

Academic Senate of College of San Mateo



Tuesday, September 23, 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 (absent)
Committee on Teaching & Learning	Susan Khan

<i>Division & Student Representatives</i>	
Student Representative	Ameer Dababo (absent)
ASLT / Library	Matt Montgomery
ASLT / Library	Wesley Hingano (absent)
Business/Technology	
Business/Technology	Kimberly Salido
Creative Arts/Social Science	Lee Miller (absent)
Creative Arts/Social Science	Maggie de Vera
Kinesiology/Athletics/Dance	Kajari Burns (absent)
Kinesiology/Athletics/Dance	Mike Marcial (left 3:35)
Language Arts	Tim Maxwell
Language Arts	Robbie Baden (absent)
Math/Science	Wendy Whyte
Math/Science	Beth LaRochelle
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 (2:31) <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 (President Keller needs make the following changes to the agenda before we adopt it: Remove Guillermo Cockrum as possible Senator, and switch times for 3.2 and 3.4. Tim Maxwell moved to approve today's agenda with President Keller's changes. The motion was seconded by Kim Salado. 10 Yes. 0 No. 0 Abstain. The Agenda was approved.)	President / Facilitator	~2:32pm 2 min	Action
1.3	Adoption of Consent Agenda (President Keller highlighted the Consent Agenda as shown below; for more detail see September 23, 2025 meeting on the Senate website for Consent Agends. Susan Khan moved to accept today's Consent Agenda. The motion was seconded by Malathi Iyanger. 10 Yes. 0 No. 0 Abstain. The Consent Agenda was approved.) <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> • Bylaws change: CTL merging with program review • Faculty professional development committee makeup	President / Facilitator	~2:34pm 5 min	Action
1.4	Public Comment (Tim Maxwell commented on behalf of himself, Robbie Baden and students as to the half-mass status of our campus flags for Charlie Kirk's mourning. He heard from Latino students were upset by the status. Tim would like to follow-up on the reason that the flag was flown at half-mass and whether our institution must adhere to the protocol since we aren't a Federal campus. President Keller asked if Tim would like follow-up on this subject. Tim indicated that he would like that to happen.) • Questions/comments on non-agenda items	Public	~2:39pm 6 min	Information

	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 (We passed a resolution in support of our Undocumented Students as have all the other campus' and the District plans to make a work group to create a District statement on the subject and requests a member of the CSM body to join a work group. IPC met on 9/17 and President Keller facilitated. It was a short meeting, 90 minutes, and one big thing was a summary of the Budget forums. The update didn't seem to be different from the Opening Day information. The committee also heard about the cuts to the grants for the HSI and the AANAPISI. There have been moves made to retain the people hired under these grants for the remainder of the year. President Keller highlighted the need to fund scholarships through Senate dues as a tie to the cuts in funding for these two grants.) Summary of 9/12/25 IPC meeting	Daniel Keller	~2:45pm 5 min	Information

2.2	Curriculum Committee Chair Report (Malathi Iyengar said that AB-111 updates are continuing. Beth LaRoche will reach out if your discipline will be required to update their curriculum based on new state templates currently being released. The committee is continuing to come up with a schedule of phased deadlines to deal with AB-111 updates and regular 2 and 6-year updates. Proposals for entirely new courses have a different schedule. Michelle Mullane (this may not be correct) has been hired to do DE supplemental review as part of tech review. Natalie (Aligaza?) has volunteered to do the tech reviews for curriculum committee. Malathi asked for a vote from Senate to update the by-laws for the student members to be voting members. President Keller will do that in the next Senate meeting. The last update Malathi share concerns a new Curriculum software. It will be a newer version of CurriQunet, which Malathi believes may be called Acadia or owned by a company called Acadia. The makeup of the RFP (Request for Proposal) committee has been under discussion. The RFP committee will hear proposals from companies, review the software and proposals and then make a decision on which company/software to move forward. Malathi goes to Deb for help and she as the curriculum specialist needs to be involved, and was denied. The curriculum specialists from the three colleges and the District Curriculum Committee asked that the curriculum specialists be admitted to the RFP and both requests were denied. Todd Windisch, DAS President, advocated and was able to get one curriculum specialist as a representative on the RFP. Beth added that her target for AB-111 is to have all CSM courses in CurriQunet by October 1st. She is currently halfway done. Once they are through CurriQunet they will be on track to get them outside Beth's process. As a result CSM should be the first to have their updates done for AB-111.)	Malathi Iyengar	~2:50pm 3 min	Information
2.3	Distance Education Committee Chair Report (Jennifer Howze-Owens was not here to report.)	Jennifer Howze-Owens	~2:53pm 3 min	Information
2.4	Committee on Teaching and Learning Chair Report (On Monday, 9/22 CTL met for the first time with the new group. The committee looked over the by-Laws that Senate just voted on in the Consent Agenda to allow two shorter meetings per month in order to get more regular check ins. The new by-laws passed, so the committee will now meet twice per month. Guillermo is trying to put something in place so ILO (Institutional Learning Outcomes) evaluation can be added. He wants to put together a student focus group to find out	Daniel Keller Rene Anderson	~2:56pm 3 min	Information

