**MSUAASF State Board Meeting Minutes**

**January 21-22, 2016**

**St. Cloud State University Welcome Center**

**Attending:** Jim Anderson, Tracy Rahim, Barb Oertel, Maureen Acosta, Jean Clarke, Sue Bayerl, Heather Soliem, Stephanie Bard, Eduardo Gutierrez, Janet Haak, Shirley Murray, Mike Sharp, Mike Penrod (Thursday), Tim Alcorn, Rich Wheeler, Owen Zimpel (Friday).

**Thursday, January 21, 12:30 pm-5:00 pm**

**Officer Reports**

President’s Report (Jim Anderson)

These past few months I have been heavily involved in Charting the Future coordinating committee work, and with visiting with members at Southwest Minnesota State and MSU Mankato. One common statement I heard from our members at those two campuses is that their work responsibilities are growing with not necessarily the same amount of resources needed to do their increased workloads. I think this is an issue we will continue to need to address with management in negotiations, and at the local level. At the Board of Trustees meeting in November I met with the presidents of IFO, MSCF, AFSCME, and MAPE and this meeting was productive. The board continues to be focused on CTF progress.

Our MSUAASF financial planning workgroup met in early January and we will be having a discussion under old business about how to handle a 30 percent reduction in our budget in case of a bad ruling in the Friederichs decision. I also have visited with a few of our current board members about serving in the role of Grievance Officer in training under Rich Wheeler. I have this item under old business for us to discuss. We have set-up our meeting with Jim Jorstad and MnSCU HR to discuss the SEC position allocation process, and look at ways to make it more timely and work better. The meeting with management will be on April 7th.

Vice President (Eduardo Gutierrez)

Long Term Financial Sustainability

There have been 4 meeting of the Long Term Financial Sustainability Committee

We meet every mouth for a goal to be done with recommendations by June 2016.We are looking at the possibilities of shared space, curriculum and resources. Keeping in mind the changing student demographics.

Secretary’s Report (Shirley Murray) – submitted as separate document to the Board.

**T. Rahim moved and J. Clarke second to approve secretary’s report. Motion carried.**

Treasurer’s Report (Susan Bayerl)

1. Account Balance as of 10/25/2015: $40,713.87

Account Balance as of 01/21/2016: $55,101.93

1. Business Savings Account Balance 10/25/2015: $30,738.27

Business Savings Account Balance 01/21/2016: $30,742.92

1. Business Checking Account Balance 10/25/2015: $ 9,975.60

Business Checking Account Balance 01/21/2016: $24,359.01

* 1. Expenses reimbursed by Local 320
     1. July 2015 Board meeting
     2. Parking related to Negotiations

1. Campus Maintenance FY 2016: List of full share members due March 15, 2016
   1. Formula: (Full share X $12) + $100
2. Legal Counsel & CPA
   1. Work completed with Legal counsel
   2. CPA – need to submit form 990 for last 3 years
   3. Discuss financial audits with Eric Baertch on Friday
3. Budget

FY 16 budget - $59575

President/VP $30000

Board Meeting $ 9000

Campus Maintenance $11000

**Motion by M. Sharp, second by E. Gutierrez to approve the Treasurer’s report. Motion carried.**

Grievance Officer: (Rich Wheeler)

A fair amount of issues have arisen about non-renewals, based on new language in the contract. We need to be sure our members understand the new contract language. Also there have been questions about grieving non-renewals – this is possible if the appropriate process was not followed (notification and timeline). This process can go beyond Step 3, but grievances disagreeing about non-renewal can only be grieved up to Step 3. An employee is probably not going to learn a lot of information about non-renewal. The only time a grievance was upheld dealt with potential discrimination, but this is extremely unlikely.

Another issue that has arisen is evaluation for possible re-classification. (General rule is a PD should be reviewed if it has changed over 25%). The contract doesn’t have a lot of timelines and delays have been of concern for members. We need to work with management to help influence being timely. Sometimes range reviews can result in a lower range. If that happens, there is grandparenting for 2 years, then it goes down. People can also be reassigned to another position within our bargaining unit. This can occur after a person takes a leave.

Question about appealing SEC decisions – timelines are given, but if a clear argument can be made, there may consideration given (especially if there is no incumbent who has received notice of the timeline).

Another thing that may happen again due to the financial situations on our campus is layoff. At our April meeting, we may need to review this process in anticipation of possible layoffs. Rich is also willing to come to campuses where this may be faced earlier than April. Rich will also send out documentation on this to our Board members.

