

## May 2020 SAN Coordinator Call Transcript

Cheryl Dowd: There you go, Dan. Okay, we seem to be having an issue again. Dan seems to be on mute. I'm not sure what's happening there. So, Dan, one more time we'll try to get you off mute. And if we're not able to, we'll just progress with the call. Okay, he's still on mute.

Well, welcome everybody. This is the May coordinator call and we're really happy that you could join us today. We have a very full agenda, as you see, and we're starting off with a person that I'm glad-

Dan Silverman: Hey, everybody, this is Dan. I can't hear a thing.

Cheryl Dowd: ... okay, Dan. I'm going to-

Dan Silverman: Are you really talking?

Cheryl Dowd: ... yes, I'm texting you. Okay. Well, sorry folks that we're having these issue. So, what we're going to do is go ahead and move forward with our first agenda item because this is a very important one. We're talking about the July 1 Federal regulations that are to become effective. You know that these were released back in November, and they've been on ... an institution could choose to have already implemented these July 1 regulations, but what we're going to talk about right now is there's been some questions about whether they're going to move forward and how should we be addressing these regulations. So, Caitlyn, I'm going to turn it over to you. Welcome.

Caitlyn Shelby: Great. Thank you so much for having me. And just for the sake of the technology check, can you hear me all right?

Cheryl Dowd: Yes, you sound great. For those of you that don't know Caitlyn, Caitlyn Shelby is our wonderful colleague with Cooley LLP. She's an attorney there, she has helped us in advanced topics workshops and on virtual seminar. She's a terrific colleague and we are really grateful that she could take the time today to speak to us.

Caitlyn Shelby: Well, thanks for that introduction, Cheryl. It's always great to join my friends at WCET and it's my first coordinator call. So, thanks to all of you for having me as well. It's great to take a little bit of time to touch base on the Title regulations. I'm sure that everyone has a lot on their plates right now, personally and professionally, and it can be a little bit difficult to find ways to interact and keep on task, especially when you have something before you like these new regulations and coming into compliance with them. Probably it really requires quite a bit of teamwork and engagement from different levels of institution, from your General Counsel's office, from folks who are familiar with the program curriculum, to administrators. I really think compliance here is an all hands on deck situation, and I know that this group always takes these regulations seriously and really understands not only the nuts and bolts, but

also the bigger picture. So, it's great to be with this group and to dialogue more with folks who really have their arms around this day to day.

I'm here today to talk about these regulations and to share my thoughts about timing and keeping the eye on the ball, and to hone in on a few particular issues. Clearly, I'm an associate at Cooley, attorney by trade. Here not, today, to provide specific legal advice. I'm sure very smart people in your Counsel's office or other outside counsel that you'll really bounce things off of before implementing, but that said, always happy to engage offline and kind of drill into any of these topics a little bit further.

So, with that said, it's not lost on me that yesterday was Memorial Day. I don't know if anybody got up to much, but being in D.C., I stared out the window a lot and looked at the lovely weather, but didn't quite get out and engage. We're still in quite bit of a lockdown here until June 8th. So, it doesn't quite feel like the unofficial start of summer, but I suppose it really is, which means that July 1st is right around the corner. It's really sneaking up on everyone, or at least sneaking up on me, and I get the sense that a majority of institutions, although there was an option to implement these regulations early, did not do so. So, I imagine that in addition to a number of other issues that institutions are dealing with related to COVID-19, related to the pandemic response and trying to be forward thinking to fall, I also expect a lot of institutions are really seeing that July 1st date circled on their calendar and wondering what it means for them and how they can best prepare.

So, I think a question that's kind of floating around in the ether is, hey, is this July 1st date really going to be the effective? Is this really going to be the date when these regulations are finally going to take effect? I don't have a crystal ball, I wish I did, so I can't say for sure. Stranger things have happened, particularly in relation to state authorization regulation over the past, what, four or so years now. Kind of a long history of delays, and legal challenges, and implementation kind of sneaking up on you. But for purposes of these regulations, it's my thought that at any rate it's important to act as though July 1 is going to be the date. I certainly haven't gotten the sense from the Department, in any of their other FAQs or guidance that's been issued, that there's a real push to reconsider the date.

