

Academic Senate of College of San Mateo



Tuesday, February 24
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	Rene Anderson

<i>Division & Student Representatives</i>	
Student Representative	Ameer Dababo (absent)
ASLT / Library	Matt Montgomery
ASLT / Library	Susan Khan
Business/Technology	Vacant
Business /Technology	Kimberly Salido
Creative Arts/Social Science	Lee Miller
Creative Arts/Social Science	Maggie de Vera (after consent 2:40)
Kinesiology/Athletics/Dance	Vacant
Kinesiology/Athletics/Dance	Mike Marcial (absent)
Language Arts	Tim Maxwell
Language Arts	Robbie Baden (after consent 2:40)
Math/Science	Wendy Whyte (Zoom)
Math/Science	Beth LaRochelle
Counseling	Emily Cotla
Counseling	Jennifer De La Cruz (2:37 after agenda approval)
Enrollment Services and Support Programs	Daniel Rhyne (Zoom)

1. Opening Procedures				
No.	Item / Description	Presenter(s)	Approx. Start Duration	Action?
1.1	<p>Call to Order (2:35)</p> <p><i>Senate meetings shall require a quorum of the membership to vote on action items. A quorum for a meeting of the Senate and all Senate committees shall consist of 50% plus 1 of the committee's voting faculty members.</i></p>	President / Facilitator	~2:30pm 2 min	Procedure
1.2	<p>Adoption of Today's Agenda (Motion to approve the agenda Beth LaRochelle & 2nd by Kim Salido. By roll call vote. 9 Yes. 0 No. 1 Abstained)</p>	President / Facilitator	~2:32pm 2 min	Action
1.3	<p>Adoption of Consent Agenda (Motion to approve the consent agenda by Beth LaRochelle & 2nd Matt Montgomery. By roll call vote. 10 Yes. 0 No. 0 Abstained)</p> <p><i>All items on the consent agenda may, by unanimous vote of the Academic Senate members present, be approved by one motion after allowing for Senate member questions about a particular item. Prior to a motion for approval of the consent agenda, any Senate member, interested student, citizen, or member of the staff may request that an item be removed from consent to be discussed in the order listed, after approval of remaining items on the consent agenda.</i></p>	President / Facilitator	~2:34pm 5 min	Action
1.4	<p>Public Comment (Beth LaRochelle wanted to remind everyone that there will be a strike authorization vote on March 10th and 11th with a catch-up day on the 12th. The authorization vote, Beth said, is not that we are going to strike, just that we are authorizing the strike. She also reminded everyone about the "Count on Me" commitment, a very important topic that is all over campus right now.</p> <p>Susan Khan reminded us that the April Flex Day proposals are now welcome and are due by February 27th. The desire during the April Flex Day is to highlight assessment practices that are driving relevant change. She said that this can be defined very broadly, but welcomed any practices that Senate would like to highlight, including the practices of Senators. Susan also highlighted a brown bag lunch discussion that will be happening on Friday, 3/6 about math across the curriculums. In this discussion, Katryn Weiss is trying to get the conversation around the importance of math literacy across disciplines and Susan is assisting her in this endeavor.</p> <p>Daniel Keller, as English faculty, doesn't approve of Dual Enrollment courses taught in</p>	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.