Notification of change provision in our contract is 30 days. This provision needs to be followed by management.

Former state ASF treasurer Pam Ekstrom is on the vacation donation program. Please help pass this word on (flyer sent to Board) and consider donating.

**Old Business**

MSUAASF State Board Finances Task Force (30 percent reduction plan)

We have several questions to ask of Teamsters in terms of breakdown of where our money goes as well as questions about why we cannot receive more back. J. Anderson has requested a breakdown of where are funds go from Sami. (see below under Local 320 Update)

State Grievance Officer Transition Plan

There have been two people who have expressed interest in becoming state grievance officer after Rich retires; this is still open for others to express interest (*State Presidents – please announce this opportunity to your members.*) Action on this will be taken at April 2016 meeting. Training would begin in summer 2016, with final transition July 1, 2017. The new person should also be part of negotiations and go to the campus contract trainings that are upcoming. Maureen offered to share materials and information she has used, and others are encouraged to do that as well. We also have to address the expense of having a person “in training” and whether Teamsters will be cover this expense.

Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA)

We were told by MnSCU that they will give us an update, so this will be on M&C agenda for Feburary.

**New** **Business**

Social Media (Rich Wheeler)

We need to be aware that personal communications on social media cannot be clearly separated from work. We need to be cautious in our social media communications and remind our members about this. This is a possible topic for Professional Development Day next year (Linked In, etc.)

State Officer Elections and any constitutional changes (Rich Wheeler, Barb Oertel, Jay Lee)

In two weeks we need to have a proposed slate of officers. Please talk to the nominations committee about interest in running for state office.

MSUAASF Excellence Award Nomination (Mike Sharp)

Universities will be submitting nominations to the system office, and Mike and two other ASF representatives will be serving on the state committee. The ceremony will be modified this year based on feedback.

Academic Partnerships LLC (Shirley Murray)

Discussion held about potential relationships with private vendors and how these could impact our members. We want to stay aware of these proposed arrangements and how they could impact our contract and our membership.

**Campus President’s Round Table Discussion-(facilitated by T. Rahim)**

Topics of concern included: fixed term, policy changes, committee assignments, lay-offs, title changes, flex scheduling, unit classification, evaluation procedures, investigations, professional development and lateral moves.

**Friday, January 22, 8:30-12:00 noon**

**Local 320 Report (Brian Aldes, Sami Grabriel)**

Website – Teamsters does not have access to MSUAASF website. We can send things to Sami for the ASF dedicated page on the Teamsters 320 site. Jean Clarke is willing to do updates on our local site. Shirley Murray is also willing to post minutes if trained to do so.

Dues, Revenue, Money coming back to ASF –

Dues run about $42,000 per month ($502,000 annually). Bargaining unit size about 800. Local 320 covers cost of business agent, Rich’s time at 20%, support, legal, communications, lobbyists, hotels, meals, etc. (Direct reimburseables in 2015 = $47,000)

What is the formula that derives what we get back? It’s random and was updated once since its inception (update in 2012). Our dues do subsidize other groups. With the current formula, we can’t afford the release needed to do the business for ASF. We are asking for the release of our state President’s time (40%) to be paid by Local 320. Brian will take this proposal under consideration and said he would be able to respond after the Freidrich’s case is decided, so we look forward to that decision. We encourage the most transparency possible on the finances of Local 320 as it relates to our members.

Protecting our Union and Implications of Freidrich’s Case (handout provided)

Brian outlined the results of Right to Work in Wisconsin, not being able to bargain salaries, health care, etc. currently the Wisconsin governor is trying to get state-wide at-will status. Freidrich’s could end the requirement of fair share fees and the entire nation could become right to work. We expect that Local 320 will lose 17% revenue right away, and probably about 30% ongoing. We can protect ourselves through changing model to put more responsibility on stewards and members.

Members will be asked to complete new applications and maintenance of check-off, and an additional form with rating of interest in Teamsters (we will talk to Sami about a way to gather the electronic information without the additional form). The new membership form guarantees Teamsters can collect dues for up to one year if a current member become fair share.

Lobby Day – will be April 13. Details will be forthcoming.

**Committee Reports**

**MSUAASF Committees:**

Legislative (Mike Sharp)

Lobby Day participation is very important because of the supplemental request. It is April 13.