In a different context ... I don't know if anyone caught [Caydis 00:06:55] Jackson's [SNAQUA 00:06:57] presentation a couple weeks ago, but at least in connection with the new Title IX regulations, August 14th is the effective date for those regulations. And the Department seems quite inflexible on that deadline. Seems to be pretty certain that it's set that expectation and that institutions need to be ready for that date. And, again, different regulations, different context, but I think that there is possibly some carryover, too. When asked why the Department was maybe not considering any flexibility in the Title IX effective date, the response was something along the lines of, "Well, you've had time. You knew these regulations were coming, and you should have

probably been working towards that in this timeframe." And I think there's a little bit of that sentiment that kind of carries over into these Federal regulations as well.

Negotiated rule making ended over a year ago. Believe or not, the NPRM came out almost a year ago. And the Department was pretty clear in the final rule that finally came out that it was not interested in implementing any sort of grace period or giving any flexibility for institutions to come into compliance, particularly the professional licensure disclosures. And so, of course, anything can happen. Either unprecedented times, if you aren't tired of hearing that phrase yet, but they truly are. So, maybe there will be some communication that comes down, but I really do think that it's in an institute's best interest to act as though July 1st is going to be the target to put plans and processes into action to be ready by that date.

If an institution already has distance education offerings, you might have a little bit of a head start because maybe you've already been thinking about this specifically with your distance education programs that prepare students for licensure. So, maybe there's already been some advance work done. And those institutions that have early implemented or have really had a great head start or have been chipping away at this, I think it's great. Maybe July 1st is not that scary. But I think anytime you see a deadline coming up, especially in light of national and international turmoil, it's only natural to feel a little bit anxious about being ready for that date. So, kind of beyond my general sense of timing and just a friendly reminder that among the million and five other things you have going on, this is one more thing that requires your attention.

I want to just touch on a few questions or a few areas that Cheryl and I kind of kicked around the other day, and that I think certainly come up in other conversations and discussions. And maybe some of these things have been on your mind too, particularly in the context of professional licensure disclosures. And I think one thing that ... obviously it's one thing to read the rule and to understand what the goal is, what the intent is, and it's an entirely different thing to actually try to put this into action and formulate the disclosures that you need to formulate. Do the very difficult research, coordinate, learn about these programs, all in the spirit of being precise, and being accurate, and providing the information that you need to provide and keeping the students front of mind.

An area where I think, as institutions dig in a little bit into the research that they need to do in order to really make these disclosures, assuming that you've made the choice to go down that path and make a determination as to whether a program meets the educational requirements for licensure, and more specifically whether the curriculum of that program meets the requirements for licensure is, how do I go from this research and then put it into these categories? And I think a question that some institutions may have, and something that some institutions may be considering in kind of making these

categories and these determinations is, well, here's a program where, okay, it does not meet all of the requirements for licensure in a state. Maybe the curriculum ... or maybe it's a nursing program, and your nursing program contains or includes a certain number of clinical hours and covers a range of substantive topics, but in a particular state, the State says, yeah, and there also needs to be three hours of pharmacology or something like that.

And you're looking at this, and you're saying, hey, we're doing pretty good here. Our curriculum meets almost all of the requirements to qualify for licensure in this particular state. And I think the instinct there may be to say, yes, because you feel like the program really does meet and check a lot of these boxes, and then to disclose maybe the one area or the couple areas where it's close, but not quite there. And I like to think of that ... and it's easy to frame that as a yes and. Yes, we meet the requirements, and you need to keep these things in mind. I think it's really a yes, but, right? Yes, the program meets these requirements, but not really. And in thinking about if there's a program or a situation like that, I think again it's important to consider a couple things. And one is really whether this yes, but approach is really compliant with the intent and the spirit of the regulations, which is to provide very discrete categories, to provide concise and precise categorizations, and to take the burden off of the student.

