With question to what time, it’s usually the end of the business day at 5 pm, but with the CO, it would be noon which would be the end of the business day.

Jaycox – You want students to see the academic calendar, one issue is that I understand the academic calendar, but students who haven’t worked on campus won’t understand this. They just want to know the dates grades will be available online. So I recommend we just post the dates online.

Davis – We can post that grades from the instructor are due on a particular date.

Eudey – Picking the time it has to be submitted if it’s done electronically, are there functional reasons grades must be in by the end of the workday versus the end of the actual day? If there’s not a reason to cut out hours of work time, we should give that to the faculty member. There may be a functional reason why, and some folks may be submitting paper grades. But the maximum flexibility with time to submit is the best thing we can do. We want thoughtful grades, not rushed grades. But I recognize grades need to be posted for many administrative reasons that we don’t want to postpone.

Strahm –Junn’s noon comment, regarding noon on that third day for grading, would definitely be problematic. That might need to be negotiated to allow maximum of those three days rather than maybe noon, maybe 5.

Davis – FAC needs to look into the administrative steps that happen after grades are submitted.

Greer – In general, 11:59 or midnight makes sense and not be subject to the holiday schedule, but the people we need to confirm this with are not here.

Davis – If you run into difficulty posting your grades there’s no one there to help you.

Junn – Using pro-forma language would be least problematic. Gitanjali is not here, but maybe Suzanne Espinoza knows. At other campuses, just because the faculty member submits grades it doesn’t mean the registrar has the data for students. I don’t know if Admissions and Records posts the grades as they come in or if there’s some kind of batch process. We will need to find out these details because it can affect financial aid. We would need to send out reminders to folks about deadlines.

Strangfeld – In regard to the comment on what happens if they’re not submitted on time, I’m concerned about how that would be worded in this policy. When I submit my grades and I don’t push the extra “approve” button, and I go away on my life thinking I did it right, and then sometime in January I get an e-mail that my grades weren’t submitted, and then I find out I didn’t push that extra button. I get the point about how things can be open and can be interpreted negatively, I don’t want to then create punitive language that can be off-putting that doesn’t recognize simple mistakes.

Hight – To echo Provost Greer with checking with staff. The last 2 years President Sheley gave everyone the other half the day when the Governor gave the half the day.

Ashmun – Is there a way to get a confirmation e-mail that you’ve submitted grades?

DeCure– At another campus I worked at, you get a confirmation and a report of all the grades you’ve submitted, which helps you file those grades in a folder as part of your own record keeping. Right now, I have to print and keep them and then shred, but other than that you have no confirmation you’ve indeed submitted these grades. I didn’t get a training about this extra button, and I found out about this by pure chance. If we’re going to update this, we also update the language we give to new faculty because there’s no training on this.

Nainby – A couple of senators have spoken to the feeling that there’s no confirmation. I’m interested if other folks have similar experiences. When I’ve hit the button, there’s a screen that appears that says “Congratulations” and I wouldn’t characterize this as effective communication, so we might need to look into this.

Davis – We’re at the end of our time to discuss this. We can definitely share our concerns and the need for a report that’s e-mailed to you. We can request that be added. Ask your departments about this and make sure this is forwarded to them.

**11. Open Forum**

Strahm – I’ve seen in the news these last few years about the opioid crisis. I haven’t noticed it on our campus, but I was reading that Walgreens was stockpiling Narcan and I was wondering if our UPD or our Health Center or other people in authority are keeping a dose of Narcan on them so that if we did encounter this, we know who, outside 911, we can contact. Do we have that on campus? Do we know if our people in authority have that?

Davis – Narcan is a drug that will overt an overdose.

Strahm – it’s a spray, not a shot, that counteracts overdoses.

Junn – Suzanne will check with the health center

Crayton proxy – It doesn’t need to be just one dose.

Carroll – at MJC, their faculty gets flu shots for free. Can we set this as an aspiration for our campus?

Junn – If you have a regular health plan, you can show your card and get it at most drug stores. I don’t know if that works on our campus. Suzanne, can you check with our health center?

Nagel – Not every faculty member is eligible for healthcare coverage. I also want to caution about flu shot overdose since there’s no antidote for this.

Erickson – In the past, your health card didn’t work for free at the Health Center. Your health plan card does work at Walgreens and CVS, etc.

**12. Adjournment at** 3:17pm