Membership (Janet Haak)

Janet is working on getting updated membership representative lists from campuses. Suggestion made that new membership form completion be presented and completed at membership meetings.

Nominations and Elections (Rich Wheeler, Jay Lee, Barb Oertel):

The Nominations and Elections Committee is now in the phase of the biennial election cycle where we are seeking candidates to serve in each of the 4 elected officer positions.  All of the current officers are eligible to seek re-election, although prior to this meeting the current President and Vice President have notified the committee that they are not seeking re-election.

Per the Constitution, the committee is charged to find at least 2 candidates for of the offices.  That has proven to be a very difficult task for the past few elections.  That challenge is still being faced this year. The committee needs to get out a notice to all campus associations during the first week of February with a proposed slate of candidates and also information on the petition process.

The slate will be finalized after the petition process has concluded at the end of February.  Ballots will be sent out to all of the full members by Teamsters Local #320 in March and will be due by a date to be selected at the end of March.  The results of the election will be certified by the Board at our meeting in April 14.

Please let any of the committee members know if you have any members who you wish to nominate or may be interested.  Likewise any questions on the officer duties or the process may also be directed to any of the committee members.

**MnSCU Committees:**

Branding Initiative (Tracy Rahim)

This project will be completed in June. The desire is to create a “brand” to appeal to all of MnSCU – focus is on MnSCU as accessible, affordable, talent-development, employee preparation, economic development; want something aspirational and not literal. Plan was to not change legal name, but add a branding name. Tracy sent a survey to gather our member opinions – most preferred to keep MnSCU. The second choice overall (from the committee) was Minnesota State. Tracy will keep us updated.

Policy (Barb Oertel, Linda Meidl, Sue Bayerl)

The Policy Council met on 11/19/15. We had a lengthy discussion about Policy 2.9, Academic Standing and Satisfactory Progress. Several members of the committee (including student reps) expressed concern about requiring all students (including part time and those not receiving aid) to meet completion standards. System staff reported that the CSAOs were in favor of current wording of policy, and presented (questionable) data to show that only very few students would be impacted. No general consensus to change policy but there was talk of adding some language to emphasize the ability to change procedures for certain target populations and/or make changes in the procedure. Policy went out for review with no change.

We reviewed Policy 3.30 which does not apply to universities, and continued discussion of merged policies 3.21.1 and 3.37.1 on transfer curriculum. These are not yet out for review. Review continues on 3/39, Transfer Student Rights and Responsibilities, and several changes have been made (see Shirley’s memo). Next Meeting is scheduled for January 28, 2016.

Assessment for Course Placement (Michael Evans, Jill Quandt)

The committee met in October and December.  Michael Evans did not attend either meeting, and I was added to the committee list late, but did attend the December meeting.  It appears to be a very productive and well-functioning group, which has 4 workgroups: Testing/Retesting Procedures, Developmental Education, Multiple Measures, and Validity Study.  It appears some campuses are still relying on only Accuplacer scores for cut and dried placement, but the System Office representative, Pakou Yang, was clear that considering other factors should be encouraged and Accuplacer is more of a rough cut tool rather than the final/only say.  The new version of Accuplacer will come out sometime this spring, likely in March, however both the old platform will still be available for about 5 years and this group has no desire to be early adopters of the new platform so instead will look at transitioning in three years.  The committee will be meeting again in February and April.

Defined Contribution Retirement Committee (Richard Wheeler)

Since the last meeting, the DCR Advisory Committee has been involved in 2 main tasks:  RFP for the Plan Record Keeper / Administrator, as well as the general state of the plan, performance of the funds and the fees/revenue used to support the administration of the program.

RFP

 First, with regard to the RFP, after a failed start and a restart of the RFP process, MnSCU was able to get 3 firms to submit a proposal.  The committee did engage a consultant to assist with the RFP and also the evaluation of the proposals received.  It was determined that each of the proposers would become finalists and would therefore be interviewed.  The DCR Committee, along with the Investment Committee interviewed all three firms.  After considering the proposals submitted and the interviews, the DCR Committee made a recommendation to the Investment Committee and the MnSCU Board on the award of the Record Keeper contract.

The contract will be for 5 years effective July 1, 2016.

The Committee felt good about all 3 finalists, but agreed very easily on the recommended firm.  However, there were things noted to be considered during the negotiations process that will take place to arrive at a contract.

The MnSCU Board will  consider the recommendation at their Board meeting on January 27.

