

Cheryl Dowd: Okay. Hello everybody. Thanks again for your patience as we start using Zoom for our SAN coordinator calls. This is the January SAN coordinator call. We have quite a full agenda here of good information to share about upcoming events and an update on negotiated rulemaking. So, without further adieu, I want to move right into the NASASPS conference agenda. You'll see on the agenda that item number 2 is the conference agenda and I want to share that with you because they've just opened the registration and we had quite a few of our SAN members submit proposals. I would say probably 80% or so of those that submitted the proposals were chosen by NASASPS to provide their presentation and those that weren't, I understand that NASASPS will be working with them to provide some webcast on the very good topics that they brought forward. But it just was amazing to them frankly that we had so many good proposals this year. It was a record number, they said.

Cheryl Dowd: So we're very excited about that. So as you look at the agenda, what you'll see is we have the most important thing I think just focus on for SAN is looking at the Tuesday morning and what you'll see there is a slate of SAN related topic items. On the first day, which is a Monday, is the concurrent session. Excuse me, the general session day where we have wonderful variety of things in regard to interactions with SARA by higher ed regulatory agencies, NSP and the institutions learning about what's going on in Washington from our friends at Thompson Coburn. So, these are sessions that we will be able to learn with regulators.

Cheryl Dowd: The next day in the morning is the SAN focused morning where we will have a SAN breakfast and we have a number of sessions starting with our friends from James Madison University who'll be providing a compliance checklist that they've cultivated and worked with colleagues. And we will also have, our next session will be on communication strategies from our friends at Ohio State University. And then we'll conclude the morning with talking about NC SARA reporting being able to look at it from the viewpoint of a small institution and from a large institution. We'll have our colleagues at Texas Women's University and Penn State University providing that session.

Cheryl Dowd: After lunch, our colleagues from Embry Riddle will be providing session on creating a culture of compliance and then we will have, at the end of the day, an hour and a half about professional licensure research from 3 different institutions perspectives from our friends at WGU, Northern State University and University of Phoenix. Very pleased that these will be available to you.

Cheryl Dowd: Then, Wednesday morning is the end of the conference and back by popular demand, information about international compliance for online programs. So, we're very pleased that Greg Ferenbach from Hogan Lovells is willing to come back and do a part 2. We will have an NC SARA update which will include a variety of things including where we are. We should have the guide live by then so to show everyone how to operate and use the guide. Then, we'll conclude on Wednesday with an update from Russ Poulin about the negotiated rulemaking

for 2019. You'll recall that negotiated rulemaking just started last week so by April, we should have some pretty good information about how this will all move forward.

Cheryl Dowd: So, you'll see that the registration option is right there, the link there. This is open to all staff members not just coordinators so you can share this information with others at your institutions. The registration code for SAN members is that 8-digit code that you'll see there. You can share that with your other institution contacts or your other membership contacts if you're from a larger membership. Please share that coordinator code, excuse me, that registration code with other SAN members so that they can register for the conference. It'll be in Jacksonville and that's in mid-April. We really look forward to that.

Cheryl Dowd: If you have any questions about that, please don't hesitate to contact me. Just for those who aren't familiar with it, what we have here is the opportunity annually. NASASPS is very gracious in allowing us to help coordinate the agenda and allowing us to attend as the member rate. This is something that we've been able to do for a few years now and have appreciated their willingness to collaborate with us on this very productive conference each spring.

Cheryl Dowd: I will let you all move on to the agenda because we have Russ and Mary Ann here and I'm here as well. We're attending the CCME conference right now so we have another session that we need to get to so it's important that we move through this first half of the agenda. So, I want to turn it over to Russ who is going to be able to share with us about negotiated rulemaking and suggested principles for addressing issues that you may have seen as the blog post from about a week ago. So, I want to turn it over to Russ now, Russ.

Cheryl Dowd: Dave can be next.

Russ Poulin: Dave's could be next. Okay. Alright.