	<p>English in the high schools. Appointments of English faculty in Dual Enrollment positions were made through Interim positions. Ultimately, these appointments were not approved by the faculty and should not have happened. Daniel Keller is the affected Burlingame high school faculty member's point of contact and Teeka James is the evaluator. They are not contesting the appointment that should not have happened due to the repercussions on the students, but it has been noted and there is follow up. Malathi said this isn't the first time this has happened, where a high school faculty member was given a negative evaluation and they continued to teach despite the CSM evaluation. She thought it might have occurred in Psychology. Daniel Keller said this has happened before.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions/comments on non-agenda items • If more than one public commentator is present, comments may need to be limited to 1-2 minutes to accommodate everyone 			
2. Standing Agenda				
No.	Item / Description	Presenter(s)	Time	Action?
2.1	<p>Presidents' Report (President Keller is going to Division Meetings with Natali Aligaza beginning this Friday, 2/27 . This week CAD and next week they'll be attending the Language Arts division. He hasn't heard from a few divisions yet about dates for attending their meetings. For instance, he hasn't heard from Math Science yet; so if your division is one of the one's not scheduled for a meeting yet, please encourage them to schedule a meeting for President Keller to attend. President Keller will be writing an executive summary of Senate feedback from program reviews. Hopefully by the next Senate meeting, he will have written feedback for Senate approval before sharing them on the Senate website. Natalie is joining him to inform faculty about the assessment plan and to make sure that everyone is either doing SLO assessment or making another type of plan for the assessment of courses and programs.</p> <p>Vice President Rene Anderson also reminded Senate that CTL has been doing the great read and they were using the same questions that Senate used to assess the program reviews.</p> <p>Beth added that she believes we need some type of culture shift and it is getting more difficult to get representation in shared governance. This is an issue because our viewpoints are feeling very narrow because we don't have a variety of voices. She</p>	Daniel Keller	~2:45pm 5 min	Information

<p>would like to propose we discuss this issue. President Keller feels that it is a District wide issue and that he has had it in various meetings. He feels that lack of participation may be due to Senate being a committee where the voting members must attend in person.</p> <p>President Keller had a meeting with President Manuel. President Manuel is willing to come and talk, but President Keller would like to have questions prepared before we extend the invitation. President Keller said to prepare for a discussion around this in our next meeting on March 10. Robbie Baden would like to know about Fall 2026 and what percentage of cuts in classes should be expected and how that compares to the cuts in Fall 2025. Robbie's heard that a 14% cut from Fall 2025 should be expected.</p> <p>At IPC there was a discussion about how the body would like to conduct their Great Read. IPC needs to look at slightly different things than Academic Senate, but President Keller will present Senates process, the summary of take-aways from the Program Reviews, and from there try to devise questions for IPC to use in their Great Read. President Keller hopes that the three groups doing the Great Read will be able to gain different perspectives and feedback from the process. IPC also approved the new Professional Development Committee and the bylaws for that committee.)</p>			
--	--	--	--

2.2	<p>Curriculum Committee Chair Report (Malathi would like divisions to know about the 50% rule for Certificate Programs. She would like to get feedback from pertinent constituents about whether to approve the same rules that Canada and Skyline use or whether to stick with our current rules before the committee votes on the topic. Malathi has put the vote off to allow time to gain more feedback. She encouraged the Senators to spread the word to their divisions and either bring any feedback to her via Senate, ask the constituents to reach out to her themselves, or ask the constituents to visit the Curriculum Committee meetings to express their viewpoints during public comment. The fellow colleges in the district are pressuring CSM to vote to make a change. The district wants alignment from all campuses and Skyline and Canada have expressed frustration with Malathi not bringing a decision to District Curriculum that expresses CSMs willingness to align with them on the matter of the 50% Rule for Certificate Programs. President Keller asked for further clarification on the 50% Rule. Malathi clarified again that the 50% Rule applies to the local AA and AT degrees, and it says that 50% of the coursework must be completed in the district for the degree to be awarded at one of the schools in the district. The 50% Rule for Certificates is slightly different at CSM, while Canada and Skyline have the exact same policy for certificates that they have for local degrees. At CSM the rule is 50% of the coursework in a certificate must be taken at CSM to get the certificate at CSM. This policy and its lack of alignment at CSM came up last year, and the CSM Curriculum Committee did not endorse the change. Since Skyline and Canada are so insistent about CSM's alignment, Malathi is bringing this up in committee again and to add to the decision she wants to add as much voice as possible from the entire campus before she allows the committee to vote on the subject. Tim Maxwell asked about the arguments for alignment. Malathi said that from the perspective of the students the courses should be interchangeable, and thus the students should be able to take the classes from anywhere in the system and have them count. Malathi admitted that the 50% Rule for in District completion is not quite in alignment with the idea that courses in the community college system should be interchangeable. Malathi added that thinking about the requirement that 50% come from a certain school, CSM, is even more of a barrier for students wishing to complete a certificate that they may have started elsewhere. She added that on the other hand, it does in some respects make sense, since not every certificate program may have the same ideas about what is or is not important in their certificate. However, in the case of this in-district disagreement, Canada and Skyline seem to feel that by CSM requiring students to complete 50% of their coursework for a certificate at CSM, to get</p>	Malathi Iyengar	~2:50pm 3 min	Information
-----	---	-----------------	------------------	-------------