Another RFP process will begin very shortly.  Along with the Record Keeper of the plan, there is an investment consultant.  The current consultant is AON.  That contract also ends on June 30, 2016.  The results of that process will also lead to a 5 year contract to be effective on July 1, 2016.

State of the Plan

As is usual, the committee reviewed the performance of the funds and the general administration of the plan.

Other than the fact that there has been a downturn in the market, the fund options are performing acceptably.  There are very few of the options on the “watch list”.  The watch list contains investment options that perform under the expectations for 3 or more consecutive quarters.  The committee was generally happy with that aspect of the plan.

We again spent a considerable time reviewing the educational and outreach programs by TIAA-CREF dealing with retirement plan information and planning tools for participants, most specifically as it relates to preparedness for retirement.  That also included how participants can use technology.  In person visits to campuses has been a strong part of the TIAA-CREF program and those visits are heavily used and seemingly helpful and appreciated.  The Committee is particularly interested in a better use of technology, as participants use technology in managing their accounts more and more all the time.  That will be an important goal to work on during the term of the next Record Keeper contract.

The committee is generally pleased with the readiness for retirement of the participants.  Most of what we see does not include the specifics of the members who have TRA as their main retirement plan.  That is another area of needed improvement during the term of the next contract.  Technology available to members needs to be able to take into account at least some of the information on TRA.

Revenue / Fees

This last area is one that I need to get input from the Board as we look forward.

As was noted at the last 2 Board meetings, there were changes that took place this summer that led the DCR Committee to increase per participant fees to pay for the general administration of the program.

Prior to the beginning of this fiscal year, the program was administered mostly with money that came to MnSCU through revenue sharing from some of the investment options.  There was also a small fee.  At the beginning of this current 5 year contract cycle, there were many funds that were involved in revenue sharing.  Those options included all of the TIAA-CREF funds.  As investment options began to move away from revenue sharing and had the revenue passed on to the fund investors (i.e. participants), TIAA-CREF moved in that direction to remain an optimal investment option for participants.  That left very few options being involved in revenue sharing compared to 5 years ago.  It was that situation that led to the DCR Committee to move to the $14 per participant, per quarter fee.  That $56 is being used by MnSCU to administer the DCR program.

It must be noted that some of the investment options do still have revenue sharing.

The discussions of the committee have involved around the overall finances needed to operate the program and where the money should come from.  Just as a starting point note, the program needs about $384,000 per year to operate and maintain the required operational reserve.  Even with the fees that started on July 1, 2015, the revenue for 2016 is expected to be about $346,000.  The difference for this year will come out of reserves while the committee works on a plan to be implemented in 2017.  There is adequate money in the reserves to cover this year.

As a part of the discussion, we have been considering whether the right thing to do now is to put all of the revenue sharing back into the funds where they were generated and then it would go back to the participants in those funds.  Otherwise, the participants investing in those options pay more than those selecting other options and eventually they will move out of the revenue sharing funds to funds that “make more money”, by not sharing revenue.  So, at that point, we are at the same place.

The DCR Committee is very interested in ending the revenue sharing and operate the program on fees per participant or based upon asset value. In order to operate the program on fees alone, we would need to increase the per participant fees to about $80 per participant considering budget estimates.  Those fees would be deducted from the participant accounts on a quarterly basis; $20 per quarter.  That could be compared to the current $14 per quarter.

A proposal has been brought forward to consider the asset value and have higher fees for people who have more money invested.  We have not generated at this time any specific proposed models.  The idea being that people with higher invested amounts would pay more.

We could also look at a combination of per participant fees and asset value fees.

I would like to get a feeling of the Board prior to the next DCR meeting in April on the following:

1.      Does the Board support the ending of the remaining revenue sharing and reallocate the money to the fund investors?

2.      Does the Board prefer to administer the program with per participant fees to be deducted quarterly (now proposed at $80 per year)?

3.      Does the Board prefer that we look to an asset value type fee?

4.      Does the Board prefer a combination of the above?

It must be noted that even if revenue sharing does continue, the $14 fee will need to be increased to make up for the revenue shortage considering the program administration requirements.  That additional money would need to come from either per participant or asset value based fees.

I would like to have at least some conversation about this topic as we gather on February 5 for the State Meet and Confer. Please contact me (Rich) if you have any questions.

IT Council (Braden Kuznia, Michael Penrod, Dotty Hayes) No report submitted.

