Academic Assembly March 26, 2012 2:05–3:35pm, STCN 130 <u>MINUTE</u>S

Present:David Arnesen, Brenda Broussard, Mary Rose Burkaue, Feldt, Paul Fontan Eerry Foster, Sonora Jha, Tina Johnson, William Kangas, Chuck Lawrence, Kristi Lee, Michael Skeamotti, McDowell, Jacquelyn Miller, Mary Sepulveda, Frank Shih, Chris Stipe, Jeremy Stringer, John Weaver, Jason Wirth

Minutes taken by Rosa Hughes.

- I. Introduction of substitutes Mary Sepulved Library) and Frank Shit Science & Engineering).
- II. Minutesfrom 3-12-12 approved
- III. FY13. 0 0

- 1.Issues that faculty, staff, and students don't feel comfortatule/ressing within he new structure(s), such astierpersonal difficulties, departmental issues, and othegue situations that the new policies don't necessarily address.
- 2.Importance to students
 - a. The normal chain could lack confidentiality
 - b. Safe space to discussiven if claim is incorrect or has no merit.
 - c. Avoid retaliation
- 3.Importance to faculty.
 - a. Navigate policy territory and advise on how to proceed.
 - b. The more detailed the policies become, the greater the need for someone who is an

- F. The draft was approved y vote
- VI. LMS Recommendation Guests: Randy Horton, Chuck Porter, Rich LeBlanc)
 - A. After an 18 month needs analysis process, the FTC/ATC has developed a short list of four LearningManagementSystems with recommendations.
 1.Desire2Learn(D2L)
 - 1.DesirezLearnDZL
 - 2.Instructure
 - 3.Blackboard "Learn"
 - 4.moodlerooms (was just bught by Blackboard)
 - B. Needs analysisscluded:
 1.Faculty survey
 2.Angel Use Analysis
 3.Stakeholder Meetings
 - 4.Industry Trends
 - 5.Peer Institutions
 - C. Usability and Performance, Supp, and Functionalitywere the main faculty priorities Additional features that were important to SU: Architecture and Technical, Budget, Business, Security nd Legal
 - D. Evaluation activities:
 1.Faculty Usability Tess
 2.Vendor Demos
 - 3.Student Usability Tests
 - 4.Online Sandbox Demos
 - E. Results:
 - 1.Faculty Usability Test was best wi.