<p>the certificate at CSM that we are not putting the student first, and are creating a barrier for students to complete a certificate. Furthermore, there is a feeling that if these certificates are for job training then they should be interchangeable regardless of where the training is acquired. Malathi stressed that she is sharing what was given as arguments for the need for alignment in yesterday's (Monday, 2/23/26) District Curriculum Committee meeting; this is not her personal argument. Rene Anderson asked for CSM's perspective. Malathi responded that if CSM is endorsing the certificate, then they feel that they need control of the training to guarantee the certification of the knowledge and skills represented in the certificate. The other edge use-case is that CSM faculty worry that a student would take one course at CSM and then CSM will have to award the certificate to the student when they took only one class from CSM and therefore CSM was not able to verify the skills and knowledge acquired. Robbie Baden added that with the current issues with the budget and cuts to classes, that CSM might eventually lose certificates because if the courses are cut then we won't have the courses to offer. He also added that certificate programs at CSM can include things that aren't just credits. Some of the additional mentoring that occurs at CSM include bringing professionals in the community to CSM for student interaction and campus events that support the community and the growth of our students in their certificate area. In speaking directly about the Creative Writing certificate, he feels that the policy change would not be student centered because the new policy would encourage students to just get the credits from wherever and not worry about all the community building and support built into CSM's certificate. Maggie de la Vera wondered about the harm to our programs if we open up to other colleges in the district especially in light of the cut backs. She discussed her program in Addiction Studies. This is the only such program in the district. However, if we were to loosen the policy then maybe other schools would begin opening classes to compete with our classes and that could lead to the decline in numbers for her program and the eventual close of the program if the current trends in class cancellations continue due to CSM's budget crisis. President Keller called a point of order on this conversation since it is not an actual agenda item and asked if the Senate would like to bring this back as an agenda item during the next meeting. At that point, Malathi reminded Senators that she is asking for feedback as stated at the beginning and reminded Senators of the various ways stated at the beginning to provide that feedback. Tim Maxwell asked about the differentiation between certain certificates and if that could be used to protect CSM's certificates. Malathi said that could be a strategy, but she had concerns of whether it would hold against Skyline and Canada's insistence for alignment. She felt that the differentiation</p>			
---	--	--	--

	<p>could still lead to concerns over alignment, only this time over the alignment in the certificate details.</p> <p>Another issue Malathi updated us about the Common Course Numbering (CCN) templates. Classes were being denied for articulation from the UC's and CSU's after they had been run through the CCN templets and sent for articulation. Malathi cited that Beth LaRoche might have more information if anyone had further questions. Due to the issues that have occurred in articulation, they are trying to correct the templates by updating the CCN legislation. This involves a bill that would and Malathi read the following, "...require commencing with a spring term within the 2027-28 academic year the streamlined system-level articulation agreement to be the only articulation agreement used for a community college course subject to the Common Course Numbering system described above." It seems that the legislation is meant to solve the current problem and the two sections 66725.5 of the CTM legislation that came out today, 2/24.)</p>			
2.3	Distance Education Committee Chair Report (Jennifer Howze-Owens was not present today so we did not have an update from the committee.)	Jennifer Howze-Owens	~2:53pm 3 min	Information
2.4	Committee on Teaching and Learning Chair Report (President Keller informed us that CTL did the Great Read just as the Senate did. He indicated that Natalie Alizaga may be able to offer more of an update at the next Senate meeting. Rene Anderson also added that Natalie will be bringing in assessment coaches to help them meet the requirements of the assessment process. President Keller added that the people chosen as assessment coaches working with others to help set up assessment processes will get a small amount of release time to do so.)	Natalie Alizaga, Rene Anderson	~2:56pm 3 min	Information
2.5	Student Representative Report (There was not a student representative present today.)	Ameer Dababe	~2:59pm 3 min	Information

