

Academic Senate of College of San Mateo



Tuesday, November 12, 2024
2:30pm - 4:30pm

Building 19, Room 121
1700 W. Hillsdale Boulevard, San Mateo,
CA 94402

<https://smccd.zoom.us/j/85134096982>

Meeting ID: 851 3409 6982

Phone: +1 669 444 9171

Officers	
President	Todd Windisch
Vice President	Daniel Keller
Secretary	Yvette Butterworth
Treasurer	Stephen Heath (≈3pm)

Standing Senate Committee Chairs	
Curriculum Committee	Jeremy Wallace
Distance Education Committee	Jennifer Howze-Owens (out 4:10)
Committee on Teaching & Learning	Susan Khan

Division & Student Representatives	
Student Representative	Anthony Pena Vasquez / Simon Htet (≈2:45)
Academic Support & Learning Technologies / Library	Matt Montgomery (absent)
Academic Support & Learning Technologies / Library	Wesley Hingano (≈3:10)
Business/Technology	Hellen Pacheco
Business/Technology	Kimberly Salido
Creative Arts/Social Science	Leighton Armitage
Creative Arts/Social Science	Maggie de Vera (absent)
Kinesiology/Athletics/Dance	Kajari Burns (absent)
Kinesiology/Athletics/Dance	Sarah Artha Negara (absent)
Language Arts	Mick Sherer
Language Arts	Robbie Baden
Math/Science	Wendy Whyte
Math/Science	Beth LaRochelle (Zoom; will not vote)
Counseling	Emily Cotla
Counseling	Brandon Williams
Enrollment Services and Support Programs	Makiko Ueda

1. Opening Procedures				
No.	Item / Description	Presenter(s)	Approx. Start Duration	Action?
1.1	<p>Call to Order (2:40 when quorum reached. Prior to this time, Todd gave an informal synopsis of Fall Plenary. At this time we have enough present in the room and though Beth LaRoche was present on Zoom, she chose not to be included in official voting, avoiding roll call voting.)</p> <p><i>Senate meetings shall require a quorum of the membership to vote on action items. A quorum for a meeting of the Senate and all Senate committees shall consist of 50% plus 1 of the committee's voting faculty members.</i></p>	President / Facilitator	~2:30pm 2 min	Procedure
1.2	Adoption of Today's Agenda (Motion Jennifer Howze-Owens & 2 nd Leighton Armitage. 12 Approved, 0 Nay, 0 Abstained)	President / Facilitator	~2:32pm 2 min	Action
1.3	<p>Adoption of Consent Agenda (Motion Jennifer Howze-Owens & 2nd Emily Cotla. 11 Approved, 0 Nay, 1 Abstained)</p> <p><i>All items on the consent agenda may, by unanimous vote of the Academic Senate members present, be approved by one motion after allowing for Senate member questions about a particular item. Prior to a motion for approval of the consent agenda, any Senate member, interested student, citizen, or member of the staff may request that an item be removed from consent to be discussed in the order listed, after approval of remaining items on the consent agenda.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Approval of faculty appointment(s) ● Draft minutes from previous meeting(s)... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ October 8, 2024 	President / Facilitator	~2:34pm 5 min	Action
1.4	Public Comment (Robbie Baden announced Writer's Rukus which is a showcase of great student writing will be held at 1:30pm in Building 10 on Wed., 11/20. Susan Khan announced that College 1 sections First Year Experience ID 110 course is having a "Community Cultural Wealth Symposium" where they will showcase their	Public	~2:39pm 6 min	Information

	<p>research posters in Bayview on 12/3. Todd asked for flyers for both events.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions/comments on non-agenda items • If more than one public commentator is present, comments may need to be limited to 1-2 minutes to accommodate everyone 			
2. Standing Agenda				
No.	Item / Description	Presenter(s)	Time	Action?
2.1	<p>Presidents' Report (Unofficial (prior to call to order) Plenary recap: Todd, David Eck for DAS, Gampy Shankar from Canada, Kate Brown for Skyline where representing our District. Late resolutions for AB-1111, AB-1705. Todd highlighted what didn't pass: 101.01 asking to stop using SLOs and only use course objectives to align with other system partners who don't use SLOs in order to make articulation easier; 101.4 for auto approval of ethnic studies; 105.04 which asked ASCCC to establishing guidance for syllabi by asking that the ASCCC create a document to encourage the use of syllabi and to dictate come of this information, such as office hours, be included in such a document, since there isn't anything in Ed Code or Title V that says we must have a syllabus. Everything else passed. Implications of things passed will be discussed later, but here are a few that we may discuss: Creation of an Indigenous People's holiday, resolutions around AB-1111 asking for a pause in implementation until the first 6 agreed upon courses have been articulated UCs will articulate and the UC and CSUs. The agreement had been made that the UCs would articulate the courses if they were written using the templates, but they reneged on the articulation agreement citing that the templates weren't substantive enough and needed more detail, which seems to give the faculty on campus less flexibility in their curriculum. Common curriculum push is what it seems like the UCs are headed toward according to Todd and Jeramy Wallace, which is why Todd voted against the resolution. Jeremy said to remember that the resolutions are not actionable, but instead just tell ASCCC to go talk to the State, but it</p>	Todd Windisch & Daniel Keller	~2:45pm 10 min	Information

