

Academic Senate of College of San Mateo



Tuesday, August 26 2:30pm - 4:30pm

Building 10-468
1700 W. Hillsdale Boulevard, San Mateo,
CA 94402
Zoom
<https://smccd.zoom.us/j/85146915715>

Meeting ID: 851 4691 5715

<i>Officers</i>	
President	Daniel Keller
Vice President	Rene Anderson
Secretary	Yvette Butterworth
Treasurer	Makiko Ueda

<i>Standing Senate Committee Chairs</i>	
Curriculum Committee	Malathi Iyengar
Distance Education Committee	Jennifer Howze-Owens
Committee on Teaching & Learning	Susan Khan

<i>Division & Student Representatives</i>	
Student Representative	Ameer Dababo
ASLT / Library	Matt Montgomery (Left 4pm)
ASLT / Library	Wesley Hingano (absent)
Business/Technology	Vacant (8/20/25)
Business/Technology	Kimberly Salido
Creative Arts/Social Science	Lee Miller
Creative Arts/Social Science	Maggie de Vera (Zoom)
Kinesiology/Athletics/Dance	Kajari Burns (absent)
Kinesiology/Athletics/Dance	Mike Marcial (Zoom; left around 3pm)
Language Arts	Tim Maxwell
Language Arts	Robbie Baden
Math/Science	Wendy Whyte
Math/Science	Beth LaRochelle (Zoom)
Counseling	Emily Cotla
Counseling	Jennifer De La Cruz
Enrollment Services and Support Programs	Daniel Rhyne

1. Opening Procedures				
No.	Item / Description	Presenter(s)	Approx. Start Duration	Action?
1.1	Call to Order (2:33) <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>	President / Facilitator	~2:30pm 2 min	Procedure
1.2	Adoption of Today's Agenda (Motion to approve today's agenda was made by Jennifer Howze-Owens & 2nd by Tim Maxwell. 15 Yes. 0 No. 0 Abstained.)	President / Facilitator	~2:32pm 2 min	Action
1.3	Adoption of Consent Agenda (Question from Makiko Ueda about a committee member from another campus; Daniel Keller clarified that the person was to be approved. Motion to approve today's consent agenda was made by Jennifer Howze-Owens & 2nd by Beth LaRochelle. 16 Yes. 0 No. 0 Abstained.) <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> • Approval of Faculty Appointment(s)	President / Facilitator	~2:34pm 5 min	Action
1.4	Public Comment (Susan Khan is an approved member for the new committee focused on PD including Flex Day. The committee will report to IPC. If you are interested planning and development of professional development or Flex Day, please reach out to Susan Khan. Lee Miller asked about the Committee for Teaching and Learning and why that committee isn't still dealing with professional development and flex. Susan explained that there were changes made to the committee and that the duties related to professional development and Flex Day are no longer a part of the committee. She clarified that this is a request for assistance. Steven Lehigh wanted to clarify the message stated during Flex Day about the budget crisis. The District itself is not short on funds. The College of San Mateo is having some budget issues, but not the District. The faculty funding isn't necessarily a part of the issue and the District is choosing to allocate funds in certain ways and this could contribute to the faculty funding shortfalls.)	Public	~2:39pm 6 min	Information

Meetings of the Academic Senate are open to all members of the public. Materials are posted on the meeting page of the Senate website.

	• 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	Presidents' Report (Typically this space would include reports from District committees such as the BOT: Board of Trustees, IPC: Institutional Planning Committee, DAS: District Academic Senate, and DPGC: District Participatory Governance Committee, but at this time most committees have not met and there is little to share. Instead of reporting, Daniel discussed the Brown Act, including protocol for using Zoom to attend the meeting as a Senator. Any time a Senator is present as a voting member via Zoom there must be a roll call vote, which is why we are conducting those today as we have voting Senators on Zoom. He also reminded Senators that their absence in person must be justifiable and a request to be present via Zoom sent prior to the meeting for approval. In addition, any Senator is only allowed two absences with representation via Zoom according to the Brown Act. Daniel invited any questions about Zoom and Brown Act. Jennifer H. clarified whether Daniel would prefer questions to personal or Senate President email. Daniel said either. Daniel also requested that any information for the Friday announcements be sent to him by Thursday.)	Daniel Keller	~2:45pm 5 min	Information