2.6	<p>Other Officer & Liaison Reports</p> <p>(There were no Liaison Reports today.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CSM Faculty Dual Enrollment Liaison: Leo Cruz ● ASCCC CTE Liaisons: Beth LaRochelle ● 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	<p>Adding “recognition and accolades” to Senate agendas: Should our Senate agendas include a regular update focused specifically on positive things happening on our campus?</p> <p>(President Keller introduced a new idea proposed at the IPC executive team meeting. The team felt that sometimes meetings are depressing and that it would be nice to set aside a little time to recognize the good things that are happening rather than just focusing on the bad. He added that they have already implemented it in IPC and without any preparation the members of IPC shared that a CSM student saved somebody’s life over the Super Bowl weekend and they learned about the programs that are happening in the writing center. President Keller wanted to propose this for the Senate and decided to make it an action item because he figured it would not need discussion. He would like input on whether we would include this new portion of our meeting after Public Comment or at the end of the meeting. Robbie Baden and Beth LaRochelle both felt that the best place for good news is at the beginning. President Keller asked if 5 minutes would be an adequate amount of time for sharing recognition and accolades. Lee Miller made a motion to add an allotted 5 minutes to the beginning of the meetings following the Public Comment and the motion was 2nd by Tim Maxwell. 13 Yes. 0 No. 0 Abstain.)</p> <p>The Senate was asked if anyone would like to share any positive stories. Robbie Baden shared that a cohort of creative writing students went to the San Francisco Writers Conference where they were able to work with agents and present before panels. One of the students may end up working with City Lights bookstore and their publication or a very famous agent. Yet another student got a card from Houghton Mifflin. It was fun for all, and he wanted everyone to know the fantastic group of writers that exist at CSM. Lee Miller added that he took the CSM Democrats to the California Democratic Party Convention over the weekend. Thanks to a call from the football coach the day before the event some student athletes came as well. The students were also eligible for credit for some classes through an assignment origin board. The students learned a lot of fun facts.)</p>	President	~3:05pm 10 min	Action

3.2	<p>Feedback on revisions to faculty screening guidelines: District Academic Senate is seeking input on the new guidelines for screening committees.</p> <p>(President Keller introduced Julie Johnson from HR and Kristi Ridgeway from ESL and added that there was a 24 page document included in the digital agenda which included the changes to the screening process. Julie and Kristi came to discuss the new guidelines for screening committees. Julie informed us that there were issues with the vendor providing our hiring platform. The new platform needs to be aligned with our paper process. There is currently an issue occurring due to ratings. There was a rating system for different components, but the overall score was all that was being input as a “traditional” way of inputting the ratings. These “traditional” ways of inputting the ratings had developed organically and had not been incorporated in any formal way into the system. HR has heard the feedback from screening committees and they have some ideas and are working on potential solutions in the Equal Employment Opportunity Workgroup.</p> <p>Kristi shared that as both faculty and an administrator she has witnessed the process. Her experience with the process this semester involved the issue of KSA ratings (knowledge, skills, abilities) for a bunch of questions. The questions all asked for 0, 1, 2 ratings for the applicants. Her committee needs 24 KSA ratings, and she has already spent 25 minutes per application for the first 25 and she still has to complete 5 more applications. A failure to meet minimum qualifications usually disqualified people and committee members didn’t answer all the KSAs for such applicants. The reason that she has 5 remaining applications to go through in a very short time frame is because they were disqualified through minimum qualifications and she believe she was done with processing, but then she learned that even these applications had to be reviewed with the 24 KSAs even though the ratings in most of the fields would be 0s, they still had to be input, which takes time. In addition, Kristi feels that the ratings should not hold the same weight for all 24 ratings, since they are not all equally valued qualifications for the job. The tool as it stands now, with the equal value of the</p>	<p>President, Julie Johnson, HR Kristi Ridgeway, ESL</p>	<p>~3:15 pm 20 min</p>	<p>Discussion</p>