	about student outlooks on things like critical thinking. The by-laws were also changed to require only require one representative from each discipline. The committee still needs a representative from the following: students, Slassified Senate, Kinesiology, and Math & Science.)			
2.5	Student Representative Report (The student representative was not present so we did not have a report.)	Ameer Dababo	~2:59pm 3 min	Information
2.6	Other Officer & Liaison Reports (Treasurer Ueda gave us an update on Senate funds. We currently have \$3000 in the bank and dues drive will hopefully be brought back to add to this amount, allowing Senate to fund more scholarships this year than last. The budget for paying adjunct will be discussed tomorrow, but we currently have a guarantee of the amount of money that we were granted last year, though all that money is not available since Senate paid out more than we were allotted last year. Now that Heidi Bonilla is taking over as Workforce Development Director, CTE will soon start meeting and reporting again.) • CSM Faculty Dual Enrollment Liaison: Vacant • ASCCC CTE Liaisons: Christy Baird & Beth LaRoche • ASCCC OER Liaison: Mohammed Akhoirshida • 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	Treasurer, Secretary & Faculty Liaisons	~3:02pm 3 min	Information

3. Senate Business

No.	Item / Description	Presenter(s)	Time	Action?
3.1	Statement in support of students affected by Trump administration revocation of Visas: After our discussion on 9/9, bringing in Vice-Chancellor McVean to answer further questions. (Daniel discussed Robert's rules again. He wanted to clarify the difference between a discussion, an amendment, and a disagreement. He emphasized that the first thing we need to do is to move to approve the resolution as is. Once the motion has been made and seconded, then we can discuss and debate. If we wish to make small changes, changes to improve the clarity, not to change it because you disagree with it, we can then ask for an amendment to the wording. If there are requests for other amendments on other issues, then the resolution will need to be sent back to committee for rewording. Wendy Whyte stated at this point that she wants a roll call vote with each person's vote recorded in the minutes. President Keller said that this needs to be brought up at the point where we vote on it and it would have to be a motion which was further voted upon. He moved on from this request asking for a motion. Beth LaRoche made a motion to approve the resolution. The motion was seconded by Maggie de Vera. President Keller invited discussion at this point and reminded the Senate that Vice -Chancellor McVean is here for additional clarification and questions that relate to the Districts position. Discussion: Beth clarified as to whether there had to be a work group on the resolution before it came to Senate for a vote. Daniel clarified that last semester there was a work group which consulted outside sources in the drafting of the resolution. Beth thanked him for his clarification stating that she thought that seemed to be her recollection. Wendy Whyte wants to amend the first paragraph. She feels it is over-the-top. She feels that the language says that the paragraph isn't helping students. There is a lot of indication that there is not factual content in this paragraph. She wants to re-write this. She continued to call attention to what she said in the discussion during September 9th meeting. President Keller clarified that Wendy wants a complete re-write of paragraph one, and not an amendment. She confirmed. Beth wants VC McVean to clarify 2). The district offers legal clinics and IIDA	Daniel Keller, Aaron McVean, Manasi Devdhar- Mane	~3:05pm 15min	Action