	Note: There is nothing yet to report from regular committee meetings (District Academic Senate, Institutional Planning Committee (IPC) & Accreditation: or District Participatory Governance Council (DPGC). I would like to use this time instead for a quick welcome and a review of senate policies, including the Brown Act			
2.2	Curriculum Committee Chair Report (Phased scheduled deadlines for regular course modification deadlines. There had been issues in managing the workload. See the schedule:	Malathi Iyengar	~2:50pm 3 min	Information

Phased Deadlines for Curriculum Course Modification

DIVISIONS AND DEPARTMENTS					FACULTY SUBMISSION DEADLINE INTO CURRICUNET	DEAN'S REVIEW AND APPROVAL DEADLINE	CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MEETING DATE
Training Session for CC Representatives							8/28/2025
ACTG, ADMJ, BUS., CIS, DGME, KINE courses for Cal-GETC	ASLT; Counseling; Career	CCN Phase II and III			End of Spring 2025	End of Spring 2025	9/11/2025
ACTG, ADMJ, BUS., CIS, DGME, KINE courses for Cal-GETC	ASLT; Counseling; Career	CCN Phase II and III			8/21/2025	8/28/2025	9/25/2025
Non-CTE Kinesiology	Non-CTE CASS	CCN Phase III			9/4/2025	9/11/2025	10/9/2025
Non-CTE Kinesiology	Non-CTE CASS	CCN Phase III			9/18/2025	9/25/2025	10/23/2025
Language Arts	Non-CTE CASS	CCN Phase III			10/9/2025	10/16/2025	11/13/2025
Language Arts	Non-CTE Math and Science	CCN Phase III			10/16/2025	10/23/2025	11/20/2025
Overflow	Non-CTE Math and Science	CCN Phase III			10/30/2025	11/6/2025	12/4/2025
December overflow meeting; no new course submissions							1/22/2025
ACTG	ADMJ	BLDG	MUS.	CCN Phase III	1/8/2026	1/15/2026	2/12/2026
ACTG	ADMJ	BLDG	MUS.	CCN Phase III	1/22/2026	1/29/2026	2/26/2026
BUS.	MGMT	PNPA	AOD + SOSC	BIOL (CTE)	2/5/2026	2/12/2026	3/12/2026
BUS.	MGMT	PNPA	AOD + SOSC	BIOL (CTE)			
CIS	COSM + ESTI	DENT	NURS		2/19/2026	2/26/2026	3/26/2026
CIS	COSM + ESTI	DENT	NURS				
DGME	ARCH	DRAF	ELEL	R.E.	3/5/2026	3/12/2026	4/9/2026
DGME	ARCH	DRAF	ELEL	R.E.			
FIRE + EMC.	KINE (CTE)				3/19/2026	3/19/2026	4/23/2026
FIRE + EMC.	KINE (CTE)				3/19/2026	3/19/2026	4/23/2026

The committee would also like the faculty to learn to use CurricUNET for themselves.

*The table above needs to be read from right to left. The table was sent out earlier and will now be implemented.)

2.3

Distance Education Committee Chair Report (Donna Eyestone is no longer the DE Coordinator. The major focus for the Committee this semester will Regular and Substantive Contact ahead of the accreditation visit. The QOTL 1 & 2 updates are pending funding and as soon and funding is released the dates will be announced.)