Russ Poulin: I'm assuming the chair power here so. Hello everyone. I seem to recall at the negotiated rulemaking that there's quite a number of issues that the Department of Education is interested in reviewing and making changes on around accreditation and innovation. We'll have Dave Dannenberg on in a bit. He'll talk about the main committee but I'm a sub-committee that is focused on distance learning and education innovation issues. Well, there quite a number of issues that probably that we'd want to talk about. For the purposes of this SAN call, I'm going to focus on the state authorization discussion. Dave may want to talk about some of the others. For state authorization that there were suggested changes that were put out in paper form prior to our meeting, and that, they were suggesting getting rid of all of the federal language that was introduced in 2016 and was supposed to have gone into effect in July of 2018 but had been delayed. They have suggested the leading on that so that was interesting.

Russ Poulin: When I spoke, I did remind everyone that even if you got rid of the federal rule, but the state still have the rules and we've been constantly reminding people know that, can remind them of that because it's often portrayed that if you get rid of the federal rule then the institutions won't have to do anything with any of the states. That's just not the case. After considerable discussion about the issues and the thoughts of those around the table and just a bit about those who were there that they represent, consumer protection folks, different types of institutions, those who are doing competency based education. We have somebody from attorney's general office. We have somebody from state higher education executive officers. So it's quite a few different constituents whose represented.

Russ Poulin: After some discussion that the Department of Education said that they had discussed and that they do indeed think that they would like to reinstate some of that language and we're looking for committee members to propose what would be appropriate in terms of federal state authorization language. We didn't get too deep into that discussion other than that they would like to see language at our next meeting. At first part of it is that they would continue to tie eligibility for federal financial aid to being approved in the state where you're serving students. Second was around some of the notifications that were in the last one and so we're tracks and the older versions of the world. Especially, the department seems to be taken by the discussions about notifications of professional licensure that it's really a high stakes area for students and that students should now whether the program will lead to licensure after taking the distance if we will meet the academic requirements for licensure within their state.

Russ Poulin: There's also some talk about complaints and actions being part of the notifications but we really didn't get that deep into that. Second big part of the discussion had to do with the definition of reciprocity and reciprocity agreement agency to run those. You may recall that there's a few years ago when they came out in 2016, there is great confusion about the language that the department included. It made it look like it could have reciprocity as long as every state could enforce whatever rule or law that it had which of course if you did that, that it would even really have reciprocity because going back to every state doing whatever it wanted to would put as back to the initial state prior to reciprocity.

Russ Poulin: We do have a couple of the members who are advocating that position that state should even if they're in reciprocity that they should be able to enforce rules like refund policies and should be able to treat institutions of different types differently should they choose. So that they're talking about that. I think, there also were number of members who pointed out that that would harm reciprocity.

Russ Poulin: At this point, it was a lot of general discussion. There is agreement to try to move forward with working on some language although no one was really

appointed but I'm certainly going to try to go to the front and try to look at some of the old language from 2010 and 2014 and 2016 and get some recommendations from that language and look at that language and also interest them in getting input either on this call or after this call. If you want to send emails about what you would like to see or not see in that language, we'd certainly like to hear from you. That's a brief update and so we'd like to turn it to Dan or turn it to Dave or ...

Cheryl Dowd: I'm going to unmute Dan. Dan, are you there? Can you unmute yourself, Dan? Can you see?

Dan Silverman: Yeah. I'm here. Yup.

Cheryl Dowd: Super. I'm a little challenged today because we have just the one screen. I have my little laptop that I'm doing this on today. Plus Dan, if you wouldn't mind, keeping an eye on the chat to see if you will have any questions for us.

Dan Silverman: I don't see anything so far.

Russ Poulin: Okay. Why don't we turn to Dave? Dave Dannenberg, University of Alaska Anchorage. If I could introduce him. He's, A, a great guy and B, he's on the WCET string committee, and C, that he's on, remember I was on the sub-committee that's making recommendations and we're making recommendations to the main committee which will make the decisions on this and Dave is on that. So, Dave, let me turn this to you and see what sort of comments that you have about the meetings that you have.

Dave Dannenberg: Okay.

Cheryl Dowd: Oh, there he is. Hi, Dave.

Dave Dannenberg: Good morning. Thank you, Russ for those kind words. I think you're a great guy too as well.

Russ Poulin: Oh, thank you.