	partnership with SF and in addition we have community resources that specialize in immigration law. VC McVean says that we are guaranteeing that there is support. Beth feels this does clarify what the statement means by the guarantee of legal support. VC McVean said there is also support through the State Chancellor's Office. Wendy wants it clarified because she read it as CSM will hire a lawyer. Suggestion was to say "referral." These services have been available prior to 2016, but most certainly in earnest since 2016 when the first round of executive orders for new applications was issued. President Keller again made a clarification to Robert's Rules of Order in order to allow everyone the floor. Robert's Rules state that everyone must have a chance to speak and question before anyone has a second chance to add their voice. Guillermo questioned the students' ability to remain enrolled and study remotely. Would that mean that CSM would cover their tuition. VC McVean called upon the recently signed AB-695, which allows these students to be allowed to pay resident tuition if they have their visa revoked and choose to go back to their country and study remotely. President Keller asked for further comments or questions on the resolution. When none were heard, he turned the floor back to Wendy Whyte asking if she would like to move to return the resolution to a work group. He reminded everyone that the motion would then need a second to be voted on. Wendy Whyte moved to create a work group to rewrite the resolution. Without a second the motion failed. Malathi Iyengar asked VC McVean as the "expert" if the resolution seems to have any troubling portions. VC McVean doesn't feel that as the Vice Chancellor over International Education there is anything of concern. The only thing that he would point out is that our ability to as a District to seek action in a Federal court would be limited depending upon the exact situation, and if the District was directly targeted, he said we would seek action. VC McVean gave an example where we might ask for intervention on our behalf, but wouldn't directly bring a case into a federal court. The example was sending a letter to our Senator asking that he speak on our behalf in retaining the HSI grants. There was no further discussion and as the motion to pass the resolution was made at			
--	---	--	--	--

	the beginning a vote was taken. 10 Yes. 1 No. 1 Abstain. The resolution passes. At the request of Wendy Whyte, the secretary is including the no and abstention votes with the permission of both. Wendy Whyte voted NO. Kim Salido abstained.)			
3.2 3.4	Brainstorming and agenda setting: Faculty concerns about artificial intelligence (This item moved to the place of 3.4 due to timing. Daniel Keller isn't bringing this as the President, but as a teacher since he began the workgroup just after Chat GPT was first introduced (November 2022). This discussion has also been brought up multiple times, including in our brainstorming session during Flex Day where it was a top topic of concern. Background & Concerns: - Initial Work Group formed at CSM (see January 24, 2023 minutes for first formal discussion after public comment in December 13, 2022 meeting) - Existence of a District Work group Guidance and Procedures now available on District Website - Differences in different departments - Workload increased as AI use increased and questions of academic dishonesty and plagiarism came into question - Turn-it In AI accounts are often false as tested by Daniel's personal submission of the Declaration of Independence and something he wrote personally, both of which were flagged as AI - Intellectual property and student's ability to opt out of use of their work to training AI. Brought before Senate by a student about 1.5 years ago. - Ghost students who use AI to do all the work. Big issue at Cañada - Online teaching is changing due to the use of AI by students - AI is making assessment challenging both on-line and even in-person as was exhibited by a share-out about use of Meta-glasses during a classroom final Questions to Senate: - How can we learn more? - Who do we want to hear from? Anyone in particular?	Daniel	~3:20pm 20 min	Discussion