Jennifer
Howze-Owens

~2:53pm
3 min

Information

2.4	Committee on Teaching and Learning Chair Report (The first meeting of the committee will be on Monday, 9/22. Leadership and the charge of the committee is changing. After the change the committee will have to establish its working protocol, so there will be some adjustment with the transition. The primary focus of the committee moving forward will be on assessment. The committee will be working on SLO and ILO assessment, and may be overseeing program review though that will be discussed later in the meeting. Committee membership needed. A minimum of one representative, but ideally two, are needed from each division. Representation is currently missing from Math & Science, Creative Arts & Social Sciences, Kinesiology, Athletics & Dance. If anyone is interested reach out to your dean. Jennifer Howze-Owens asked about adjunct representation pay in Senate Committees. Daniel Keller said there would be more of a discussion about this during the Liaison reports in a report from the Treasurer.)	Susan Khan	~2:56pm 3 min	Information
2.5	Student Representative Report(Today was the first day they have met, so there was not much to report.)	Ameer Dababo	~2:59pm 3 min	Information
2.6	Other Officer & Liaison Reports (Daniel Keller explained that the Liaisons receive communications from state ListServes and then bring anything of import back to the Senate as they learn about it. He indicated that his experience is that there are not many updates from the ListServe and thus there are not often things to report. Jennifer Howze-Owens is hoping to have someone take over the OER Liaison role since she has done it for 3 years. Daniel Keller discussed his recent meeting with the President. Money for adjuncts was underfunded last year by \$4000. This money is a negotiated amount through the Office of the President. Two years ago, our then Senate President Todd Windisch, negotiated for \$10,000 of funding to pay adjunct faculty to serve on Senate committees. After questions from Senators, Todd Windisch clarified that this money is separate from dues which we use to fund scholarships. He also added that CSM is the only school in the district that pay adjuncts for their service. We are currently able to fund adjuncts for this semester, but we are not positive whether there will be further funding for anything beyond Senate membership.)	Treasurer, Secretary & Faculty Liaisons	~3:02pm 3 min	Information

	● 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 Liaison: Emily Cotla ● ASCCC IDEAA Liaison: Makiko Ueda ● ASCCC Part-time Faculty Liaison: Maggie de Vera			
--	--	--	--	--

3. Senate Business				
No.	Item / Description	Presenter(s)	Time	Action?
3.1	Update on international students at CSM (Aaron McVean (oversees from District), Alex Guiriba (VP of Student Services at CSM), Chikako Walker (Director of International Affairs at District), and Saroj Quinn (Executive Director of International Affairs at District), and Manasi Devdhar-Mane (Program Manager for International Education Program at CSM), introduced themselves and their roles in the International Students Program. The Senate asked for this update as it relates to our International Students with regards to the federal government administration that took over in January. Aaron thanked us for drafting our resolution in support of the students. The representatives also want to re-iterate the District support for our students, especially when sometimes there are conflicting reports of District leadership's input into these matters. We had three students initially affected by new federal policies. The students' records were deleted, but within two weeks the effected students were brought back. Unfortunately, one of the three had already returned home and they did not return. The programs represented have been working with the students since the initial policy roll-out and the three International Student Program (ISP) managers are making daily checks for any effected students. The officers reach out to any students affected and connect them to resources to fight the issues. Students are not required to drop courses, they are allowed to maintain any current support systems that are not related to Federal Funding. The students become undocumented at that point and don't have to leave the country, the district, or the state. There are now 19 countries on the travel ban, with others proposed that haven't been put into effect yet. The program made sure that the students affected didn't leave the States at the end of the semester because they would be stopped from returning. There wouldn't be effects if the students stayed. There was an issue for Visa awards for a period of about three weeks during the peak time during the award time. This affected many students by delaying students on F1 Visas in receiving their F1 Visas. Although our District was not affected, larger institutions were told that with over 15% Visa students there would be no further Visa issued for their institutions.	Manasi Devdhar-Mane, Aaron McVean, Alex Guiriba, Chikako Walker, and Saroj Quinn	~3:05pm 20 min	Discussion

	Even if there is no direct effect due to federal policies, there is an indirect effect on students. This is why students need to hear support from the Senate, and this is why the Senate's resolution was so important. Our District is not affected at this time in terms of seeing students not coming to our college due to the issues discussed. There have been some issues with students from Myanmar, but the program is working with students who may be affected. Lee Miller had some questions: Are International Students allowed to take on-line classes? The answer is yes, if they must return to their country they can take on-line courses from that location. Non-resident tuition is higher than that of residents. What happens with that additional money from international student tuition? The money stays in District. What kind of financial impact will the reduction in the International Student population be caused by the current federal administration have? There won't be a dramatic impact, there will be a temporary impact, but measures are being made to mitigate the effects. How much of the budget comes from International Students? Aaron was unsure and said that Steven Lehigh might know. Tim Maxwell: Tim expressed a concern about social media and the pretext for expelling International Students due to the things found in social media accounts. How are the students being counseled? The students are being told that their social media post could be scanned upon entry and maybe even when they are here. Students are teaching students about how to block invasive scans when entering the country and for responsible use of their social media. The ISP managers are discussing how they can help the students, and they host chats over coffee to let students discuss issues and solutions. There doesn't seem to be any distress coming from students at CSM according to Manasi. The International Students Office at CSM hosts many events and co-hosting some with personal counseling to help students. Statement: It used to be the Chinese government students had to worry about and now it is the US government. The school and district are being very upfront with the students and informing and helping with solutions. Saroj said that none of our students have been affected by the scanning of their Social Media accounts. She also stated that she was in Southeast Asia and that many students still want to come to the US and especially to California.			
--	---	--	--	--