So, in a situation like that, where you're saying yes, but not really, I think it's important to ask whether that really is compliant and is within the spirit of the regulations, and whether that's providing the level of consumer protection and student protection that the Department is aiming for with these categories. And the second thing to think about is really a little bit more of a practical question, from a risk standpoint, which is, at the end of the day what you are coming up with are how to fit the program within these three categories, this yes, no, or no determination. And that's really what you need to provide, right? Just it does, it doesn't, or we haven't checked, we haven't made the determination.

Anything beyond that, any additional information beyond that I think that institutions should really consider whether it's worth potential risk of misrepresenting what's missing to provide that information. I think it runs the risk of giving the impression that maybe the school is working with that State Board or State regulator to try to find a work around. We're almost there and we're getting there, which may or may not be accurate. But at any rate, I think you do run the risk of unintentionally, because I do think this comes from the best intention, unintentionally misleading someone when you're adding more information to that yes determination, all in the name of really trying to be as accurate as possible, but also really frame the program in a more positive way.

And I'm very sympathetic to the optics of this because I think it's human nature, and I think it's also just good business sense, and I think there's a lot of reasons why nobody ever wants to say no. And in part because no also has other obligations that are triggered with a no under these regulations. So, I

understand the inclination to move a no to a yes. But from the Department's perspective, I think it's important to remember that at least from the regulations and the way that they're crafted, the Department doesn't view no as a bad answer, and it doesn't even view no determination as a bad answer. I don't think there is that inherent judgment call built in from the Department's perspective.

I think, from a student facing perspective, I understand why no feels like the wrong answer. But I think institutions are coming from a place from wanting to empower students and wanting to provide the right information. And I think if you continue to follow that thread, I think where you land is that if you can't really say yes and really check all the boxes, then it's a no and those obligations attach. And you're able to engage the student or the prospective student in a way that the Department intended, and that is meaningful to the students, and meaningful to the institution and, frankly, protective for the institution.

So, I think that's kind of one area that I think, as institutions are really trying to actually implement, and from a practical standpoint put these regulations in a way that's going to work within your system and with your institutions culture, that's one kind of question and one kind of idea that has been floating around. And in a similar vein, I think another sort of question about framing, or level of detail to provide, or level of research leads you to an area where maybe you think there has to be a shortcut, right? You cannot possibly be expected to do all of this research for all of these programs in all of these states and reach these determinations. And I guess, in a way, that's true. You aren't, right, because there is that third bucket, that third option where an institution can make a conscious determination ... that's a bad word ... a conscious choice to not make a determination. So, in a sense that's true.

So, maybe if you want to call that a shortcut, I guess it is. But what I'm thinking of are shortcuts like relying on or drawing from compacts. A natural sort of inclination would be to say, look, we offer registered nursing programs, and we are in a state that is a member of the RN Compact. And therefore, our program qualifies students for licensure in every other compact state. And I think there's some logic to that, right? Because you think okay, what a compact effectively does is allow someone who is already licensed to qualify, or transfer, or have some special privilege in another state, then sure that has to trickle down. But really, when you take a deeper dive and you think about what the purpose of a compact is, it really is a tool for folks who are already licensed professionals, right? So, who are already a registered nurse in Virginia and need to move to Maryland for some reason, and are able to facilitate that transfer easier.

What a compact doesn't do is focus on that initial level of attainment, right? So, that first RN, that first license, a compact doesn't really have any control or any authority or any effect there. And that's where these Federal disclosures come in, is it's focused on that initial licensure question. So, not does your program qualify students for licensure in state X? And then, because state X is a member

of a compact, they can then qualify for licensure in states A, B, C, D, E. That's not how the disclosures are framed, it's not what they're asking, right? They're asking specific questions about curriculum, which compacts really don't get into. And I think that's another area where it seems like a natural fit to say, look, there's a compact, and I think we can rely on that compact to make these disclosures. Unfortunately, it's just not that easy.