Dave Dannenberg: So, hello everybody. I am David Dannenberg up here at the University of Alaska Anchorage by introduction. I serve or I am serving on the main accreditation and innovation committee as the primary negotiator for 4-year public institutions. It's kind of a daunting task thinking that I'm speaking on behalf of all 4-year public institutions so if you fall in that category, if at any point in time today or over the next few months you have thought, comments, concerns, please let me know because I would love to be able to bring those to the table as we move through the negotiation process.

Dave Dannenberg: As already mentioned, it did start last week. Our main committee meetings were supposed to be on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday. However, as those

of you that sort of live in the DC area or out on the East Coast side, you had a little bit of a snow storm so our negotiations were actually delayed by a day and a half. Instead of starting Monday morning, they did not start until noon on Tuesday. It is still unclear what that would do to our timeline. We did have conversation around that. The department is hoping that we can make up the time as we move through the issues but I think that's even more ambitious than tackling the number of issues we already have in front of us. So we will be discussing probably at February's meeting what we'll be doing moving forward with the time.

Dave Dannenberg: The main function of the main committee in this first meeting was to get our legs under us. So out of the day and a half, rather than actually speaking about all the issues as the sub-committees that were able to meet the following days, after our meeting, we're able to sort of jump in to a lot of their work. Out of the first day and a half, we spent about 7 hours, I guess so that's almost a full day, just doing all the formal practices that have to go in place to begin the negotiation. The introduction of the negotiators of which there are, we just added 1 so I think we're at 16 primary negotiators. Primary negotiators are the ones that do officially vote for consensus on issues and then there's the secondary negotiator who is allowed to speak but is non-voting member of the committee. Those 16 members represent just as you have constituencies.

Dave Dannenberg: And as Russ mentioned we also have the sort of same look at a broader perspective on the main committee so we have 4-year schools, 2-year schools, those that engage in predominantly distance education. We have the state higher education authority. We do not have an attorney general representative on our committee but we do have a couple of consumer advocacy groups from a state-wide level. We have students. We have 2 or 3 accreditation agencies representing different segments of the higher education committee. It is a broad group of folks discussing these issues. We also had to agree on the protocols so the formal set of rules that we will all abide by. Then we had to set the agenda, agree on the issues that would be discussed. There's a lot of formalities that went into it. I was kind of amazed at that part. A lot of formalities had to go in like I said, it was about 7 hours so it took us through all of our first half day and then half way through the morning of our second day.

Dave Dannenberg: By the time our committee started really discussing the issues at hand, it was about 11 o'clock on Wednesday morning. We paused for lunch. Sorry for the background noise. There's a helicopter across the street at the hospital if that's bothering anybody. We jumped into, initially just talking about accreditation. As Russ mentioned, the department did prepare proposed language for us to start reviewing. As they kept saying, this is their sort of starting point. They were open for suggestions and really looking for some agreements and direction on proposed languages. Because there are 3 sub-committees, it's still a little unclear to the main committee when exactly we'll be talking about different issues because the Department of Education was very clear and said that anything that they have referred to a sub-committee, of which there are 3

representing religious based institutions that teach grant few folks and then the committee Russ is on. Anything discussed on those committees will not be discussed in the main committee until the sub-committees have completed their work and bring language or proposals or information forward.

Dave Dannenberg: Timing wise, we're still all little uncertain of when we'll be talking about what topics but we did start with section 602 which covers the accreditation and who and what goes into being in that accreditation agency. We only got, honestly, through 5 or 6 sections based on the discussion so I'm happy to take questions or concerns but honestly and because we missed that day and a half, there honestly wasn't a whole lot of discussion of the actual issues on the main committee at this first meet.

Cheryl Dowd: Thank you very much for that synopsis, Dave. I really appreciate it. Dan, if you could watch the chat for us. Does anybody have a question for either Dave or for Russ? We're really fortunate that we have this direct connections to our main committee and also to the sub-committee. So Dan, do you have any questions you can share with us?

Dan Silverman: Yes. We have one here. Wondering if negotiators can communicate outside of the face-to-face meetings.

Dave Dannenberg: According to the protocols, and that sort of again, the rules that we are all acting by. There is nothing prohibiting us from communicating outside of the face-to-face meetings. In fact, I'm sure I'll see this more the next set of meetings as we get into the main event. Russ is already probably living some of it. Specifically when you're talking about proposed language, there would be quite a bit of work going on between meetings for folks to talk about.