doesn't mean anything is going to change, it just guides their work. Beth was in attendance virtually, so when we have the discussion in Senate, Todd will call on Beth LaRoche to add her perspective.

DAS has not met since our last meeting, so there are no updates.

IPC last week with 2 major presentations. One presentation was an update from facilities on building projects. Their [powerpoint](#) is linked on their website under the November 6, 2024 meeting Agenda and Minutes or you can ask Todd for more information. The second update was on basic food services for students. This included information on the tango and SAM cards. These were/are pilot projects and they are looking at how they can increase the services and at balance the budget.

BOT

DPGC voted on Board Policy on cancellation of classes. The AP, academic policy, is what the Chancellor has purview over, and since DPGC voted to pass the board policy presenting the two options, the chancellor will now choose from among the two choices that have been presented. The choices are the 50% of the class maximum enrollment that we had previously reviewed and the new 2 fixed number policy based on modality which came out of the faculty survey. It is now up to the Chancellor to decide what the academic policy will be. Todd believes they are moving toward the 2 numbers policy because it seemed that the faculty preferred this policy and the Chancellor's office seems to think that this policy will be easier to implement. Jeremy asked on numbers in that and Todd referred to the link in the [DPGC agenda](#) from November 4, 2024, but he believes it is 15 for in-person and 20 for asynchronous courses. The comments that Todd brought concerning the mission statement was heard and the committee will be having further discussion about the inclusions of values in the statement making it more substantive, but they have not yet voted on it.

Participation is requested for IPC, the safety committee, the tech committee. Todd is currently serving on the safety committee in the place of a faculty member. The Tech Committee that is under IPC and run by Tarana Chapple.

Jeremy asked about the Auxiliary Services Committee. The bookstore is under the

	<p>auxiliary services and all report to Richard Story. We no longer have a bookstore manager and there seems to be some restructuring, so perhaps that is why there hasn't been a call for faculty participation. Todd said that we currently don't have a bookstore manager and that Kevin from Skyline was filling in for the vacancy. Jennifer added that Jay (Kumar) from Canada has also been helping fill in. The clarification of Jay's last name came from Jeramy when Leighton asked if anyone knew who Kumar was.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● District Academic Senate ● Institutional Planning Committee ● Board of Trustees (next meeting 10/23) ● District Participatory Governance Council (DPGC) ● Calls for Participation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Institutional Planning Committee (1 faculty member appointed by Senate) ○ Safety Committee (1 faculty member appointed by Senate) ○ Technology Committee (1 faculty member appointed by Senate) 			
2.2	<p>Curriculum Committee Chair Report (A few big things are happening this semester. First, the Common Course numberings were approved a few weeks ago and they are board approved at this point.</p> <p>The Curriculum Committee is also interested in having a facilities update. They had a discussion about beach volleyball and led to a bigger discussion like how all academic facilities are looking, since one of the charges of Curriculum Committee is to ensure that the facilities exist for the programs that the committee is approving. Jeramy asked who provided the facilities update that Todd discussed and Todd said that Marie provided information on the capital side of the project and Robert provided information on local facilities stuff like taking down dead trees and other happenings on the campus. Beth added that beach volleyball was passed but facilities said that the location wasn't OK, and facilities had to locate another place which they have by tennis courts and the project is now moving forward with the courts placed near the tennis courts instead of between the athletic center and the library where there was concern about noise disruption.</p>	Jeramy Wallace	~2:55pm 3 min	Information