	Wendy Whyte: Planning ahead seems to be important so the students have time to get their Visas. She reiterated that our college isn't being affected in quite the way that many bigger schools are and she feels that our students shouldn't be so unnerved by the issues. Wendy also wanted to make sure that the first three paragraphs of the Senate's resolution gets changed and that the International Student's Office take a look at it and give the Senate feedback before we pass this resolution. Daniel Keller asked to be able to bring the resolution to the International Students Office before we finalize and vote on the resolution. Aaron indicated that he'd be happy to offer his input. Manasi wanted to end on a positive note. She highlighted one of our International Students from CSM who will be studying Mechanical Engineering at Berkely received the Regents' and Chancellor's Scholarship Award. This is a fantastic statement for this student's drive and accomplishments.) <i>Note: At our final Spring '25 meeting, a senator requested we take the resolution in support of international students off the consent agenda for further discussion. Since this situation continues to evolve, we will hear an update from the International Education office.</i> Resolution in Support of Students Affected by Trump Administration Revocation of Student Visas			
3.2	Equity Syllabus statement (This is an action item today. We are just bringing this item back from discussion and update from Spring 2025. Though it is now too late for inclusion in Fall Syllabi, the Senate President would like to have action taken on this important syllabus statement for future inclusion. The office of the Ombuds is here today if there are questions. Before a vote, a request for discussion was made. There was no discussion. Robbie Baden moved to approve the Equity Syllabus statement & 2nd by Lee Miller. 13 Yes. 0 No. 0 Abstain.) Equity syllabus statement draft	Daniel Keller	~3:25 pm 15 min	Action
3.3	Graduation: Commencement day and time (Daniel Keller postponed this agenda item since Alex Guriba had to step away before the item came up at 3:40pm. Daniel left this as a potential open item for this meeting in case Alex returned. Knowing that it was unlikely, due to Alex's statement that he was over-committed during our meeting time, Daniel indicated that he would place the item on the agenda of future meeting should Alex not return.)	Alex Guriba	~3:40 pm 10 min	Discussion

3.4	Committee on Teaching and Learning (CTL) update (The Program Review Committee is joining the CTL Committee because it is closely aligned with the goals of the CTL (For more detail on the decision see the CTLs notes from April 28th) . Susan Khan detailed the membership and thoughts on a tri-chair model where the SLO Coordinator, PRIE Manager Natalie Alizaga, and the VP of Academic Senate who is charged with the task of advising on Program Review. Todd Windisch added that the by-laws for the CTL was solidified last year as the PD was being removed from the committee. Daniel Keller detailed the changes in Program Review and why it seems to make sense to bring the Program Review Committee into the CTL Committee. Daniel highlighted the changes of a staggered schedule to alleviate the volume of reviews to be assessed at one time and changes in types of assessment including opt-in self assessment studies. (For more details on the changes made to the Program Review process see the Senate notes from 5/13/25 Agenda Senate Business item 2.4.) Todd Windisch commented that while it might seem odd to have PRIE's voice in Program Review which is in the purview of the faculty and thus a Senate committee, he felt having PRIE as an active participant in CTL and PD would add the connection to this review process and the need for data informed decisions. Lee Miller asked about the representation. Todd Windisch said that the majority of the membership/representation would need to be faculty, but that it is not unusual for some committees to have other representation, one such example being DEAC. Daniel Keller stated his intent to add and update to the by-laws which would include Program Review within the CTL Committee to the next Senate Agenda as a Consent Agenda item. This would mean no further discussion unless someone wished to remove it from the consent agenda for further discussion. Natalie Alizaga joined the meeting to give here input. Natalie didn't have anything further to add. There were no further questions or comments.)	Susan Khan, Daniel Keller	~3:50pm 15 min	Discussion
3.5	Program Review: Adding Program efficiency questions (Daniel Keller reminded the Senate that there used to be efficiency questions in Program Review, so this is not an unprecedented topic. Danni Redding Lapuz commended Senate on the Program Review questions that were developed during the Spring 2025. Danni said that efficiency questions could be many different things and there could be many things that define efficiency. She feels that the idea behind asking an efficiency question is to define how we use our resources. Danni said that the Senate should be making the decision and create something that is broad enough to be meaningful across many disciplines. Natalie provided the following from Cañada's Program Review: • Instruction: Program Efficiency Indicators. Do we deliver programs efficiently given our resources? Summarize trends in program efficiency as indicated in the	Natalie Alizaga, Danni Redding Lapuz	~4:05pm 15 min	Discussion