	• Future Flex Day informational session? • Actions in Senate that we can take? • Is there a timeline of which to be mindful? Discussion: Matt Montgomery wants to know if Canvas (Instructure) is being used to train AI. Daniel said that his understanding is that it is and it is using both professor and student submissions to do so. Daniel knows of at least one professor that refuses to use AI for just this reason. Guillermo Cockrum said that he is moving toward video presentations for the assessment. His preference was one-on-one meetings, but his dean that he couldn't require one-on-one meetings in an asynchronous course. Guillermo also said that the announcement of video presentations for assessment made many students to drop, students he feels may have been what he called "not good students." There is a state session next Friday about assessment issues concerning AI. After the discussion surrounding someone suggesting students use AI to "get through", Guillermo added that he does encourage the use of AI, but within the bounds of policy. He notes that in his industry, Business, that students will be required to use AI and thus he feels the need to incorporate and teach its proper use. After Emily's shareout and Tim's comment about AI use not being a matter of academic freedom, Guillermo disagreed and felt that it would be a matter of academic freedom. Daniel noted that something he had noted was AI policies for asynchronous courses. He feels this is something that could be revisited. Also of note is a change in the English department's in-class writing policy in the COR; the policy is only 10% of the grade can come from in-class writing. The department is considering a change because of AI. The department has a writing lab where internet access can be suspended, and some professors are using that for in-class writing. Malathi Iyengar mentioned Tatiana Irwin from his division may be someone that Senate could invite to discuss her knowledge and resources. Malathi is unsure how or if we or the students will be trainers of the bots now incorporated in Canvas. Instructure does have end user policy statements, and they do say that they can change their mind at any time how they use the information. Malathi is concerned about student privacy in Canvas as well as AI training. Later in the discussion, Malathi			
--	---	--	--	--

	returned to the concern of student privacy and encouraged use of AI to “get work done regardless of the means.” She feels this is especially concerning because some students are encouraged to share some very personal stories. She feels that if these are not private, which is seems that they are not, then the students should be aware and have the option of opting out. Malathi added she is concerned about accountability of individuals telling students to cheat by using AI to “get through faster.” Malathi responded to Guillermo’s story positively; she felt use in your course with boundaries was fine, as long as you aren’t telling students that use in other courses is equally permissible. After Emily’s story, Malathi added that Jeremy Ball had suggested a writing lab where there are computers that are networked so that there would not be a question of AI use. Daniel said that there is a lab on campus that already has that capability. Beth LaRochelle also noted that there is a lack of communication from Canvas. She feels it would be nice to have someone from Canvas present about privacy and AI use of data. Beth said that when asking students to share personal stories she asks that they do so outside Canvas via a file submission directly to her or through a paper submission directly to her. After the discussion about encouraged cheating by Malathi, Beth added that she knows a grad from Berkeley who is looking for an internship and after eight months still doesn’t have something because AI is taking all the entry level jobs. In addition, Beth said she tells students if they don’t want something seen by anyone else then they should not put it on Canvas. Maggie de Vera said that she had a student write a reflection from a presentation that never occurred, and the student had obviously used AI to write the reflection. After Emily’s share out of her experiences with high school students, Maggie added that she used AI to create an AI policy. She felt it was very effective. In the past she has allowed students to use spell check and grammar check which can now be flagged as AI use. Tim Maxwell also noted that he had a student write a personal account using AI and the student owned the use of AI stating that there was no reason that he shouldn’t have used AI when he had so much work. Tim reflected on how AB-705 and AB-1705 has increased pressure on students to be successful at a level for which they are not			
--	--	--	--	--

	prepared due to the elimination of preparatory courses. He feels this added pressure to succeed at such a level in the amount of time required will inevitably drive a lot of students to use AI to help them succeed at the goal they and others have set for them. After Emily's share out, Tim said maybe policy on AI could potentially be added into COR. He didn't feel it was a question of academic freedom. Susan Khan hopes it is only one person that is encouraging cheating such as Malathi mentioned. Malathi responded that it was only 1 person that she is aware. She said this person shared, in a breakout room during the Flex Day Senate session, that they encouraged the use of AI to just get work done. At the end of the discussion, Susan added, in response to Emily's story, that she would like to see the training at the time of a student's entry into college. Susan also felt that AI consequences should be outlined so teachers feel that they can call students out on their inappropriate use of the tool. Jennifer De La Cruz wanted to emphasize that one person in a group shouldn't be generalized. Daniel added to the discussion of AI use by faculty in their own courses needs some guidance from the departments, so that conflicts don't arise with how we use it. Emily Cotla wanted to emphasize that the students coming out of high school have been trained to use AI and that maybe there needs to be more about the use in AI in the transitioning. She has been trying to help her Promise students understand how AI is not necessarily as helpful as they may think. Rene Anderson asked Emily to detail her experiences. She said that her experience is a little different because she interacts with high school students through dual enrollment and then with those same students in Promise. Emily knows what students were doing in high school is going to continue in college. She feels that the conversation needs to happen and she discusses college policies with incoming students on plagiarism and how violations can escalate. Though the students have an online orientation and some of these topics (of academic honesty and plagiarism) are covered, it is important for professors and counselors to remind students about use of their own words in their work. Daniel wrapped up the conversations saying he has some good ideas. Since Jennifer			
--	--	--	--	--