System Evaluation Committee (Mike Sharp and Kerry Ross)

There have been several reviews coming from Moorhead lately.  Asking Renee Schmitt about that, her explanation was that there had been some significant turnover at MSUM and that the number of appeals should dwindle as the new personnel get the “hang of things”.  I asked if there was something we as SEC members could do to help expedite the new staff getting the hang of things.  She said no.  While that was the end of the conversation with Renee, it wasn’t long after the November meeting that I received an email invitation to participate in a group that Jim Jorstad is leading to review the CEC/SEC process with the goal to streamline and make it more responsive to the needs of campuses dealing with changing employment needs.  That meeting is scheduled for April 7, 2016 at the System Office. Next regular SEC meeting is scheduled for February 2, 2016.

Transfer Oversight Committee (Julio Vargas-Essex, Jim Anderson)

The Transfer Oversight Committee met and reviewed a number of items related to transfer. After a long discussion on goal area variation and the common number convention, it was decided that the Transfer Advisory Group is going to be tasked with coming up with suggestions for the aforementioned issues to bring to the Transfer Oversight Committee and the committee from there will make recommendations.

            Along with the previous two items discussed, the committee went over the policy regarding the MnTC and residency requirements and the computer science proposal for the possible reevaluation and endorsement for the MnTC from the Transfer Oversight Committee of only computer sciences courses. As far as the MnTC and residency requirements, it was reiterated that the MnTC cannot have residency requirements and that communication regarding this was sent by memo to campus Chief Academic Officers (CAOs). For computer science, no endorsement or re-evaluation was made by the committee. However, it was recommended by the committee that a broader conversation on what is general education, who will determine what general education is and a timeline for this to occur needed to happen with the rationale that the Transfer Oversight Committee needs clear definitions for the enforcement of system-wide general education requirements.

            The committee meeting wrapped up with a report on the AAS to BAS workgroup where we were informed that the group is going to be looking at system models that already exist (i.e. Metro State and Minnesota State University Moorhead models). Additionally, the committee received a report on Transfer Pathways which included the reporting of the decision that the disciplines of Biology, Psychology, Theatre and Business where to be the disciplines focused upon as pathways. With this report, the committee discussed the life-cycle of a pathway and possible advising challenges with the implementation of the Transfer Pathways. The committee will be revisiting these last two items at a later date.

The Transfer Oversight Committee met again and reviewed the Transfer Credit Appeal Process and Transfer Policies and Procedures (specifically the proposed Amendment to procedure 3.21.1), was updated on Reverse Transfer, the AAS to BAS workgroup and Transfer Pathways, and provided feedback on the Course Equivalency Guidelines document as well as the Transfer Credit Appeal Process and on the proposed Amendment to procedure 3.21.1. As there was no quorum represented, no action was taken on the feedback provided with the exception of the feedback on the proposed Amendment to procedure 3.21.1 that will be taken to the policy council.

It is important to note the reviewed item of the Transfer Credit Appeal process as it will have a significant impact on data-gathering and procedure on campuses.  The review of the process included a presentation of the tentative online template that would be used for what will be called “Transfer Review Process” in Eservices for students to begin the transfer review process with an institution when they “Agree” or “Disagree” with evaluated credits. There was a lot of concern expressed on whether or not the process would be more taxing on already understaffed MnSCU employees working in transfer without providing a real benefit to students. The timeline of release of this feature in Eservices is the end of spring term. It was recommended that the Campus Designated Officer over this feature would be determined before the release. Institutions will determine on their own who the Campus Designated Officer over the process will be.

The committee will be revisiting the Course Equivalency Guidelines document at the next meeting on February 25th, 2016.

SA Council (Jean Clarke, Jay Lee, and Eduardo Guiterrez)

The Student Affairs Committee, met in Nov of 2016. We are looking at what is student success.

Is it a degree?

Is a job?

Is it a personal goal?

Is it a 4 year degree in 4 years?

AA Council (Greg Mellas, Shirley Murray, Heather Soleim)

AA Council met Nov. 16. Report on Achievement Gap showing no appreciable decrease in gap since 2004, which is very concerning. Gaps remain in readiness, median incomes, persistence and completion rates. We have continued growth in students of color served across system.

Toyia Younger reported that the college completion report is due to legislature by Jan. 15. Pakou Yang reported that the educational credentialing requirement for concurrent instructors may be delayed. Ron Anderson reported that the CtF Coordinating committee has met twice and is “feeling their way” in terms of their role. Metro baccalaureate report indicated state universities were queried regarding their interest in offering degrees in metro. Lynda Milne reported on launching of first four transfer pathways teams to occur in December 2015. Louise DiCesare updated the group on Reverse Transfer – 256 AA degrees conferred since July 2015 through this process. Next meeting scheduled for Jan. 25, 2016.