Russ Poulin: Let me add to that. Thanks, Dave. In fact, they encouraged us that we are representative of our groups and Dave represent the all 4-year institutions, that's pretty good. They do want us to reach out and do things like this poll to alert people and then to get feedback as we go along. The one thing they asked us not to do is to put any color in terms of what others on the committees are saying or what their, make opinions about what their opinions about what the others are saying. I was trying to be careful to put forward that here's what they said throughout this. I'm sure, Dave and I will both do that. We'll be careful about what we say about other comments from other committee members.

Dave Dannenberg: Exactly. The other thing I would note, Russ and I were in the room and taking part of the negotiations which is ... I found it fascinating but there is a live stream of both the primary committee and all the sub-committees which I would encourage you all to view though I have been told that watching the live stream is not as nearly as fascinating as being in the room. Just be aware that they have asked us not to use our phones in terms of posting to social media or engaging in any sort of outside conversations while we are actually sitting at the negotiation table. If someone was hoping that someone might sort of do a live

twitter stream or post some during the actual day to day progress, that activity is not allowed based on the owner code. Bare concern is allowing people to focus on the negotiations rather than what's happening on the phone. Feel free to reach out to anybody, negotiators, myself, anybody else at any point in time just be aware that we may not be able to communicate right back during the negotiations days themselves.

Cheryl Dowd: Thanks Dave for bringing up the live stream too. I found that really helpful to view and listen to both the regular committee and the sub-committee. Last week, they will be meeting again mid-February and if you go back to the e-news letter viewing at January, there was a URL to find the links to view the live stream and I will put that in the February news letter as well so that you'll have the links to be able to find it. Actually, I don't know if you knew this Dave but they used YouTube for the sub-committee and that was much more clear than the stream that they had used for the regular negotiators. They may have learned from that. It's actually a really good stream to listen and hear actually everything that's going on. You all may appreciate having the opportunity to view that.

Russ Poulin: In our sub-committee, we have a few people who asked for an estimated order of the day of what was going to be discussed and then proposed times for when something would be discussed. So I'm hoping that that agenda comes out ahead of the next meeting. If not, Cheryl could put it out to our folks but it's a lot better for you if you do want to see it to know that you could get on at 2 o'clock Eastern in state authorization part if you want to see that rather than sitting there trying to watch it the whole day and kind of wondering what the next issue will be because it was not very linear for our group.

Cheryl Dowd: Right. And you know what, it just dawned to me. I'll put it on the home page of the website. That may be easier for everyone rather than trying to find it in an email. I will put the link to get the different streams on the home page of the website. If we are able to obtain some kind of an agenda with timing, I will also post that on the home page of the website as well. So be easier to find and you can share that with others at your institutions.

Cheryl Dowd: Are there other questions, Dan that you see?

Dan Silverman: Yeah. Here's another one. For Dave, are you allowed to share some of the proposed language to documents with us same day. Although not while at the table so it's a follow up question to the question about no live social media but what about afterwards?

Dave Dannenberg: We are because there's nothing in the protocols that would prohibit that. I will say, that's not always actually really ... I understand why you would want that, it's not always actually really easy to do. At least, based on my first few hours of experience, and I say that ... Let me preface all of this by saying that in the primary committee, we talked about we will not vote for consensus of the



issues until probably the very last day. We did spend some time about because not hearing back from different sub-committees and because of the complexity of the issues and they're all sort of interrelated, we wanted to be able to ensure that we are talking and understood everything and all the multiple impacts before we decided to reach form of consensus on any of the 3 individual sort of packets the department is broken things into. Consensus, just for anyone who's not aware means that everyone around the table has to agree and if we agree then primarily, that would be the language that will be used.

Dave Dannenberg: There are a couple of exceptions that the department wants to keep on hand mainly regarding the, there was some sort of federal legislation change so then it becomes illegal to do what we had just agreed, stuff like that. But if we reach consensus, then that's the language that would be proposed and be moved forward. So, we won't vote for that for the very last day. What we're doing right now is we go through things. There's a lot of tweaks but they sort of happen on the fly. Almost as soon as somebody proposes one thing, somebody else proposes something else so it will be really hard to give anyone language in the middle of the meeting knowing that it might change 5 minutes later. I am happy to try to do that when we seem to formalize around certain things. Honestly, the best thing to do to see the proposed language is to look at the negotiated rulemaking page and watch for the updates as the department releases them. We'll actually be discussing as we move forward.