	Howze-Owens knows the most about Canvas, he suggested having her present about Canvas' use of AI. He also feels that a conversation about student writing would be a good topic.) Review of concerns raised on the opening day flex session; discussion of priorities for future agenda items			
3.3	Presentation: the REAL Guide (Postponed until a future meeting at Susan Khan's request. We will bring this to the 10/7 meeting.) The REAL Guide was developed at CSM by the faculty, staff, and students who participated in the Redesign for Equity & Accessibility Lab (REAL) workshops in 2023-2025. We will be voting to adopt it as a "Senate recommended resource" in the consent agenda for our next meeting (10/7)	Susan Khan	~3:40 pm 15 min	Discussion
3.4 3.2	Brainstorming and agenda setting: Concerns about academic freedom (Google Doc Canva Presentation.) This item was moved up in the agenda to the position 3.2 would have held due to timing. President Keller introduced Rika Yonemura-Fabian and Chet Lexvold as our AFT representatives here to discuss Academic Freedom. Due to recent firings at Texas A&M and concerns over Berkeley passing names of faculty on to the government, President Keller has received emails from faculty who are concerned as to whether our academic freedom is protected here at CSM. He reminded us that the Senate doesn't usually work with the union on things because if it is in the union contract it isn't under the purview of Senate, but last year we did vote to elect a faculty member, President Keller, to work with Rika and Ellie Westfold to craft a statement for the union to put in our contract on academic freedom. This update today is to inform the Senate on how that discussion is going. Key Points: Our contract doesn't include academic freedom	Rika Yonemura-Fabian, AFT Chet Lexvold, AFT	~3:55 20 min	Discussion

	• Board Policy and Administrative Procedure are what guarantee our academic freedom; the board believes this is enough • Board Policy is a conceptual document that can't be enforced by the Union, and the Administrative Procedure is hard to implement with scant instruction • AAUP defines academic freedom as freedom in research and publishing of results, freedom in the classroom, discussion via subject (perhaps the most important right now said our reps). This constitutes freedom from censorship. • The three point in AAUPs definition of academic freedom are reflected in the contract proposal. Academic freedom has been proposed during previous contract negotiations and has always been rejected/declined by the district. • On May 12th the DAS passed a resolution in support of Academic Freedom in the contract. The link to the proposal is included in the slides linked above. The Negotiations/District Response to Proposal: • 5 negotiations sessions over the summer; 2 in June, 2 in July, and 1 in August. None with a response from the District about academic freedom • On 9/10 many AFT members came to the BOT meeting and spoke on the need for academic freedom in the contract • During 9/12 negotiations the Board responded to academic freedom calling it a permissive subject, not mandatory, thus taking a position that they weren't willing to bargain on it as it was not a legal requirement. They state that academic freedom is covered by a Board Policy and that is enough. • AFT takes the Board's response as an unwillingness to bargain. AFT wants academic freedom in our contract where the Board can't change it without our consent, especially with the current political climate. AFT feels the response is insufficient. What Can Members Do: • Come observe the 10/3 negotiations. • Come to the BOT meeting on 10/15 and reiterate the need for academic freedom in our contract. Faculty Questions: Wendy Whyte stated that there was a collective bargaining agreement on academic freedom. She questioned whether academic freedom covers failure to adhere strictly			
--	---	--	--	--