Meetings of the Academic Senate are open to all members of the public. Materials are posted on the meeting page of the Senate website.

	Student Success and Core Program Indicators (LOAD, Full-time and Part-Time FTEF, etc.). • Student Services: Program Efficiency Indicators. Do we deliver programs efficiently given our resources? Summarize trends in program efficiency. Discuss no-shows, group vs. individual delivery, etc. • Learning Support Centers: Center Efficiency. Is the center efficient in meeting student needs? Discuss center efficiency, including staffing, hours of operation, tutorial and other services, space utilization, equipment, or technology as appropriate. • Use the data provided by PRIE to examine your enrollments by department or courses. Describe trends in headcount, FTES, and load. If applicable, describe any other enrollment data that is relevant to your program. • Have there been any significant changes in enrollment trends or course offerings? For example, has there been a significant increase or drop in FTES or Load? If applicable, consider trends in class cancellation rates and how it might have affected your course offerings. If needed, consider how the pattern of course offerings (times/days/duration/delivery mode/number of sections) affected your enrollment? Danni said that if some of the information was unfamiliar, that definitions can be supplied. Lee Miller had concerns as did Todd Windisch, about the measurement of efficiency in terms of the number of students enrolled and the numbers that stay in courses. Todd feels that these measures would actually pit departments against one another. Daniel Keller said that this is exactly what happened in the past; the colleges in the District were compared and consideration was not taken for differing course administrations, instructional techniques, and student demographics. Daniel felt that the questions didn't necessarily get to the real question. Makiko Ueda said that in personal counseling that it really wouldn't make sense to compare two counselors' student load because there would be so many variables at work in causing the numbers to look very different. Tim Maxwell said that he felt this efficiency "regime" is really coming from the State, like the AB-705 and AB-1705 legislation, that says we need to move students through more quickly. He feels there is clouded data due to the pandemic and we aren't seeing the true picture just because we have imposed these bills. Lee commented that with a transfer degree program he can make his courses more efficient by lowering the requirements and passing more students on with the lower standards, but the students then won't be ready for four year			
--	---	--	--	--

	universities. Maggie de Vera has a different perspective on the issue. Maggie's program has been cut because they have low enrollment. She recently had a conversation about why there is an issue with budget and learned that our caps were more lenient at CSM than other campuses and that was why there were budget issues. She wanted to make sure that we prioritize education and that it isn't just about budget when efficiency is considered. Danni stressed that the efficiency concerns aren't always just about the caps. She mentioned in STEM they had changed some of the chemicals being used in class such that they were able to lower their budgets and that is increasing efficiency. She feels that the Senate can be the curator of the question(s) so that the question doesn't lead to putting institution against institution. Danni also feels that by having discussions about efficiency we can see how we are in this together. She mentioned the need to capture all the cases and scenarios in the efficiency questions so that every program can capture what is meaningful for their program. Daniel wanted a timeline for the Program Review questions. Danni feels the team can work on it and then a few different options could be brought back. She looked to Natalie as a timeline because Danni shared that she will be going on medical leave and that Chris Walker will be taking over in the Interim VPI role. Natalie talked about the timeline in terms of using Nueventive. She thinks that maybe this should be tabled for Fall 2026 rather than trying to resolve it on a timeline would be allow for the new questions to be added to the Nueventive software. Natalie added that the questions could be added to Nueventive at any time, but if it were to be added after the Program Review was launched, some might not see the new additions and may have to be asked to redo or add to their submissions. Daniel didn't feel that voting on this issue today was wise because it would require something to be returned to the Senate by the next meeting for submission to Nueventive before Program Review submissions open. Malathi Iyengar was struggling to process all of the information and shared some of her thoughts on this. What is cost based on? Do some of the costs come from expensive equipment, insurance, etc., as opposed to simply the cost of the instructor and classroom and balancing that against money coming in because of student head count. She is concerned about quality if financial is considered without all pertinent			
--	---	--	--	--