Russ Poulin: Especially as the state authorization network here, what we'll do is that as we see proposed state authorization language then we'll send it out to this group and then also, my head is still spinning from the whole thing. I'd hope to have a blog written on this by now but I'm trying to figure out what to say. I think I've got a fast forwards for you but we hope to have a ... Cheryl and I hope I have something out to make this figured early next week with some question giving some of the main issues then some questions that we may have for you about what would you like to see regarding this issue or that issue or how would you improve such [crosstalk 00:29:41] as an example and things like that.

Cheryl Dowd: Great. Dan, what are the kind of questions do we have?

Dan Silverman: We have one. Was there a reason given as to why the committee did not want to add a seat for the attorney's general? That's for Dave.

Dave Dannenberg: That is a good question. Again, as Russ mentioned a little bit ago, I cannot speak for any of the other negotiators. I try to characterize any one person's particular stands why or why not. I will say, out of sort of the day and a half, probably the most hot league contested issue was whether or not the attorney general's office should have representation on the main committee. There were a number of people who felt there should be. There was a number of people that felt they should not be. Honestly, after what seems like hours of conversation, the compromise was struck that we would give a seat on the main accreditation and innovation committee to [inaudible 00:31:05] representative to represent



the states and that the attorney general seat could be represented in the committee focusing on distance education, the one Russ is sitting on.

Dave Dannenberg: The 2 without saying who has said exactly what, the 2 main objections were the belief that there would be, if the state attorney general's office was sitting at the table there was a direct conflict of interest regarding some of the organizations represented in terms of law suits that are currently on going. Secondly, they felt that in terms of from consumer protection perspective that that constituency group was already represented by other members already on the committee. Like I said, it was a very hot league contested in discussed issue over the course of the time we met.

Cheryl Dowd: Thanks, Dave. Dan, are there any other questions?

Dan Silverman: I'm not seeing any but is there time? One came to my mind, do we have time for that or are we up against it?

Cheryl Dowd: We do.

Dan Silverman: This is for Dave as well. Dave, you mentioned all of the times spent setting up the protocols, is that the kind of thing that will pay off down the road? Just having a little trouble getting a sense of that.

Dave Dannenberg: The formal protocols, and I have not looked at the negotiated rulemaking page to see if they've been updated by the department head or not. I asked for a copy on the first day after we agreed to them and they said they would finalize them with the full membership of the committee and then redistribute them. I've not received them by email so I don't know if they've been posted but you can equate them as sort of like the Robert's rules of orders that all the members agreed to. It gives us sort of the formality of these are the rules we will abide by. It discusses everything from in terms of who's on the committee to the formation of sub-committees, to how we will be making discussion or decisions. Who is allowed to officially speak or not speak. And then how to be approved or removed from the committee for different things.

Dave Dannenberg: This is the first time I've taken part of it. For me, I wasn't exactly sure what they serve but I think they sort of set the ground rules that we're all agreeing by. That doesn't mean I'm happy about all of them. For example, there's one that talks about that once consensus has been reached, no one can sort of speak ill directly about them. That's greatly paraphrased. Meaning, and what I took it to mean to be as a negotiator, once we reached consensus, I can't turn around and say, "Oh my gosh! This is the worst thing in the world." Because as part of the group that reached consensus or agreement on it, I was part of that decision making process. The department takes it a step further so in my case, since I represent public 4-year institutions, once we reached consensus, technically no 4-year public institution is supposed to turn around and then say, "These are the worst things ever." I bought that up because I can't control what everybody in a

4-year public institution says around the US. But those are the sort of the ground rules we are all supposed to work with them.

