Academic Senate of College of San Mateo

Tuesday, September 9 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

Officers	
President	Daniel Keller
Vice President	Rene Anderson
Secretary	Yvette Butterworth
Treasurer	Makiko Ueda

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

Division & Student Representatives	
Student Representative	Ameer Dababo
ASLT / Library	Matt Montgomery
ASLT / Library	Wesley Hingano (absent)
Business/Technology	Vacant
Business/Technology	Kimberly Salido
Creative Arts/Social Science	Lee Miller
Creative Arts/Social Science	Maggie de Vera (absent)
Kinesiology/Athletics/Dance	Kajari Burns (absent)
Kinesiology/Athletics/Dance	Mike Marcial (left ≈3:35)
Language Arts	Tim Maxwell
Language Arts	Robbie Baden
Math/Science	Wendy Whyte
Math/Science	Beth LaRochelle
Counseling	Emily Cotla
Counseling	Jennifer De La Cruz
Enrollment Services and Support Programs	Daniel Rhyne (absent)

1. Opening Procedures				
No.	**Item / Description**	**Presenter(s)**	**Approx. Start Duration**	**Action?**
1.1	Call to Order (2:35) *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.*	President / Facilitator	~2:30pm 2 min	Procedure
1.2	Adoption of Today's Agenda (A move to approve the agenda today was made by Malathi Iyengar & 2nd by Beth LaRochelle. 14 Yes. 0 No. 0 Abstain.)	President / Facilitator	~2:32pm 2 min	Action
1.3	Adoption of Consent Agenda (Jennifer Howze-Owens made a comment about Edgar Mojica Villegas' approval to the hiring committee during the 4th year of tenure review. There was discussion about protocol for this and it was agreed that it isn't an issue for a faculty under tenure review to be appointed to a hiring committee. A motion to approve the consent agenda which includes the August 26, 2025 minutes and faculty appointments was made by Jennifer Howze-Owens & 2nd by Beth LaRochelle. 14 Yes. 0 No. 0 Abstain.) *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.* ● Approval of minutes August 26, 2025 (see the Senate Website for the notes) ● Faculty appointments (see the Senate website for the link to PDF)	President / Facilitator	~2:34pm 5 min	Action
1.4	Public Comment (Robbie Baden discussed the Program Review and wanted to comment that even with a hiring freeze the people should still ask for new hires. Malathi Iyengar commented about the budget memo from Friday, 9/5 and how it relates to the discussion from last week. Malathi said that she'd like more discussion on this topic of budget in a future Senate meeting. Daniel said he will bring the discussion back with an invite from Steven Leigh. Yvette Butterworth commented about the WebSmart issues at the beginning of the semester and how nice a training on the new system would have been. Mike Marcial said it was similar for the Athletics Department and they have a lot of interaction with the system due to their interactions with student athletes. The ID Me system was also very difficult. Jennifer De La Cruz also said in counseling that the student	Public	~2:39pm 6 min	Information

	success link was difficult for students who were learning how to complete forms. Beth LaRochelle said the new system is a huge barrier. Tim Maxwell asked why these changes were made if everyone is unhappy with all these changes. President Keller said this is a topic that can be brought up in a future meeting.) ● 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 (Highlights were provided from DAS featuring the priorities revolving around the faculty survey on a compressed calendar and the scheduling of Flex Days. President Keller said that while there was support for the compressed calendar, many faculty were confused about what a compressed calendar means. The confusion was a concern that the semester would be shortened to a quarter length, but faculty should be assured that a compressed calendar means a sixteen-week semester instead of a 17.5 week semester. President Keller also highlighted the downplay in the difficulty of the switch, citing the difficulty for students, scheduling of some courses including CTE courses. The repercussions to the Cosmetology program would mean the students could not complete their program due to the shortened schedule; they are legally bound by licensing to include a certain number of hours. Beth LaRochelle wondered about adding intersession and using those weeks in the courses where there are concerns. Lee Miller commented about the length of time into the semester that students can add and if it would effect that even more. President Keller reminded us that the time line is out to 2030, so it is not immediate. Another topic at DAS were changes made to screening committees based on another survey sent to anyone who served on a screening committee last year. These changes were in part brought about our Senate and concerns about the modality requirements. The faculty were pleased with changes made concerned the committee can establish the modality of their interviews and a $1500 one-time stipend for travel expenses to interviewees who display hardship for in-person interviews. Faculty were not happy about a form that they were required to fill out for every application even if not meeting minimum qualifications.	Daniel Keller	~2:45pm 5 min	Information