to the COR for a class. She expressed concern due to the breadth of material covered in the COR of one of her classes and her inability to adequately cover that breadth in a single semester. Rika discussed how this is likely covered under #3 in what is being asked for in the proposal which reflects the suggestion of AAUP, since Wendy is the professional with the expertise, but she was unable to say for certain, and said that likely this type of situation would require individual conversation. Rika stressed that the purpose here is to protect us from censorship from the administration and external bodies. President Keller also added that in an evaluation process this type of discussion had been addressed and the dean said that violations of the COR were not academic freedom, so the AFT statement doesn't seem to change that type of situation, but he admitted that the observed situation seemed different from Wendy's situation and encouraged a discussion with the department and dean for such situations. Rika felt Wendy would need to take this topic up with the Evaluation Guidance Committee and Wendy should contact Emily Kirkland for further support. Mike Marciel asked about what happened at Berkeley. In particular, he wanted to understand if it was being reprimanded for statements or for past political events. Chet said that Berkeley gave a list of names of faculty to the federal government that may have linked to anti-Semitism. This didn't have to mean they had made specific statements, it simply meant that there was an association. Tim Maxwell said that this included Judith Bishop, a Jewish woman, who has very strong opinions that may be objectionable to some. Since there is a statement about independent thought as a citizen, and Mike wanted to know making statements about what is going on in the political sphere would be covered if this were to be included in our contract. Chet indicated that it would technically be covered, but there would be a internal grievance process and if the party filing the grievance didn't get the result they desired, then there could be arbitration through a neutral third party to decide if the speech of the individual was protected by the clause. Rika added that because we don't have academic freedom as a clause in our contract such grievances can be brought up with the Public Employment Relationship Board (PERB). Malathi asked whether Chet and Rika have a sense of whether the negotiators (for the Board) are saying that they object to the Union proposal or whether they just don't want to discuss it whether it is the AAUP statement or our proposed longer statement. Rika said her sense is that they (Board negotiators) want to give the absolute minimum.			
---	--	--	--

	President Keller said that academic freedom is very important to our accrediting body the ACCJC. President Keller had a hard time finding instances where we exhibit actively defending academic freedom for inclusion in the ISER, the accreditation report. One of the only places President Keller found an active defense of academic freedom in the past five years was when Senate discussed academic freedom with respect to open-source textbook requirements. This discussion here, will also be something to add to the report. Guillermo asked about the expertise of the instructor in choosing materials that meet the core. Rika said this is a question of curriculum process and that administration should not violate that right. She iterated that this statement on academic freedom won't cover everything since there are aspects in curriculum and evaluation. Guillermo seemed to have a more specific question about curriculum and Malathi spoke as curriculum expert saying she didn't believe that what Guillermo was asking was covered under academic freedom because it involves the COR. She explained that if an instructor spoke outside the classroom speaking as an expert, they couldn't be fired for speaking out in that manner. The COR is a broader coverage of academic freedom, for instance an instructor can't be asked to teach something that isn't within scope of the COR, such as being told to add a certain date. Tim Maxwell discussed something that happened at in the Foothill DeAnza District with respect to a grade being given that the student claimed that the grade was based in racism. He felt the claim, the result media coverage, and support given to the student, resulted in instructors fearing that the same could happen to them and without academic freedom, the results could be devastating. Chet closed with an urging of faculty to read the email that was sent just before the Senate meeting today, 9/23/2025.) An update from AFT representatives on the status of academic freedom language in our contract			
3.5	Brainstorming and agenda setting: Concerns about the CSM budget (Steven Lehigh would like to address the pressure that we are hearing from our school and how the District pressure is also effecting what we are hearing. Steven highlighted the table and graph below in his presentation that show the flat area where the expense increased and the revenue was flat. He noted that this occurred during the	Steven Lehigh	~4:15pm 15 min	Discussion

change of the leadership in June of 2023, when CSM had an interim President and no VPAS which worsened our financial situation. His perspective is that the District hasn't taken any financial responsibility for the trajectory that we were put on during that time. In 2025-26 there is an expenditure decrease and the revenue doesn't continue in the same trend, which doesn't match what is happening at the District, further exacerbating our current issue.