Russ Poulin: Dave, let me add a little more color to that. I was in the 2014 negotiated rulemaking and I think we dispensed with the protocols in under an hour at that time. Certainly, for the sub-committee, we're much more informal and I think we were able to dispense with this time in certainly like half an hour, I think we're able to do it. I think there's some history here in terms of the 2 rulemaking last year for borrow defense and game full employment became very, very, very contentious and I think there were some interest in the department changing some of the rules to try to keep that from being quite so bad. Perhaps some of the ideas not everybody agreed with, I guess I'll put that way so those changes from protocols that have been repeated for several years, I think became hard issues for you. As it's not that common that they're trying to sit 2 people on a committee so I could see where that took a lot of time as well. I think once you get through it and have the rules of the road, that is helpful to the discussions but it was unfortunate that it have to take so long through.

Dave Dannenberg: Yeah. Within the protocols, the 3 main issues that took so long to agree to was whether the alternate was allowed to speak, in the original protocols, they were not what we agreed to is that they were. We're putting some limits around how and when. Obviously, we went back and forth with the membership because we had a lot of discussion about adding members to the committee. Then it was brought up that you can't add members in the committee until the protocols are approved so we sort of went back and forth a couple of times on that. There was also some talk about, in terms of decision making, how things will be grouped together. Under what have been released before hand, it was going to be all these issues were going to be in one big bucket and then we'd have to agree to an all or nothing.

Dave Dannenberg: As Russ just said, based on some previous meetings, they've now sub-grouped those into 3 separate buckets, each relating to a sub-committee and so there's a lot of discussion going back to, okay, what are the groupings? Who can group things? When will we discuss the groupings? That took a lot of time to flush out. There was a lot of work and questions not necessarily regarding the protocols but because of the protocols that took us time to work through.

Cheryl Dowd: Thanks, Dave. Dan is there any others that you see?

Dan Silverman: That's all I'm seeing right now. Thanks, everybody for who did ask.

Cheryl Dowd: We appreciate that. Thanks for watching the chat, Dan. Something that I do want to share is I was really glad that Dave brought up the recordings or actually the streaming. I wanted to point out that it is recorded. If you go to that site like I said, it's posted in the last e-news letter and I will put it on the homepage of the website later today. You can watch the recordings from last week, should

you be interested. There was some very good information shared on the sub-committee at the end of Thursday, beginning of Friday, is that right?

Russ Poulin: Now that you're the poke of it, it's Friday morning, I would say.

Cheryl Dowd: It was very good discussion. Everyone at the table was very engaged so it was a very positive thing to listen to the exchange of the folks that are on the sub-committee on that Friday morning. It was teed up on Thursday afternoon and then completed on Friday morning. I think that's very interesting for those of you that would like to view that. Don't forget, Russ mentioned that there will be a blog post end of this week, early next week that gives you a recap of what it looked like last week in the sub-committee. And Dave, you've shared with us a really great setup of what it looked like for you during those first day and a half of your committee and then he will be meeting with his committee again after the sub-committee meets in February. The sub-committee will meet first and then the committee will meet, they reversed that order for February. They wanted to get the protocols out of the way in January but in February, the sub-committee will meet first. We will keep you up to date on what is happening through this negotiated rulemaking process.

Cheryl Dowd: Thank you very much to Dave and thank you very much to Russ. Russ, do you have any final words you'd like to share?

Russ Poulin: No. We'll just say, again, do the watching and do reach out as we go along. It's probably good to put something in the subject line in the negotiating rulemaking so that we can [inaudible 00:40:51] or emails.

Cheryl Dowd: We will be looking for that. If you have any further questions or comments that you would like to see addressed. I'm going to turn this over to Dan in just a second so that I can get back to the CCME meeting but before I go, I just wanted to point out a couple of things. The state authorization basics workshop, Dan will talk more about but I wanted to point out that there's an early bird registration that were supposed to end this coming Friday. We've chosen to extend it until February first so if you have anybody at your institution who's interested in the workshop, please know that the early bird registration has been extended until February first. Then, Dan can tell you more about the announcements but please see below that we have added these new events for February, the middle of February, so please have a good look at that. Dan will tell you more about it. I appreciate Dan taking over the rest of the meeting so that I can get back to the CCME. So, thank you, Dan and thank you everybody for being with us today on our first Zoom coordinator call. Have a great day everyone.