And if anyone's looking for more information about that, I just want to give a shout out to the WCET SAN Special Interest Team for Professional Licensure who published a really great piece recently covering these topics. Kind of fact and myth, and getting into what does a compact do, and how you can think about it, and the interplay with disclosures or lack thereof. Maybe that's old news to you, but I found it was a really great piece.

And then, kind of moving on from just making the determination and making it precise, I think another question as institutions go about their research is, there's a lot of requirements for licensure actually, right? There are background checks often, fingerprinting requirements, a number of things that are all very important to actually qualifying for licensure in a state that have really nothing to do with the educational program, or more specifically the program curriculum. And so, I think it's natural to say, hey, while I have this entire list of licensure requirements in front of me, I need to include them all in my disclosures, or I need to make sure that they're reflected some way within this yes, no, no determination framework. And, again, I think maybe institutions provide this information in other areas, I'm not sure. But really, the disclosures, again, are focused on the program curriculum and that's what the basis of the disclosure asks the institution to do, is to make a yes, a no, or cannot make a determination about whether the program's curriculum meets the requirement for licensure, not whether a specific student checks all of the other boxes for licensure.

So, in terms of providing that additional information, I think again you open yourself up as an institution to potential risk and exposure by providing information beyond what is required, and particularly what is required this disclosure framework. So, I think it's something that I think is great for maybe institutions to be aware of, and to be informed about, and to be able to answer questions about, but in terms of presenting these disclosures, making these specific disclosures in these categories readily available, do you need to provide, or otherwise link to or summarize the other requirements, it's sort of outside the context of these specific disclosures.

And so, one-

Cheryl Dowd: This is Cheryl. Can I just ask a questions here?

Caitlyn Shelby: ... sure.

Cheryl Dowd: Just from what I hear you saying, from these examples that you've just provided, is that the specific language of the regulation for the disclosures, it's really important that ... unusual, isn't it, that we actually have a regulation that's really specific. So, we can really look ... am I accurate to say that we can really look at these regulations and point out the specifics of what the institution should be doing?

Caitlyn Shelby: Yeah, I think that's right. And I think particularly in the actual disclosure language, when you get down to, oh gosh, 6-68.430, Subsection C, where it's actually talking about the effect that these determinations have, and what your obligations are in terms of notifying current and prospective students, the regulation does really spell out what they're looking for you to confirm or to provide responses to. And it's not ... I speak very generally about this sometimes, and it's really a defect and it doesn't do the regulation service because I think I, and a lot of other folks say, does the program meet the requirements for licensure in a particular state? And that's true, that's the gist of it. But you're right, that the language really is more precise and it's really about the curriculum. Does the program curriculum meet the educational requirements.

So, at the end of the day, that's where ... when you're thinking about all of these kind of ancillary or related requirements for licensure, it's a good idea to just recenter yourself and focus back on the language of the regulation, which is really focused on the program curriculum. So, I think [inaudible 00:26:20] point, I think that there is a level of specificity here that is helpful and that can be relied upon.

Cheryl Dowd: Thank you. I think we're going to have a couple of people that would like to ask a couple of questions. So, I wanted to give time for that, if you don't mind taking a couple questions from some folks on the call.

Does anybody have any specific questions they have at this point? I feel like Caitlyn's done a tremendous job hitting some of the points that I'm hearing from members that have caused them particular concern. So, thank you very much, Caitlyn, for hitting those. Any follow-ups from anybody? You can put it in the chat, or please feel free to come off mute to ask Caitlyn a question.

Ann Torneece: Hi, this Ann [Torneece 00:27:06] from Indiana State.

Cheryl Dowd: Hi, Ann.

Ann Torneece: Hi, how are you?

Cheryl Dowd: Good. Glad you could be with us.