Steven highlighted the impact District decisions have made on our budget.

District Impact

- District reduced CSM revenue for 25-26 by \$1.9m for and adjustment based on “unstaffed” positions
- District siphoned off \$10m of CSM reserves for District Wide “bridge fund” as part of Capital Improvement Program. Total bridge fund is approx. \$55m
- District has set aside an additional \$20m for student housing project and \$10m out of OPEB trust (additional “reserves”) for CIP
- Estimate for student housing project has so far increased from \$65.9m to \$85.5m
- SB893 estimated to cost the district \$15.34m in 25-26

District Revenue and Expenses

	21/22	22/23	23/24	24/25
Total Revenue	\$213.9M	\$242.4M	\$264.4M	\$277.4M
Total Cost	\$185.6M	\$204.8M	\$220.1M	\$232.7M
Difference	\$28.3M	\$37.6M	\$44.3M	\$44.7M
Transfers Out	\$38.0M	\$59.3M	\$46.6M	\$44.3M

Impact of the Cost of Faculty Compensation

	21/22	23/24	24/25
Cert Salaries	31.9%	30.9%	31.5%
Benefits (total)	23.0%	21.9%	22.2%
Total	54.9%	52.8%	53.7%
FTES	13,460	15,565	16,456
CSM (FTES)	5,185	5,994	6,491

From August 2020 to August 2025:

Faculty Comp: +16.4%
Inflation: +24.7%
Real Change: - 8.3%

Current offer from the district:
+2.5%
(for next three years)

President Keller had a question about funding, "Can we shift money from one fund to another?" Steven said that restricted funds can be shifted. He said that Fund 3 can't be reclassified, but Fund 1 can be moved about. Steven's main analysis is of Fund 1 because it is our largest source and because of the restrictions on Fund 3 funds. He spoke directly to the concern of laying of part-time English instructors due to funding issues, saying those funds should be coming from places where the money is being taken in different directions. He mentioned the capital improvements and stated that Fund 1 money is not there explicitly to fund capital improvement, and they are taking money that could be allocated to faculty and classified staff for these capital

improvements. In addition, they are using it to fund SB-893 which is atypical. Tim Maxwell asked about the dean saying that the department should not ask for any new hires in Resource Requests because it won't happen. Steven said that is an accurate assessment of what VPAS Gerardo Ramirez is saying. We are feeling a squeeze, and Steven feels that because we are not in a pinch district wide, and it is being exacerbated by the district decisions. Malathi Iyengar wondered about the capital improvement projects with respect to the email from Chancellor Moreno a few weeks ago that the District had to fill in for capital improvement project, and mentioned Building 30 at CSM specifically as one of these projects. Malathi understands from Steven's presentation that the District siphoned off money from the colleges and then sent it back to us for these projects. Steven said this may be just a shift in how prioritization is being done. In the past, colleges would decide how to use reserves for capital projects, but now maybe the district is setting these priorities. Steven also mentioned the student housing project is in terms of the cost. The other two campuses have withdrawn plans for student housing due to escalating costs. This is a large capital investment even at the reduced previous rates. The potential of spending \$20 to 30 million on the project out of our own budget is clearly an anomaly in capital priorities, and thus if we weren't doing it we would have more money for other projects like Building 30. Steven also mentioned a bridge fund with regards to capital improvement projects and it not being centralized like district capital. President Keller asked for another visit from Steven. Steven also mentioned representation on the Finance Committee and his willingness to represent Senate if we didn't have two representatives already. President Keller thanked him, indicating that he believed we had the representation, but saying it could be discussed later.)			
--	--	--	--

4. Closing Procedures				
No.	Item / Description	Presenter(s)	Time	Action?
4.1	Final Announcements (There were no final announcements.) <i>President or facilitator elicits final announcements about upcoming deadlines, events, scheduling changes, etc.</i>	President	~4:30pm 0 min	Information
4.2	Adjourn (Moved and 2 nd to adjourn at 4:31)	President	~4:30pm	Procedure