CTF Coordinating Committee (Jim Anderson and Tracy Rahim)

The CTF Coordinating Committee is going to commit to meeting five times a year: two times in the fall semester, and spring semester and once in the summer. All indications are that the Coordinating Committee will be at least a two-year commitment by people serving, however, this may go longer depending on progress made on the initiatives.

The Coordinating Committee will work closely with the President’s Council and campus based CTF teams to track progress. We have developed a Gantt chart of timelines for each initiative, adopted a communication plan, and created a template for Quarterly reporting.

Transfer Pathways Coord. Committee (Shirley Murray, Jolene Richardson, Ashley Schafer)

First four teams (business, biology, theatre, psychology) were launched on December 11. TP Coordinating Committee met the next week (Dec. 18) to discuss work plan and schedule for spring semester, including identification of next disciplines to launch, communication plan, and coordination of efforts of the teams. Representatives of the coordinating team will review the progress reports and plans of each discipline team during spring semester and communicate to the full coordinating team so that the plans can be edited if necessary (if they haven’t met the criteria), or endorsed and moved forward.

**Transfer Pathway Teams** (Laura McCauley, Linda Meidl, Melissa Iverson, Carol Cooley)

Psychology (Mel Iverson)

We had our first meeting on Friday, Jan. 15. Along with the logistics of the meeting, determining meeting times and how we will report,  etc., we spent the time discussing and reviewing the APA competencies for Psychology majors and discussing some of the differences amongst the two and four year programs. These conversations seem to be very focused on the student experience, however appropriate questions are being raised asked to further clarify what is needed and what we need to do.

It was decided that we will have the following information completed and discussed by the next meeting:

\* Identify psychology courses for first two years of Psychology major, Jan 25th

\* Review competencies of these courses, Jan. 25th

\* Agree on first two year courses and competencies, Jan 25th

\* Define approach/model to use for the Psychology Transfer Pathways, Jan. 25th

The chair of the committee is also contacting the Psychology department chairs and registration advisors to identify some of the common issues or roadblocks students face when they transfer from a 2 year to a 4 year in Psychology.

Business (Linda Meidl)

The group identified classes that seem to be core at all State U’s.  Many of the courses are offered in two year business programs as well.  Homework was given and group members will be reviewing common course outlines from these courses and comparing course learning outcomes.  These will be discussed next meeting (January 29). The conversation seems to be headed in a direction that may lead to one general business pathway which will allow students to choose the specific business major when they get to the State U.  This has not been decided but seems to be the direction right now.

Math and Computer Applications were identified as hurdles.  Math because four of the state U’s require higher than college algebra; computer applications because of potential difference in content and what student knowledge is expected.

Two courses were identified as possible “deal breakers” for two year colleges”  Principles of Marketing and Management.  Metro seems to be the only school taking those as equivalent to their principles classes.  Mankato and Moorhead do a “validation” method.  Not sure what the other state U’s do.  However, one two-year college rep. indicated St. Cloud will not take at all.  Common Course Outlines will also be looked at for these courses as well and will discuss at next meet.

**Charting the Future workgroups**

Academic Advising (Zach Johnson, Paul Hesterman, Sara Granberg-Rademaker)

Paul Hesterman reported that the first meeting of the Academic Advising workgroup is scheduled for January 12.

Online Technology (Paul Stern, Nikki Stock, Bobbi Anderson)

Bobbi Anderson reports the first meeting of Student Support Technologies will be January 20th.

Academic Planning and Collaboration (Darci Mueller, Kate Southwick, Janet Haak)

**M&C agenda items**

Charting the Future – Financial Model & Transfer Pathways

MnSCU Branding Project

Legislative Plan for upcoming session

FLSA update

MSUAASF Excellence Award Nomination update

Metro Plan Update

ASF Board Meeting Adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

**Future Meeting Dates:**

**Spring ASF Board meeting**

April 14/15 in St. Paul

**Meet and Confer**

November 13

February 5

April 15

**MNSCU Board meetings**

January 26/27 March 15/15

March 15/16 April 19/20 May 17/18 June 21/22

Respectfully submitted,

Shirley Murray

MSUAASF State Secretary