	Another topic discussed was the Community of Practice for AI which includes best practices. This will likely be brought to the faculty during the October 8th Flex Day. It seems that many on-line instructors feel that all work submitted is mainly being done by AI and not by students. Since all three colleges have made a statement of support for Undocumented Students, an Undocumented Work Group is being formed. From DAS Agenda for Monday, 9/9: Work group should include at least one faculty member from each college, and the work group should include feedback from each college's Undocumented Centers and the District Undocucoalition before bringing a draft for review at District Academic Senate It is another proposal. Anyone interested in participating should contact President Keller. There was an IPC meeting, but President Keller didn't have anything specific to report. Vice President Anderson added that the meeting consisted mostly of orientation and explanation of how IPC works.) ● District Academic Senate (DAS) ● Institutional Planning Committee (IPC) & Accreditation ● Board of Trustees (BOT) ● District Participatory Governance Council (DPGC)			

<table>
<tr><td>2.2</td><td>Curriculum Committee Chair Report (The first meeting was an orientation meeting on August 28th. Some representation is still needed. The student members are not listed as voting members, but they have been voting for quite some time and Chair Malathi Iyengar would like to see a change made to the Senate By-Laws to reflect this standing protocol. The DE coordinator will also be on the Curriculum Committee. Malathi was unsure who this will be since there have been changes in that position. Daniel Keller and Jennifer Howze-Owens added some additional information for Malathi. Malathi explained that she is obligated to provide an orientation for new members before their first meeting and thus she would like to reach out as soon as possible to provide this one-on-one orientation to the newest members. Our student representative, Ameer Dababo, added that the student representative has been appointed, but was unsure of the appointee.)</td><td>Malathi Iyengar</td><td>~2:50pm
3 min</td><td>Information</td></tr>
<tr><td>2.3</td><td>Distance Education Committee Chair Report (The committee met last week (likely on 9/3, but that was not explicitly stated). Jennifer Howze-Owens asked our student representative, Ameer Dababo, about the student representative for her committee and the representative said he believes someone was also appointed, but was unsure of the name.

Below were some key highlights shared by Jennifer (see 1, 2 & 3 below):

Re: CSM: Distance Education Advisory Committee (DEAC) 2025-2026
linking the draft summary notes for the September 3, 2025 meeting as well for reference.

CSM DEAC: Must Know Items

1. Regular and Substantive Interaction RSI
○ If you are teaching a fully online course this semester, your Fall 2025 course will be included in the evaluation pool for ACCJC evaluators during the ACCJC accreditation process. Because th selection is completely random, all Fall '25 online asynchronous and synchronous course sections must demonstrate clear evidence of RSI within Canvas and align with the ACCJC Policy on Distance Education and on Correspondence Education. We invite you to engage with the resources and opportunities outlined below for further support as you implement these practices your teaching this fall semester.
▪ Regular and Substantive Interaction Policy Training (Required)
• One-time, 5 hour, self-paced training that is specific to CSM. All faculty should complete this training as soon as possible.
▪ RSI LibGuide
• A comprehensive resource explicitly designed to assist faculty with strategies and best practices for maintaining regular and substantive interactions in online environments.
▪ CSM RSI Drop-In Hours
1. Wednesdays from 12:30-1:30 pm
○ September 10th
○ September 24th
2. Tuesdays from 1:30-2:30 pm
○ September 16th
○ September 30th
2. We have longed for the opportunity to add 2 due dates to Canvas Discussions. Canvas Discussion Checkpoints has launched. You can watch a short video preview here.
3. The College of San Mateo Library has a new and improved website!