<p>This Thursday the Committee will begin discussions about the residency requirement for certificates. A couple of years ago the Committee voted to allow students to get an Associates degree from CSM if they completed 50% or 12 units of their course work at any college in the district rather than 50% coming from CSM. The Committee will discuss whether they wish to make the same change for certificates.</p> <p>The Committee will also be discussing the American History and Institutions area this Thursday. This is currently a part of the Associates Degree at CSM, so the discussion will be whether CSM will keep that requirement. The tenor of the Committee indicates that they will likely keep the requirement which will mean that the local degree will be updated by adding an Area 8 beginning next Fall. A vote will be taken on 11/21 about this addition.</p> <p>The Committee will have two meetings coming up in the next two weeks due to the amount of work the committee has to do and the interruption of the Thanksgiving break in the meeting schedule.</p> <p>Next Thursday, the Committee will also be discussing Title V changes. Title V has changed how GPAs are computed, making GPAs based only on courses that apply to their degree instead of based on all courses. That means that a student who takes 80 units and only 60 apply to their degree, will have their GPA computed based on the 60 in the degree. Since Jeramy isn't sure what the benefits are, they are going to bring in the counselors for this discussion. Though the discussion may get started next week, it may be pushed to next Spring.</p> <p>At the December 5th meeting, the Committee will be finalizing Area 7, Self Development and Kinesiology, which was already voted in. However, since they changed some of the requirements for the courses being placed in the Self-Development area, there will be some courses that don't really fit anymore. The division reps will be reaching out to people affected by the discussion, but if you haven't heard anything, then your courses likely aren't impacted.</p> <p>The final thing the Committee will be discussing are the phase two and three of the common course numbering. Over the next few months, thirty to forty courses will be done. The third phase will be coming next Spring. Since the UCs and CSUs didn't</p>			
---	--	--	--

	<p>approve the phase one templates as they said, there is a little hesitation and the philosophy will be to approach the new templates in a way as to make the new courses look exactly like the old courses with different ordering to maintain articulation. There will be a workshop on the templates that the UCs have approved next Spring, likely in April at the mid-semester Flex day. Todd added that he reached out to all discipline faculty asking with a call for participation in the training for the phase two common course numbers template use. The state was very late in getting back to the colleges about who had been chosen to participate. The state had asked for 2 names from each college, from which they would chose only 12 to participate; keep in mind that is 12 from 230 offered names. For October 28, 29, 30 (email recruitment sent 9/18) Tatiana Irwin (History), Robbie Baden (English), and Keira Travis (English) and Cheyanne Cortez (Art History) volunteered and only Cheyanne Cortez was selected to give feedback in the template development. For the November 18, 19, 20, 21 (email recruitment sent 9/20) John Dow (Chemistry), Lena Feinman (Math), Harry Nishanian (Math) volunteered and John Dao was selected for feedback. For the December 2, 3, 4 (email recruitment sent 9/20) Minu Mathur (Sociology) volunteered.</p> <p>Jeramy said that interest for the Committee Chair position is still open.)</p>			
2.3	<p>Distance Education Committee Chair Report (The committee's only order of business for update concerns the online handbook. During Flex Day in October was first check with faculty and DEAQ reviewed in the last session and they are putting the final touches on the update and will likely come to Senate for approval in December or January.)</p>	Jennifer Howze-Owens	~2:58pm 3 min	Information
2.4	<p>Committee on Teaching and Learning Chair Report (During the Committee's meeting they completed their draft of revised Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs). They want to get feedback from the Senate soon.</p> <p>Todd wants to know if the IPC or Senate should see it first and asked for the Senate's feedback. The Senate agreed is that the IPC should have the approval first so we only have to review once, since Todd indicated that the Senate has the last approval.</p> <p>The Committee also discussed Flex Day and reflected on the theme of revisiting the in their January 10th meeting. They will reflect on what they have accomplished and</p>	Susan Khan	~3:01pm 3 min	Information