<p>ratings, she feels is not valid. She described some of the KSAs for the screening committee for which she is a currently serving to illustrate how the assessments weren't all equal, and she compared it to when faculty grade students and they don't equally weigh all parts of the grading rubric, like tests and homework aren't weighted the same and it makes sense that tests are generally considered more valuable in assessment of student skills. In addition to her objection to the lack of validity she said that two researchers on her committee share the same concern. Furthermore, she worries that the priorities that President Manuel expressed to the committee were important in the administrative position being screened, will not be reflected with this poor tool. Kristi feels that the process is not fair and will incur liability, allowing applicants to potentially come back and sue us in the future. She warns others to be prepared for the screening time needed to be on a committee. For 150 applicants, she guessed she may need 42 to 43 hours for the screening process. Beth LaRochelle added that on the President's hiring committee the CVs were 23 to 97 pages long which took a great deal of time to read and process even without this additional workload. Kristi reminded Senate that as instructors, our rubrics, which is what these KSAs in essence represent, usually only have about 6 to 8 items. Kim Salido said that she had to do this and is questioning whether she will participate on a hiring committee again. Robbie Baden wondered why we were even scoring disqualified applications and wondered if that wouldn't lead to liability issues by giving credence to disqualified applicants. Kristi said she asked about the reasoning behind scoring the disqualified applicants and was told that every application needed a score regardless so that the tabulation could be recorded and then KSA items that relate to the disqualification can be used to reinforce the disqualification. She is frustrated by having to input a bunch of 0s or maybe at best 1s for applicants that aren't qualified. These add even more time in the already long process and it is making her reconsider being on another hiring committee. Maggie de la Vera added that the processes that are tied to liability tend to lead to errors which makes the process less accurate. Matt Montgomery clarified that applicants who don't meet minimum qualifications is no longer just put aside but instead must go through the same process beside the qualified applicants, and Kristi verified his impression. Kristi asked Julie if there is anything that can be done, and she verified that everything Kristi has noted what needs to be done at this time. Rene Anderson asked if this process means that there will be more people being interviewed. Kristi said she isn't sure, but she is concerned</p>			
--	--	--	--

<p>about the issue of just using the mathematical model as the place to draw a line. Todd Windisch really felt that it should be clarified with HR of whether the applicants were applying for minimum qualification exceptions by going through equivalency, so there may be a good reason to be reviewing the application. Todd said that there is also a work group at the District Academic Senate where they are looking at the faculty screening guidelines document and revising it and adding more context. HR has visited DAS and is open to their suggestions. He said that Kristi brought up two different options for improving the process. One of those would be to choose 5 to 6 KSAs that the committee agrees on as the most important for this search and focusing on those. The other was creating their own KSAs based on the what the committee has been tasked with looking for in an ideal applicant. Todd asked Julie as the HR rep whether there was a way to use the system to implement one of these options. Julie said that change is always possible, but the system was built in exactly the way the screening committee guidelines are written. They just coded in the yes, no, or maybe as 2, 0, or 1. Julie said that what people may not realize was this was always being done behind the scenes by HR. They would take the committee notes and put them into a spreadsheet, and they put it in as 0, 1, 2 and then subtotaled the values and those were totaled to determine the rankings. She warned that if committees were subjectively weighting areas and only providing a final rating as suggested by Kristi, that this practice could lead to issues due to inconsistencies in weighting, so she further clarified that there was never supposed to be a weighting in the process. Instead of subjective weighting, she said in the past committees sometimes chose areas of more importance in interview questions and the focus in those areas created somewhat of a weighted evaluation. Julie has been researching outside processes and comparing and looking to see how we might change our practices. The most important thing is to find a process that has been vetted by faculty, and if processes are changed then there is a documented reason why the practices are changed in the middle of a screening process. Tim said that with AI this will be human against AI since we have all probably heard about how easy it is to apply for jobs using AI and how some people are able to send out 1000 or even 2000 applications easily. The overwhelming number of applicants made feasible by AI will become more troublesome when coupled with these labor intensive processes of application review. Kristi said that in the past the process would only be given for a general pass on, maybe pass on, and not passing on. Kristi asked about the minimum</p>			
--	--	--	--