Lee Miller asked about where to find this information about changes in Canvas. Jennifer shared that when she started in 2021 Canvas was meeting with CSM Instructional Technologists monthly and sharing changes and updates made in Canvas. Jennifer learned today that Canvas have stopped sharing any updates and any</td><td>Jennifer Howze-Owens</td><td>~2:53pm
3 min</td><td>Information</td></tr>
</table>

	changes made are only discovered by the team by happenstance. This is very frustrating and shocking to Jennifer and the team. Jennifer concluded with the assurance that she will share the above information to President Keller to add to the Friday emails. Vice President Anderson asked about changes and how we are supposed to know if even Canvas isn't telling "us" about what is going on. VP Anderson expressed her frustration about the many changes and their effects on the user experience for both teachers and students in on-line courses. Jennifer expressed her understanding and commented that her work in co-chairing with Aaron she feels that they will be able to ask questions and get answers in a way that they couldn't before. Jennifer hopes to have updates about Canvas changes become a consistent part of her committee update. Yvette Butterworth also expressed frustration with the constant changes made by Canvas without notice. Beth LaRochelle asked if Jennifer's list can be shared at the Division meeting. Jennifer invited Beth to do exactly that.)			
2.4	Committee on Teaching and Learning Chair Report (The next meeting is September 22nd and Susan Khan is no longer chair. Natalie Alizaga shared that Guillermo Cockrum, our SLO Coordinator, will be one of the tri-chairs. The tri-chairs are now set. Daniel will have a formal statement for Senate By-Laws next time formally separating CTL and the new committee on Professional Development.)	Susan Khan	~2:56pm 3 min	Information
2.5	Student Representative Report (The only thing Ameer Dababo had to share was the upcoming Fall Club Fair to be held 9/22 through 9/24 in Building 10 daily from 10am to 1pm.)	Ameer Dababo	~2:59pm 3 min	Information
2.6	Other Officer & Liaison Reports (President Keller said that he has had a volunteer to be the new OER Liaison and next time he will make the announcement of the new liaison. Beth LaRochelle, with input from Chris Walker, shared that we currently have an Interim Director of Workforce and hopefully a permanent Director will be appointed tomorrow.) • CSM Faculty Dual Enrollment Liaison: TBD • ASCCC CTE Liaisons: Christy Baird & Beth LaRochelle • ASCCC OER Liaison: TBD • ASCCC Rising Scholars Faculty Liaison: Wesley Hingano • ASCCC Legislative & Advocacy Liaison: Emily Cotla • ASCCC IDEAA Liaison: Makiko Ueda	Treasurer, Secretary & Faculty Liaisons	~3:02pm 3 min	Information