	<p>what remains to be done in the areas of anti-racism and combating anti-blackness. A call for proposals went out and asked for submission of proposal by the end of the week. Susan shared that link, is on the website. The District Flex day is being coordinated by the District Teaching and Learning Co-Chair, Sarah Harmon, and the District Professional Development Coordinator, Chris Collins. They are doing a second part to the AI Symposium that was held last January. Proposals are welcomed and can be submitted to them or through Susan.)</p>			
2.5	<p>Student Representative Report (No update.)</p>	<p>Anthony Pena Vasquez / Simon Htet</p>	<p>~3:04pm 3 min</p>	<p>Information</p>
2.6	<p>Other Officer & Liaison Reports (Jennifer Howze-Owens shared for OER that they had about a dozen faculty complete the professional development option that they began this summer. They also offered it this fall with some faculty completing more than one. They will be discussing the benefits with the faculty to illicit their feedback. Jennifer just wanted to share that this type of self-paced PD courses are available. They will be talking with Danni Redding Lapuz and others to discuss continuation.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CSM Faculty Dual Enrollment Liaison: Leo Cruz ● ASCCC CTE Liaisons: Christy Baird & Beth LaRochelle ● ASCCC OER Liaison: Jennifer Howze-Owens ● ASCCC Rising Scholars Faculty Liaison: Wesley Hingano ● ASCCC Legislative & Advocacy Liason: Emily Cotla ● ASCCC IDEAA Liaison: Makiko Ueda ● ASCCC Part-time Faculty Liaison: Maggie de Vera 	<p>Treasurer, Secretary & Faculty Liaisons</p>	<p>~3:07pm 3 min</p>	<p>Information</p>
<p>3. Senate Business</p>				
No.	Item / Description	Presenter(s)	Time	Action?

3.1	<p>Vote to Affirm CSM's Interest in Exploring a Compressed Calendar for the District (Action is to be taken about the agreement to move forward with the compressed calendar. Please read the resolution below that we will then vote on. Beth LaRochelle asked if once the resolution was voted upon, whether he would add a date to the resolution. Todd said that we will make it official after it is approved. Motion to approve was made by Susan Khan & 2nd Robbie Baden. A discussion was begun. Wendy Whyte wanted to make sure that our approval didn't mean that we approved without further discussion and a vote would be needed to approve an actual proposed compressed calendar. Todd felt that the vote for approval was assumed, but he said that we could add that wording. Todd asked if the motion and second still stood with the slight change in the wording and Susan and Robbie agreed. Kimberly Salido clarified that the changes wouldn't happen for at least 5 years. Todd affirmed that the time line would be out a ways due to the many things that need to happen, like contract negotiations and pointed out that we already have approved calendars through 2027. Makiko Ueda wanted to know what would happen with the faculty that has unique schedules and wants to make sure their needs would be met. Todd said that Library faculty feels similarly and that such effected faculty should keep an eye on these discussions. 13 + 1 advisory Approved, 0 Nay, 0 Abstained.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resolution to Affirm the Academic Senate of College of San Mateo's Interest in Exploring a District-wide Compressed Calendar 		~3:30pm 5 min	Action
-----	--	--	------------------	--------

3.2	<p>Resolution to Support Students Affected by Ongoing Conflict in the Middle East (Elinor Westfold and Robbie Baden came to discuss the draft resolution. Elinor would like feedback today, especially on a particular resolve where Elinor and Sarah had different versions (see the “Alternative to above” on page 2). Elinor developed it specifically in response with conversations to Palestinian students. She would also add that a lot of this is from Canada’s resolution.</p> <p>The following commentary occurred while looking at the two different versions on page 2, see the draft resolution for specific details. “...recognizes the value of diverse perspectives and experiences in enriching our campus community and affirms that the Palestinians and Palestinian Americans...” Wendy Whyte would prefer the more general version, the alternative version, because she feels it focuses too much on certain groups and brings in hard feelings. Jennifer Howze-Owens feels the opposite about supporting certain groups who are feeling marginalized. Wendy brought up that all colleges made resolutions and that they all call out the Palestinians, and maybe they leave out all the other groups that may feel marginalized too. Todd added that if the entire resolution is read for context and whether it checks the boxes for what we are looking for. Todd feels that in many places the resolution is very general and does support a wider group. Kimberly Salido feels a middle ground is needed between the two statements, because the first is too specific and the second is too vague. Wendy felt that the associated students could announce or publicize certain things to promote the viewpoints of certain groups. Wendy was invited play around with the words and provide some specific language to Robbie and Elinor. Beth LaRochelle appreciates all the work that was done on this resolution and she would like to continue to call attention to the Palestinians and Palestinian American’s in this area because this was brought forth by a specific group which will validate that group. She can’t add to the wording, but she’d like to add that others would also have our support. Her feedback related to the resolve before the two options in question. Elinor likes Beth’s idea of highlighting the group that came for support, but in addition giving affirmation to others with a little wording after the recognition of the Palestinian students. Todd added to the discussion here and Robbie did as well. The general idea is to give credit to those that brought forth the topic, but at the same time not negating other student groups.</p> <p>Todd asked that we move on to other parts of the resolution so to get all the input that</p>	Elinor Westfold & Robbie Baden	~3:10pm 20 min	Discussion
-----	--	--------------------------------	-------------------	------------