	<p>qualifications and if we would know if someone was asking for minimum qualifications equivalency. There was discussing between President Keller and Julie about a reduction of the number of KSAs through mutual agreement by the committee. Julie confirmed that in hiring faculty that is often done but it was not done for administrators or classified faculty. Julie said that the spreadsheets sent by HR to be filled out by the committee had every KSA on them for these positions and if the committee chose not to fill all of them out, then they just took the overall rating for them (it was unclear if they just put those values in or if there was something else done). Kristi clarified a point made by Todd about the check box for the minimum qualification's equivalency box. Todd said that the new system is a bit confusing about application for minimum qualifications. Julie agreed and said that just because an applicant doesn't have minimum qualifications equivalency box checked that they may still qualify and need to be passed forward because it isn't always clear whether the box needs to be checked. Todd said that the guidelines and training need to be updated, and the workgroup will need to work on that update.</p> <p>Julie ended with the thoughts that were shared and said they are being considered and they are working on the process as we continue to use the new system. Todd added that committees need to set norms at the beginning. He added that it is OK for the committee to narrow the KSAs, but it is best for everyone to ask questions. Kristi noted that communication skills and interest in working with CA community college students should be in the job description.)</p>			
3.3	<p>Addressing challenges with district leadership: Faculty will share concerns about communication, shared governance, and fiscal decision-making, and we will discuss our options for responding.</p> <p>(President Keller shared the protocol for a vote of non-confidence per the ASCCC, which is the governing body for the Senate. He shared a slide show which he indicated would be posted on the Senate website. He had examples from Peralta Community College and Los Rios but indicated there would not be time to go through the examples. The chancellor does know that we are discussing a vote of no-confidence, and thought that she might attend today, but changed her mind, which President Keller felt was a good idea. In terms of the presentation, we are</p>	President, Teeka James, English	~3:35 pm 30 min	Discussion

at this point to step two in the process outlined below:

Broad overview of a vote of no confidence process

1. Check local rules ([senate bylaws](#))
2. Preliminary inquiry and documentation—often a letter with an opportunity for follow-up
3. Drafting a vote of no confidence (resolution)
“Whereas” clauses: Describe specific failures to consult, patterns of retaliation, disregard for Title 5 or local policy, or actions harming programs or governance
“Resolved” clauses: ask the Board to take specific action (investigation, address violations, dismissal)
4. Notice, first reading, and debate
Place the draft resolution on a posted agenda in compliance with open-meeting laws and local rules.
Present background.
Conduct a first reading:
 Allow questions and amendments.
 Sometimes send the draft to departments or divisions for feedback between meetings.
5. Second reading and formal vote at a subsequent meeting:
 The senate holds a second reading and final debate.
 Members vote according to bylaws:
 Many senates require a simple majority of those present and voting.
 Votes are typically recorded in the minutes, along with the text of the adopted resolution.
6. Resolution goes to the Board of Trustees

The remainder of the process goes as described in the screen capture above. It is important to know that we need to address this resolution to the Board of Trustees.

During the issues with Ron Galatolo there were discussions of a vote of no confidence, but the 10+1 items were not there. Examples of 10+1 items are as follow (remember the presentation link will be on the Senate website):

Examples of 10+1 violations

- Not consulting senates on major initiatives or policy changes
- Closing normal channels of communication—excluding [faculty from task forces](#), [cancelling consultation sessions](#)
- Consulting by “[after the fact](#)” notification: policies already passed, no real consultation in decision-making
- Lack of fiscal transparency
- Pushing through [large initiatives without public discussion](#), impact analyses, or clear communication of risks and unintended consequences
- Non-competitive contracting or [perceived cronyism](#) in high-stakes decisions (e.g., executive searches, consulting)
- Implementation of policies [considered harmful to colleges](#), students, equity
- Creating a climate of [fear and retaliation for criticism of policies](#)

A white paper example was given from Peralta College. This is included in the presentation linked on the Senate website. The main point in showing the example was to highlight how the 10 plus 1 are directly related to the Areas of

Concern and the Policy violations. The format shown is not one that we need to model, but it presents an example to consider in terms of organization.