	• ASCCC Part-time Faculty Liaison: Maggie de Vera			

3. Senate Business				
No.	**Item / Description**	**Presenter(s)**	**Time**	**Action?**
3.1	Revised: Resolution in Support of Students Affected by Trump Administration Revocation of Visas (You will find the original version of the Resolution in the Agenda after the revised version on the Senate website under September 9, 2025. Senate members were invited to read the original draft and the revised version. Discussion: Wendy Whyte wants to change the title to say, "Current Federal Deportation Activities." The third paragraph add "wrongful" to deportations. In the fourth paragraph, last sentence change it so that it doesn't list all the agencies, instead just saying "overreaching by immigration enforcement agencies." In the #4 add "or visa," #5 add "wrongfully" before detained and deported. Wendy feels this is a little cleaner and will prevent us from getting in trouble. She also wants to refrain from mentioning Trump. Robbie Baden asked Wendy to know how we would know if someone was wrongfully detained. Wendy responded that she doesn't like the fact that it sounds like we are defending people that are guilty. Jennifer de la Cruz disagrees with Wendy and wants the statement to be broader so as not to imply that anyone is doing wrong. Malathi Iyengar wonders if Wendy's objections and requested changes are in fact legal questions and whether we should see if the changes are legally required. Lee Miller doesn't feel that the lawyers need to see this. He feels that they will look at it at some future time when and if the District acts based on our resolution. Malathi would like to propose keeping the statement as is and letting the lawyers make any necessary changes. Tim Maxwell feels making the changes suggested by Wendy guts the document. Susan Khan reminded the Senate that this document has been under discussion for a year and that there are links to meanings of objectionable wording in the whereas statements. President Keller says that wrongful is strongly implied and that we don't need to add wrongful. Lee agrees with President Keller and believes the statement should left as it is written. Wendy wants to pass with the stipulation that the pass be made based on District lawyers feel it is legal. Daniel said that the faculty are supporting this and if we pass it,	Daniel	~3:05pm 15 min	Action

	we are saying that we as the CSM faculty stand behind this statement. President Keller offered to take it to DAS and ask for the District lawyers to look at it before we vote in favor of this resolution. Wendy made a motion that we move to approve sending this to District lawyers through the DAS to make sure that all statements are legal and can be backed up. Beth LaRochelle said that we are making a suggestion and not that we are recommending any action or policy on behalf of the District. She feels that we have been looking at this for a long time and many things are going to change. She feels it is important to pass the resolution since a lot of time has gone into writing it with appropriate input. Lee wants to clarify what is meant by legal support in #2's statement. Jennifer de la Cruz said that through the District, students can meet with immigration counsel one-on-one, but that isn't always helpful. Vice President Anderson pointed out that "all legal options" is vague. Lee wanted to clarify which is the District doing, providing the legal representation or helping the student pursue the options. Makiko Ueda wanted to know about the three students in the district that had need of defense due to their deportation. Lee wanted to know about how much support the students need our directive to District. President Keller said if we don't feel this is ready then he can take it for review from Aaron McVean and some others for advice. In addition, he reminded us that we are the first college in the district to write such a resolution. He suggested that another option might be to wait for another college or both to act and then follow in like manner. Wendy Whyte made a motion to postpone the vote and bring this back in two weeks after Daniel has found someone to offer legal advice. No one seconded the motion and it did not carry. Malathi clarified that we are urging the District to do these things. We are not doing			

	these things, nor are we telling the District to do these things. We are urging the District to look into it and they will look into the legal ramifications and make the decision of whether to act upon our requests. President Keller indicated that is the process. He also reminded the Senate that Dr. McVean had been consulted in writing the resolution and that he speaks for the District in terms of some of these legal questions being asked in today's meeting. Robbie Baden would like to see stronger language in the to the legal support. Lee would like to include a guarantee of legal representation and would go so far as say that we say we will pursue all legal options and pay for the legal representation. Malathi clarified all that had been said. President Keller called time on the subject. He feels we should get additional consultation, including consulting Aaron McVean again, after which he will bring it back. Robbie Baden moved to have President Keller take the resolution for additional consultation and return it to Senate for a final vote. The motion was seconded by Tim Maxwell. Lee Miller asked that we amend the movement to say "representation" instead of support, and Robbie agreed. 12 Yes. 1 No. 1 Abstain. Motion passed.)			
3.2	Adding question on enrollment trends to instructional program review (Chris Walker, Renee Anderson, and Daniel Keller discussed the change to the Program Review in response to the efficiency question brought to us by VPI Danni Redding Lapuz during the August 26 Senate meeting. Chris said that the information was discussed as to the meaning of "efficiency" in terms of responding and awareness to student demand and enrollment in your program that are influenced by outside factors such as changing job market. The following was agreed upon: 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. Describe how enrollment trends such as times, day, duration, delivery mode, and number of sections impact your course offerings.	Chris Walker, Daniel Keller	~3:20 pm 15 min	Action