	information. Daniel wants to know if it is OK if we just put this off until the next Program Review cycle rather than rushing a decision. Danni said if everyone has been seeing the budget issues then we should try to get this into program review this cycle. Danni gave it back to Natalie to ask if there would be an impact on the comparison of data for those doing review during next Program Review cycle where the question would now be included and the first cycle departments wouldn't have the same questions. Natalie doesn't feel that it would be an issue. She feels it would only be a little difficult for the comparison for this Program Review cycles participants, because in their next cycle they wouldn't be able to compare the efficiency questions between the two cycles. Lee made the point that if we want to make a point about efficiency it should be about the financial cost of the facilities. He feels it isn't about how many students are in the classroom per faculty member. Daniel feels that this is really an administrative question if it is about budget. He feels that faculty aren't the people in charge of budget and thus it doesn't belong in program review. Danni feels that the faculty are the experts and asks that the faculty reimagine how they could be more efficient. Maggie feels that even analyzing cost is difficult. She says that there are different numbers of students in each classroom even when discussing the same class. Todd made the point that cost is different for adjunct run departments. Malathi said that there is a clear difference between efficiency within the classroom verses budget. We can't judge the cost based on head count or a professor's salary schedule. Tim is excited to have a one unit of release time to explore ways to create a more efficient English 105 course. The English department has brought in an expert to discuss ways to improve efficiency in their courses and he has found a lot of value in this exercise. His release time is coming from a State grant, but he feels that the college could invest our own money in similar ventures across campus.			
--	---	--	--	--

	Daniel Rhyne said we haven't defined efficiency. He said he went to Palo Alto University which is considered highly efficient, but he felt that the education was subpar, so there is a discrepancy between efficiency and quality education. Danni answered this by saying that yes, some of efficiency can be defined by students in a class, but she doesn't feel that the professor's salaries need to be involved in the discussion. She feels instead that things like one-on-one meetings, materials, etc. are more important in the discussion of efficiency. Beth feels that there needs to be a question about efficiency. She feels it isn't about being more efficiency, but also about maintaining efficiency. Makiko noted that when a faculty member is sitting with a student they aren't thinking about efficiency, but acknowledges that when we are doing Program Review maybe we do need to include something. Susan said if you are really after is fiscal then ask that and don't put it in terms of "efficiency." Daniel also brought up the fact that there used to be SWAT and that was a place to reflect on cost concerns. Susan said that CTL is still involved with Program Review, so maybe CTL should be involved. Daniel asked for volunteers to work on the questions. Todd reminded us that CTL won't be able to meet soon and that would delay the start. Chris Walker, Tim Maxwell, Natalie Alizaga volunteered to work on the questions with Daniel.)			
3.6	Planning our agenda—review of the flex day brainstorming session (Daniel Keller would like to invite everyone to look over the review. He created a shortened list that came from the FLEX session and attached it to today's agenda. In our next meeting, once everyone has had time to review the list, we can discuss what we saw.)	Daniel Keller	~4:20 10 min	Discussion

4. Closing Procedures				
No.	Item / Description	Presenter(s)	Time	Action?
4.1	Final Announcements (Todd Windisch reminded us that last semester we formed a resolution in support of our Undocumented Students and since then Skyline and Canada have also passed similar resolutions. See Senate Business Item 2.1 from 1/14/25 Senate Meeting notes for more detail. The DAS will be working on something this year, so anyone who would like to join in the work should reach out to Todd.) <i>President or facilitator elicits final announcements about upcoming deadlines, events, scheduling changes, etc.</i>	President /	~4:30pm 0 min	Information
4.2	Adjourn (4:28)	President /	~4:30pm	Procedure