Ann Torneece: Thank you. My question, nobody seems to have touched on it, it relates to what programs we add in our licensure list. And in the discussion part of the

regulations, it speaks to programs which require licensure for employment, but it also refers to programs which are advertised to ... like accounting, that you could sit for a CPA, even though you don't need a CPA as an accounting major. So, we're having a question about do we include ... oh, and in the final reg it doesn't speak to advertising, it just says for employment. So, do we take that, required for employment, as the only list of programs to include?

Cheryl Dowd: I'm going to let Caitlyn address this, but I think, Ann, you might want to go back and look at the regulation because it talks about it within the regulation, about whether they were designed or advertised. It's within the regulation itself. When you look at 6-68.43(a)(vv) something like that, I think it really does spell out which types of courses are the ones that are subject to these notifications.

But, Caitlyn, do you want to correct me there because I may have incorrectly stated that.

Caitlyn Shelby: No. I mean, I think that's right. I'm trying to just have it in front of me here, so I can [inaudible 00:28:43] as you're talking. But it is ... and you're right, actually, and you even got the pincite right, which is astounding. That's wonderful. But to take I guess maybe your second question first, the language of the regulation really is a licensure or certification that is required for employment in an occupation or is advertised as meeting such requirements. So, is advertised as leading to licensure. And, again, I think when kind of kicking around some of these questions, it's helpful to think of the Department's intent, and think of a consumer protection perspective, in that not only is it important to make sure that the program the student is actually taking, and maybe is expecting to qualify them for licensure, that they have information about whether it does or doesn't, but also if there's an advertise ... if you're advertising a program as meeting these requirements, whether it actually does or not.

So, I think important to think of it in that context and it really does capture both. It captures the required for employment or if it's being advertised as meeting those requirements. And, again, to just touch briefly on your first question, I agree. I think that's really the most kind of challenging part of these regulations, at least from my perspective, is kind of determining the universe of programs that qualify to licensure, lead to licensure.

I think it's a question where, again, it's been helpful to engage with a number of folks at an institution to really understand, is that the intent of the program, is that what the curriculum is designed for? I think obviously there are programs that are ... some liberal arts programs and other programs that maybe aren't so specifically geared towards a profession, and others that very clearly are. So, it's kind of a ... not a straightforward answer, but I really ... I do think that's the challenging question, and I think it does require a little bit of institutional soul searching to really nail down what the goal of this program is. Internally, how is it treated, how it talked about, and to kind of use that as a jumping off point to



creating that universe of programs that you're going to be making disclosures for.

Cheryl Dowd: That's great. We have got a number of questions here, but I'm going to bring it down to just one question to you, Caitlyn. And the rest of these questions, I want to encourage people to look back at the blog post that Dan and I have written about a number of these topics. When we talk about ... especially we talk about the haven't made a determination. And we know that the Department has indicated that you could be compliant tomorrow by indicating that you have not made a determination in any of the states. However, as we've shared through the ... the preamble indicated that that could happen, but they would encourage you to do a triage method.

Certainly it's a marketing issue because institutions are ... some are going to move forward, so students are savvy and they're going to prefer institutions that they can get good information from. So, institutions are going to want to move in that direction. They're going to want to provide the contact information for the State Board as a ... or Federal as a best practice, but SARA already asks that as a part of the current 5.2 requirements. So, there are reasons for that.

But I'm going to move specifically to the idea of teaching endorsements. We may be able to get Caitlyn back and talk more on this in another time. So, I want ... Caitlyn, I'll talk to you about that later, but if you could address teaching endorsements today, I would really appreciate that. And then, we'll let you breathe because we've asked a lot of you today.

Caitlyn Shelby: Oh, I'm happy to field the questions and, again, happy to talk to folks offline as well.

Yeah. So, teaching endorsements, I think it's certainly an area where there a lot of uncertainty. I think it's not as easy to maybe conceptually think about within this framework as some other professions. And, admittedly, I am very lucky at Cooley to rely on colleagues who not only know the teaching and [inaudible 00:33:54] fields very well, but actually have a whole licensure chart about where endorsements, endorsement requirements in different states and for different types of endorsements.