	President Keller said this is a way to assure the survival of your program based upon the clarification that Chris Walker gave about a program that was cut do to trend changes. Lee Miller agrees that this is a better way of stating the question in Program Review over using the word "efficiency." Natalie Alizaga clarified that the reason this is being brought before Senate today is the need for approval prior to the Submission of Changes deadline required for the Program Review to be launched through Nueventive on Friday. It was moved by Beth LaRochelle to add the question to Program Review as stated by Chris Walker and Kim Salido 2nd the motion. 5 Yes. 0 No. 6 Abstain. The motion did not pass. The question of "efficiency" will not be added to this year's Program Review. Lee asked about the Program Review for the semester. Chris clarified who is doing Program Review this semester Kinesiology, Dance, Math & Science Divison, and CTE Programs are doing a mid-cycle review. For more detail refer to May 13, 2025 Senate Meeting links.)			
3.3	Proposal to form a district-wide institutional review board (IRB) (Librarian Pia Walawalkar and Psychology Professor Jennifer Merrill came to ask whether CSM faculty are interested in joining Skyline and Cañada in a formal way to support our students' academic goals/needs by having an IRB. Short Synopsis from the presentation: **Purpose of an IRB:** The primary purpose is to review research proposals and ensure that they are conducted ethically, protecting the rights and welfare of participants by safeguarding them from unnecessary harm and ensuring informed consent is obtained. **Offers Support of Many College Programs:** uSoar, Honors Projects, Phi Theta Kappa, Honors Transfer Programs, Beta Zeta Nu, and Psi Beta, to name a few	Pia Walawalkar, Jennifer Merrill	~3:35 pm 20 min	Information

	Benefits to Students: Offer a way to present research at conferences and offers way to meet the goal of information literacy. **Why Needed:** Without this students and faculty may not have the ability to conduct research, build upon and share findings, miss the opportunity to protect participants of research, offer support for correct research methods, and participate in a future State consortium of IRBs. **Ask:** Housed in the DAS, faculty led committee which includes administrators and PRIE representation, optional reciprocity with external IRB members, 2-year commitment to committee, at least 5 members, membership represents diversity (program of study, include outside institution member, diverse gender, diverse profession). Many community colleges across the state have IRBs so this is not unique to our district. **Commitments:** One time a 3-6 hour training, 2-4 hours per semester for review of proposals. More details on training HHS website. **Questions**: Beth LaRochelle wanted to know how many people across the District and how many IRB from across the District. Answer: One from each school and 5-7 student submissions per year. Wendy Whyte wanted to know about animals or plants. Jennifer clarified that they are deemed as human or non-human. Tim Maxwell added that the students from Honors projects could benefit from this program. He also said that it ties in as a resource for the English 105 project he spoke about last meeting.			

	Jennifer Howze-Owens said that as the advisor of the Phi Theta Kappa that this would help students pace differently and would thus help with study and preparation skills. Susan feels that more collaboration across the District would be nice as well. She sees links in the District Flex Days. Lee Miller added that the slides should be more gender diverse. Jennifer commented that the slide did come directly from the source for IRB information and was not their creation, but agrees with Lee. President Keller commented that the CSM website has IRB. He wondered why there are none at any of the three campuses, but they exist on all three websites. Answer: The process is what is missing from anything that is similar on any of the campus' and have been called "IRB" on the websites. Beth feels that we should be giving students the opportunity to do research projects because it is necessary in higher ed and in the work force. Jennifer agreed adding that students get excited that they can choose a project for themselves based on their interests. Lee wanted to know who would pay for this. Answer: The hope is the District will pay for it since it will be housed in DAS. Susan would like to see this expanded to Flex Days and presentations. The Senate showed their support of this idea in general.)			
3.4	Commencement: Discussion of preferred days/times (Last semester was the first time the commencement ceremony was ever on a Thursday. This coming year it will be on a Wednesday because that is the last day of classes. The last day of classes is the last day of contract, which is why the ceremonies are shifting days from Fridays.	Alex Guiriba	~3:55pm 15 min	Discussion