we can. Susan Khan said that the Center for Integrated Profession Learning is mentioned and since the idea is not completely formed, maybe it isn't the best to call attention to the Center. The consensus is that we aren't sure who should be called out, but maybe leaving it a little vaguer and just call attention to stakeholders. Beth brought out that the populations were called out earlier in the whereas, then the resolved could be more general. In this way, this resolution could be used in other instances. Todd clarified that the whereas contains the specificity and that would allow less specificity in the resolves. Mick Sherer didn't feel that the Palestinians and Palestinian Americans weren't called out in the whereas statements, so taking it out in the resolve wouldn't be the best. Robbie appreciates both Mick and Beth's viewpoints, and he also felt that the link between the whereas and resolution statements was needed and made it stronger. Robbie wants to hear about any concerns, as he appreciated the concerns from the Center for Integrated Professional Learning. Since Wendy was on the writing team, Todd asked for her input. Wendy had an issue with the paragraph in the first page. She doesn't want the resolution to take a non-political stance. She wants to affirm the goals in the resolution. Instead of affirming the ASCSM resolution, she'd like to affirm their goals. Robbie didn't wish to see that type of change because it seems to change the flavor of the resolution. It seemed that this discussion may have happened in the meeting, and the change had not been accepted at that time either. Todd called for other input since the Senate is here to add their input. There was no further input from the Senate. Wendy said the student resolution was asking for a specific action and she didn't want to affirm those specific of goals, but wants to affirm the support for what could be termed as humanitarian effort. Mick clarified about the word "affirm" and wants to make sure that we mean "recognize" and not "agree." Elinor feels it was meant to be a recognition, and felt that affirm was stronger. Brandon Williams is happier with affirm. Jennifer doesn't want the "teeth" to be taken out of the resolution. She feels everything isn't always going to be balanced. Wendy wants to know if the students were asking for us to support them. Todd doesn't believe the students ask for our support, we are standing behind them. Beth feels that when the students puts forth the effort to put out their feelings that we need to potentially be uncomfortable in order to support our students. Robbie wants to call attention to the fact that the students did this without our opinion being asked or our approval requested.

Todd asked for any language input to be sent to Robbie and Elinor so that they can

	bring the resolution for a vote at our next meeting.) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Draft Resolution• Returning for action at the November 26 meeting			
--	--	--	--	--

<p>3.3</p>	<p>Nuventive Presentation from PRIE (Natalie Alizaga is manager of institutional effectiveness for PRIE and Monique Nakagawa is the Interim Dean of PRIE. Todd introduced the purpose of today’s visit as the presentation of a new proposal for adopting a software platform to evaluate SLOs. IPC will be voting on the adoption of the software in their last November meeting. As a result this may be our last opportunity to ask questions about the impacts of adoption. Please see the presentation attached below for the details.</p> <p>Problems: Process has never been “memorialized” or formally outlined. Demonstration of accreditation standards can’t be determined.</p> <p>Nuventive will help the college deal with program review, resource request, and SLOs. CSM is currently only using Formstack which doesn’t do anything but store data. The information is dumped into Excel and the information must be analyzed by hand. In terms of storing the data the data is stored in SharePoint which is basically a filing cabinet. Using Excel to analyze the data is cumbersome due to the hands-on nature and rewriting macros that are necessary as needs and input of data change.</p> <p>The college had three choices: Nuventive, Elumen, or to make no change. The Nuventive software is already in use by the other two colleges so it comes with a support network internally. It also integrates with OneLogin. Elumen will handle the 3 processes that are needed and it can integrate with Canvas and Banner, but with our customization with Banner it won’t work for CSM. Doing nothing could be considered as being less expensive, unless the work needed to complete all tasks handled by the proposed new software is expensive in a different way. Nuventive is the preferred because it meets all the needs.</p> <p>There are two timelines that are important in adopting the Nuventive software. The college needs an SLO process and then Nuventive needs to be set up in order to accommodate the College’s plan for evaluation. The hope is to have an introduction of the software in April and training May through December.</p> <p>Mick Sherer wanted to know if the faculty will need to adapt a certain software, like Canvas, to assess SLOs. Wendy Whyte wanted to know if Canada and Skyline’s feedback has been bad or good. Natalie said that the only glitch is that any changes to</p>	<p>Monique Nakagawa & Natalie Alizaga</p>	<p>~3:35pm 20 min</p>	
------------	---	---	---------------------------	--