So, I will admit I am actually not the best person to speak to about teacher endorsements, other than to say that ... ooh, Cheryl, I don't know. This is a tough one.

Cheryl Dowd: No worries.

Caitlyn Shelby: If you have any-

Cheryl Dowd: No worries. We will ... thank you about the endorsements questions, there's three people that indicated that we will ... we'll hunt down that answer, and

Caitlyn and I will talk about it more too and provide that in the wctMIX. So, look forward to some more in-depth information about endorsements on MIX, okay? So, that will be coming up.

So, Caitlyn, you have been tremendous. Thank you so much for addressing this issue with us, it's of concern to everyone. Hearing from you specifically about your idea that it's going to move forward with July 1 helps us to understand. I will point out to everyone that I had submitted to the Department, asking if there was going to be any sort of delay or enforcement flexibility. I have not heard anything back. I communicated with our colleagues at NASFAA, the financial aid folks, and they had submitted the question as well and have not received a response. But their indication is they think that this will move forward as well, especially given the idea that you can choose the option of have not made a determination. Again, I urge everyone, if they do that, to include contact information for that State Licensing Board along with that to meet SARA requirements and also as a best practice.

So, Caitlyn, thanks so much for being on this call. Really appreciate it. And I will be in touch with you to follow up on endorsements.

Caitlyn Shelby: That would be great. I really appreciate all of the great questions. And I'm not saying this as a joke, you all really make me smarter every time that I talk to you all, and it's just a real pleasure. So, thank you.

Cheryl Dowd: Oh, thanks so much, Caitlyn. We really appreciate that. And I love that Caitlyn did a shout out to our Special Interest Team. That was wonderful. Something we were going to talk about a little bit later, but we're going to move a little bit more quickly now through some of the updates.

The Special Interest Team, since our last coordinator call, has provided on the SAN website information about compacts, the myths and facts about compacts. Plus they have provided the transcript to an interview with someone that is a representative of both the teaching compact and of the nursing compact. It's a really must read, and it's available on the SAN website.

Dan, is your audio back up? I'd like to turn the meeting back over to you.

Dan Silverman: It's back, it's back.

Cheryl Dowd: There we go. Yay, Dan. All right, Dan, I'm going to turn it over to you.

Dan Silverman: Okay. We're going to go then to Tyson Heath, Western Governor's University, to talk a little bit about the new Special Interest Team that will be brewing this summer. It's a great idea that Tyson and others have come up with.

Tyson, are you there? I'm not seeing Tyson, so we will ... in a nutshell, so many of these ... the regulatory information that you learn can only be implemented

with good campus buy in. And campus engagement, and engagement with leaders on campus has been something that, at the institutional level, has been something that we've talked about in different contexts for years. And now we are looking to tap into your expertise even more, to have a Special Interest Team just coming up with resources on that topic. So, Tyson can talk about that some other time.

Next on the agenda is ... Cheryl, did you want to go, or do you want me to do ... or is it Lisa's turn?

Cheryl Dowd: Let's go ahead with Lisa.

Dan Silverman: Okay. So, the SAN Advisory Group, which was one of the groups that came up with this Special Interest Team idea, has one opening this summer. Katherine [Cross 00:38:17] from the University of Louisville, her two-year term is expiring. She is eligible to run again if she would like. But this ... we are going to have an election for a member of that group, which is just as it says, an advisory group just to Cheryl and me, and a representative body for all of you members. The election is going to be open for nominations from July 6 to 17, and the voting will take place from July 20th to the 29th. So, it's a little bit far ahead. That seems like 2075 to me in some ways. But we wanted to at least get it out there on your radar and have Lisa Siefker, a member of the committee, talk a little bit about what they do and to encourage as many people to run as possible.

Take it away, Lisa.