	There were 500 students who participated in commencement at 4pm on Thurs., 5/22/2025. There were conflicts that resulted from Thursday afternoon finals, but in the end there were only two students who didn't have an opportunity to change their finals to participate. Last spring the issue of conflict with finals could have been avoided by holding the event later the day, but that often means battles with the weather. Our purpose is make the process of decision making for the date and time of Commencement more transparent and invite input from the faculty of CSM. Options for this coming year are: Thurs., 5/21 Fri., 5/22 out of contract Sat. 5/16 before all finals Beth LaRochelle said that last spring the major concern was due to the last minute decision to have the ceremony on the last day of finals. She appreciates the ceremony being on contract, but that decision needs to be made with sufficient time for faculty to accommodate student requests. In the future our sister colleges plan to do Friday ceremonies. The Friday before and the Friday after finals end. That means CSM doesn't have a Friday to choose from because that puts students in potential conflict for attending other ceremonies for themselves or others. Jennifer de la Cruz feels that ceremony is for students and thus finals should not bring about conflicts. Tim Maxwell asked about rehearsal for the graduation ceremony. Alex said that it is optional. Jennifer Howze-Owens said that other colleges could present an issue for the students. She didn't mind Thursday, but she respects that having the faculty be in contract could be an issue. VP Guiriba noted that we do have a higher rate of faculty participation than the other colleges, likely due to the respect to the faculty contract. The student rep was asked his thoughts. He said he doesn't see a problem with a			

	Thursday commencement ceremony, but he would need to ask others, since he really isn't impacted personally. Susan Khan asked about having the ceremony on the Saturday before finals and how that could affect graduation of students (in terms of not having completed all finals yet). VP Guiriba responded that graduation is always contingent on passing courses, so it doesn't influence the decision of a Saturday ceremony. Robbie Baden asked about the different constituents' opinions. VP Guiriba acknowledged that all input is not yet available. Emily Cotla felt that students were most impacted by the overlap of the ceremony with finals. She felt if there will be overlap, then if the decision is made early enough the students could be accommodated by the teachers. Malathi Iyengar suggested the college decide when the ceremony will be held and then if it conflicts with finals, the college could change the final schedule so it isn't on the faculty's shoulders to make the choice of accommodating students or not. VP Guiriba wanted to know about the possibility of having a later evening event off campus to make an indoor event possible. Beth asked about the cost. Alex said that even though there would be cost for an outside event, the cost for an outdoor event here is not inexpensive either. At this point the overall budget is about $50,000 for the outdoor events. Jennifer Howze-Owens felt that an indoor ceremony would be better than an outside one due to weather and the added complications of getting everyone to the football field. VP Guiriba said that the location was considered for the north side of campus to avoid the issues regarding the football field, but that would add $16,000 to the cost in order to provide chairs and/or bleachers for the event. Emily Cotla offered an option of doing the graduations in waves so that the students are split up to reduce the number of students in any one ceremony.)			
3.5	Setting our goals for the coming year (We ran out of time for setting goals.)	Daniel	~4:10pm	Discussion

			20 min	
4. Closing Procedures				
No.	**Item / Description**	**Presenter(s)**	**Time**	**Action?**
4.1	Final Announcements (We ran out of time and there were no final announcements.) *President or facilitator elicits final announcements about upcoming deadlines, events, scheduling changes, etc.*	President /	~4:30pm 0 min	Information
4.2	Adjourn (4:33)	President /	~4:30pm	Procedure