<p>the process needs to be changed through Nuventive, but that it is generally a good experience. Todd Windisch feels that the response is positive as well. Robbie Baden wanted to know what kind of changes the faculty will be asked to make and if the faculty will be able to do any data crunching on their own. Monique said that there will need to be research requests made for most data crunching because what Robbie noted was institutional data. Canada did create data dashboards that faculty could use, but the data is pretty “canned” and is not dynamic. Natalie said that the level of tracking depends on what the faculty decide to do for their SLO assessment.</p> <p>The costs for Nuventive will be a one-time \$10k setup fee and an ongoing cost of \$20k per year for licensing. The first year the cost will come from the PRIE budget. With all the colleges using the software, the yearly cost will come out of the District budget because the cost will be centralized.</p> <p>Makiko Ueda wanted to know if specific departments would have the freedom to change the requested input information. Todd said that will really be dependent upon the development of SLOs and SAOs. Monique added that the changing the SLOs directly was not a good idea because it because a tracking mess, and resulting in a loss of ability to track and align the data. There was a discussion surrounding process and effects on student services as well as SLOs and SAOs as they change from year to year. Mick was concerned about what would happen if the SLO process isn’t a good fit within the Inventive software. Monique feels that it won’t be a problem and neither does Todd since it will accommodate our current process.</p> <p>IPC is planning to adopt Inventive this month. Please let Todd know of concerns so he can share in IPC. Natalie wanted to share that she can share her Inventive access to show anyone who would like to view.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nuventive Presentation from IPC, Oct 16 			
--	--	--	--

3.4	<p>Approval of Resource Request Prioritization Plan for November & Establish Evaluation Criteria</p> <p>(The resource request process has been expanded this year to make it more transparent and to include more opportunities for feedback from faculty and staff. The Senate was tasked with doing its own prioritization parallel with the Deans, which the Senate will then forward to the Cabinet. The Senate Executive Committee met twice to come up with a process which is shared in the document below. We will vote on whether to accept these criteria today. If it is passed, then Todd will send out the prioritization tomorrow. The exec team decided that the timeline is too short to bring in outside sources to support the position requests, so the team chose to provide the information to all in Senate and allow them to read and reach out to others for more information as Senate members feel is needed. The Senate needs to provide their prioritization by December 4, so this is our timeline. The voting for prioritization will occur via an anonymous spread sheet which will be tabulated to get the Senate recommendation. The spreadsheet also includes prioritization by the divisions. Emily Cotla brought up that the Coastside Counselor position is being merged into 1 request verses 3. Todd will clarify this before sending the spreadsheet out. Robbie Baden wanted to make sure that the spreadsheet is anonymous. Susan Khan wanted to make sure that no one can change another person's input. Todd said that others can adjust, so cautioned make sure Senate members to write down their choices and check them when we do the review prior to voting. Jeremy Wallace wanted to make sure we could vote after a final discussion. Todd said that we would have that opportunity, and we could even ask for updates before making the final tabulation. Hellen Pacheo wanted to know about the ability to bring programs in to give a pitch. Todd said that there was one pitch that we didn't realize was a pitch early in the semester and we decided that we didn't want to encourage that to be fair to all requests. Brandon Williams wanted to know about the spreadsheet and the two separate line items on the Communication's faculty request. Todd listed the two positions based on the prioritization from the divisions. Beth LaRochelle wanted to make sure that we aren't going to get off topic when the final vote comes about. Todd will do his best to keep the discussion on track when it comes to the final vote. Jeremy wants to bring up that CalGETC has impacted the growth of some programs. Todd added the CalGETC and curriculum changes to the list of considerations. Todd called for any other updates to the considerations and a discussion was had about other criteria. With 10 in the room, we will vote. A motion was made by Wendy Whyte & Kim Salido 2nd to approve the process. No further</p>	Todd Windisch	~4:05pm 30 min	Discussion / Action
-----	--	---------------	-------------------	------------------------

	discussion was forthcoming and the motion passed with 10 Approved, 0 Nay, 0 Abstained.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty Resource Request Prioritization Process & Criteria 			
4. Closing Procedures				
No.	Item / Description	Presenter(s)	Time	Action?
4.1	Final Announcements (none) <i>President or facilitator elicits final announcements about upcoming deadlines, events, scheduling changes, etc.</i>	President / Faciliator	~4:25pm 5 min	Information
4.2	Adjourn (4:29)	President / Facilitator	N/A	Procedure