Lisa Siefker: All right. Thank you, Dan. First, I wanted to share a little bit more information about the SAN Advisory Group for any members who might not be familiar with it yet. Basically, the group was created a couple of years ago to serve as kind of a connection between SAN and the member institutions. And the intent of the group is to provide feedback to SAN on programmatic issues or new ideas. We help with some of the planning for SAN events and new activities. As far as time commitment for serving on the group, we typically have a phone call to touch base about once a quarter, and try to coordinate an in-person meeting every year as well. So, there's a little bit of preparation and follow up work that goes along with that.

But I would really encourage any SAN member who would like to share their experiences with State Authorization, or share feedback, or ideas with SAN, to submit a nomination for the open seat on the group. It's a great opportunity to get to know other SAN members, and to kind of collaborate and learn from other group members as well. And I think the goal for the group is to be representative of the SAN membership. So, whether your institution is large or small, or SARA or non-SARA, or whether you're new or you have a lot of experience with State Authorization, I think that we would really value having your perspective as part of this group.

So, again, I would encourage anyone who has time and interest to submit a nomination. I'd be happy to answer any questions about the group. And otherwise, I'll turn it back to you, Dan.

Dan Silverman: All right. Thank you. Yes, working with Lisa is reason enough to get on this group.

Cheryl, I think you are now going to provide a few updates?

Cheryl Dowd: Sure. But thanks, Lisa, for that explanation. And we're really pleased with having the SAN Advisory Group to give us insight and it's been very helpful. They've helped us direct what our Special Interest Teams should be, and so those have been very productive. And we're looking forward to the next Special Interest Team.

A few things that I'd like to share. We had some discussion last month about the SANSational Awards. And I think it's hilarious that Dan just said it feels like, what, 2075 is coming up, yeah, or is in the future. Yes, I feel like June 17 must be a million years away, but yet June 1 is coming up next week and that just shocks me. So, that means that June 17 follows soon after that. So, the SANSational Award submission period is from June 17 to July 17. And as we talked about last week, it would be great if your institutions would consider submitting their own good work. And so, you can look on the SAN website. I think the best place to go is the main landing page for SAN Awards to look at the SANSational Awards from previous years, and you can also gain access to the application. And the information about how to submit is all available on that same landing page.

So, I would take a look at that. All of you are doing such great work, and here is an opportunity for you to showcase it and for us to recognize you. And we appreciated being able to do that for the last many years.

We have three different category. One is licensure programs, about how the institution is managing notifications and disclosures. One is location, how to determine. It adds a little extra nuance now that the Department has provided direction about how we determine location because we know that we need to meet Federal regulations. We also need to be aware of how we determine location for purposes of SARA compliance for reporting, data reporting. And also for being able to know where our students are located for professional licensure. So, location really adds new dynamics, so how are you doing that at your institution? Then, finally, a newer area that we started a couple years ago called compliance innovations, and it's a catch-all kind of. But it provides the opportunity to submit about the tools you've created, or the special teams you've created at your institutions, or perhaps a policy that you've created at your institution that brings in all the key stakeholders. So, it's very open, but it also provides us with some insight into the creativity that the institution has done to be able to manage State Authorization compliance.

So, we look forward to your submissions. We have a team who will be reviewing the submissions after July 17. And we will be announcing it in late summer, and providing them with an award and notification. And we're very excited about how we're able to do that. So, please have a look at that website, please consider the projects you're doing at your institution, and we look forward to those submissions.

The SAN Membership renewal time is upon us as well. It is amazing that June 1 is so soon, and we have asked that June 1 be the date that you provide your changes to your membership. That's the deadline. We would appreciate any changes by June 1 because we will be releasing invoices after June 1. So, we will assume that you're status quo and happy to renew you after the June 1 deadline for changes. So, we look forward to a SAN 10, we look forward to SAN 10 with you. So, if you have any changes within your membership, please let us know and we will make those adjustments. And you can find that information about the process for renewal on the SAN website, or you can relocate the item on MIX. So, you can look on MIX.