Dan Silverman: Okay. Thanks, Cheryl. Thanks everybody. We're moving on here to the next item on the agenda, something I have learned recently that might help others. I've visited a friend recently who is obsessed with model trains, making the tracks and all the different types of engines and everything. I do not share that

obsession but I do share the obsession with the end in the state authorization network. We're trying to think of as many ways to get you guys talking and get as many voices into these calls and other areas of SAN programming as we can. So, with that, may I ask for volunteers to see if anybody wanted to share something? Anything really that they've learned that might help others. Charlene Lee from East Carolina was going to go first but she actually got sick today so we're going to Beverly. Beverly, are you there? Beverly Wade.

Beverly Wade: Yes. I'm here.

Dan Silverman: Okay. Take it away.

Beverly Wade: Alright. California have passed a law last year called California Consumer Privacy Act. It will go into a fact January first of 2020. Basically, it is a data protection act and any entity that is doing business in the state of California will be affected by this. It is care towards data driven businesses of all side. What it does is it provides California consumers the protection. We will have the right to know all data collected by business on us. The right to say no to the sale of our information. The right to delete our data. If some of these are reminding anyone of you to [inaudible 00:43:52], it loosely is similar but not exactly the same thing. The right to be informed of what categories of data will be collected before, I'm sorry, about you prior to its collection and to be informed of changes to how this information is collected. The right to know the categories of third parties with whom your data is shared. The right to know the category of sources of information from whom your data was acquired. The right to know the business or commercial purpose of collecting your information.

Beverly Wade: My institution is currently in the process of figuring out how this will affect some of our business practices. But one of the things that I'm thinking off just at the top of my head is as we collect data for this whether it's grad school or undergrad for student list. I wanted to make sure that I let the rest of the network know that you may want to check your third party vendor contracts to ensure that they are aware of this upcoming privacy act and that they are at least in the process of trying to get in compliance with it. Because, like I said, it goes into effect January first of 2020.

Dan Silverman: Thanks, Beverly. Is it your understanding then that universities who have students enrolling from California distance or otherwise would be subject to this?

Beverly Wade: That's my understanding right now. How it is that it's going to be enforced by the attorney general. Just understanding California law, I don't see them making any kind of differentiation but one they're saying that it applies to all entities doing business in California. Yeah. I'm taking them seriously on that. That that's exactly what it means.

Dan Silverman: Okay. Thanks. Does anybody have any questions for Beverly on this one? I'm not seeing any in the chat box right now but that is a good heads up and also a better reminder that our webinar on February 13th on this topic. You can read about that at the bottom of the agenda. We are getting towards the end here. The state authorization back to basics workshop, we are trying to doing something new this year which is a, any participant there can take an assessment at the end to receive a credential. This is the BTC SAN's first dipping our toe into the pool of badging which we're seeing all the cool kids are doing nowadays in a number of areas. We're working on questions right now the way it works for those of you who have gone to a basics workshop before.

Dan Silverman: We're an advanced for that matter but at the end of the actual test you would take when you get back to campus so you will learn everything you can while you're there and you get back to campus and have a chance to go online and take an online assessment. You will be then graded and if you pass, you will get a wonderful new credential which we will then see what that does in terms of how interested people are. So you have a chance if you go to this first basics workshop to be one of the beta testers, if you will of our new first road of badging.

Dan Silverman: Anyway, I encourage anybody to attend this who wants to go to the basics workshop. We are working on the curriculum day and night over here. I would encourage that and also remind you as Cheryl does, to take a look at the announces at the bottom for the upcoming programming of a forum and data protection webinar. Do we have any questions from anyone about anything? They don't. See anything. So, we do have 1 question here for Beverly. Would you mind sharing a link or a copy of the new act? I will.

Beverly Wade: Not a problem.

Dan Silverman: Okay.

Beverly Wade: I was slow on the take but yes. I will put it in the chat box but I can send it to you as well so you can send it out to everyone.

Dan Silverman: Yeah. Why don't you do that.

Beverly Wade: Okay.

Dan Silverman: We'll send it out in the next mailing and yes the mute on your quick draw [inaudible 00:48:51] of office workers these days. Okay. So, seeing nothing else. Thank you all for your time and I'll look forward to you next time we talk. Thank you.