Actually, I hope that you all have found that you can find older distribution of topic areas for SAN on MIX because your community is the SAN Network or SAN Coordinator communities, and both of those will have the previous discussions available. So, you can review and learn some of the things that we talked about. If it's an issue that wasn't something that was of a priority at that time, but is now, you can go back and see if we've addressed it already before and ask follow-up questions. So, please have a look at that.

Something that also just came to our attention is some of you are interested in attending NASASPS. NASASPS is, as we know, did not move forward with an in-person conference, they have a virtual conference. It's a one-day, three and a half hour conference. \$75 is the fee to SAN members, there is a code. This agenda has been updated since the one that Dan sent out on Friday, but it will be on the SAN website probably tomorrow, and you can get that code and the access to register is you're interested. The topic areas they will cover are three different sessions. Distance Education Quality, a session about Virtual Site Visits, and a session on Insuring Health and Welfare of Students and Institutions. So, you see the main topic area, Leading Higher Ed in the COVID-19 Era, and then those three topics will have sessions during the NASASPS virtual conference, if you're interested.

So, that's all on the updates, Dan. I'm going to turn it back over to you.

Dan Silverman: Okay, great. I also wanted to touch on a couple of other burning questions here. The SAN Challenge question, that puppy is taking a little rest. May or may not be resuscitated. Unsure. But I do want to take a moment to recognize some new coordinators to the group. So, we have Katherine Embry from Teachers College at Columbia University. Laura Henley from University of Alabama. Kim Howard from Columbus State University. Chris Hightower from Texas Christian

University. And [Tarina Casarto 00:48:03] from the Nevada System of Higher Ed. Welcome to them all. Hope you'll enjoy this group, hope people will reach out to them.

A couple of other quick updates here. We heard about the great work that the Professional Licensure SIT is doing, and they are actually looking for some new blood. So, June 1st to the 12th, they will have some information out for people to volunteer to be a part of the group. So, it looks like there will be some kind of questions, an application to fill out June 1 to 12. So, if you're looking to participate, that would be great.

Quick update on the SAN Coordinator onboarding project. Thank you to the beta testers. Hopefully you should have information now in your email about joining that next community and plowing your way through that.

And I think that is all I have. Anything else, Cheryl?

Cheryl Dowd: Well, I'm really glad we're able to move forward with that onboarding project. It's one that Dan has spent a lot of time with, to help people have greater access to and understand the access to the SAN website, and what it can do for you in terms of the resources. So, I appreciate the work Dan and the beta testers have put into that.

And just say again, the Special Interest Team work is available on the SAN website. I strongly urge you to look for that. Again, the home page of the SAN website is a great first start, and you can find materials throughout. There is a search guide with the resources, and I am pleased to say that ... I would say in the next two to three weeks, we will have main a search bar for the whole website, not just the research search tool. That's within the website, there will be a main search bar that's accessible for the whole SAN website. So, that's coming soon, in the next couple of week.s

Dan Silverman: Cheryl, it's also linked down there in the agenda, in connection with the-

Cheryl Dowd: There you go.

Dan Silverman: ... forum in June.

Cheryl Dowd: Oh, then I should ... let's point that out as well. Everybody, after you've had a chance to take a look at that, you can ask your questions to members of that Special Interest Team about what they found, if you have any follow-up questions to the research they provided. So, we're really pleased to be able to have them be on the open forum in just a couple weeks.

Dan Silverman: Yeah.

## May 2020 SAN Coordinator Call Transcript

Cheryl Dowd: Any questions from anyone before we go? I know there's still Federal regulation questions. Caitlyn was a trooper sticking with us through that. We will follow up on some of these questions that folks asked, and you will see answers in MIX. But at the same time, are there any SAN member questions to the updates that Dan and I just provided?

All righty, not seeing any. So, Dan, I'll let you conclude.

Dan Silverman: Thanks everybody for tuning in. I'll let my opening joke marinate for another month, sorry I missed my intro. And we look forward to hearing from you in any number of ways whenever it's convenient. Thanks again.