Some examples other than 10+1:

Governance and shared-governance failures

- Disregarding or bypassing established shared-governance structures, including ignoring faculty senate recommendations on academic and professional matters.
- Making major academic, programmatic, or structural changes without meaningful faculty consultation or in violation of local policy/Title 5 expectations.
- Concentration of decision-making power, with faculty excluded from key planning or budgeting committees.

Leadership style and communication problems

- Leadership behavior perceived as dismissive, non-collaborative, or hostile toward faculty, including “disengagement with the faculty” over a long period.
- Persistent lack of transparency in decisions, budgets, or strategic priorities.
- Poor or inconsistent communication, where faculty learn about major changes through the media or after the fact.

Fiscal management and resource issues

- Questionable fiscal decisions, including budget cuts or reallocations that appear poorly justified or misaligned with academic priorities.
- Lack of clear, comprehensible information about budget allocations and financial health, undermining trust in leadership.
- Perceived misuse or mismanagement of funds, or decisions that create severe financial instability for programs or the institution.

Ethical, legal, and climate concerns

- Mishandling of sexual harassment, discrimination, or Title IX cases, including protecting or failing to hold senior administrators accountable.
- Patterns of retaliation, intimidation, or creating a climate of fear for faculty who raise concerns.
- Behavior that violates institutional policies or ethical norms, harming the institution’s reputation or values.

Impact on academics, students, and morale

- Decisions that significantly undermine academic quality, program integrity, or student support (e.g., severe cuts or restructuring without planning).
- Chronic low morale among faculty and staff tied directly to leadership decisions and style.
- A broad loss of trust or confidence that the leader can effectively steward the institution forward, often after “years of frustration.”

This is an overview of how these decisions get made.

Teeka James, a member of our English faculty, is here today to share her concerns. She feels that we are at the point in time to begin these discussions. She is thankful for President Keller’s research into the process. Teeka feels that there has been a disregard for the faculty voice. She is looking at point four, Educational Program Development, concerning the Student First agenda and what it does and doesn’t mean. In addition, Teeka feels point ten, the processes for Instructional Planning and Budget Development, are the things that really made her feel the need to begin discussion for a vote of no-confidence. However,

<p>what really put Teeka over the edge was when the Chancellor brought her February 1st letter to District Academic Senate and the new draft multi-year plan achieve compliance with the 50% Law. The assumption that there is a softening of the assessed value of properties is untrue. Teeka notes that the plan to take a different approach to meeting the 50% law instead of hiring 20 new faculty members each year for the foreseeable future feels retaliatory to the contract negotiations. Another thing Teeka feels is duplicitous is the Chancellor shares the current approved budget each year but never shares the actual money spent from the previous year. Teeka also feels that there is a lack of oversight of the three college Presidents. This she says has resulted in a culture of ignoring faculty voice. She cited the cuts to our Fall 2026 courses without any indication to the Senate that such cuts might occur. Teeka discussed the 2008-2009 budget crisis and how the Senate was included in the discussions with Mike Claire. Teeka highlighted the great discussions with faculty and Mike Claire about how to deal with the issues. Teeka feels we are just being told what has happened and that does not count as consultation. Another thing that doesn't seem forthcoming or transparent is that at District Senate, the Chancellor overstated the District's commitment to compliance with the 50% Law and reminded the Senate that our district is at a deficit in compliance of somewhere around \$17 million with the next highest offender being at a deficit of only about \$4 million. It is due to this manipulation of facts that has made Teeka lose confidence in the Chancellor's ability to tell the truth about important things. Teeka's greatest frustration, aside from the failed contract negotiations, is that students are having classes cancelled at the last minute which is difficult on them. She feels this is anything but "student first." In addition, at the District Participatory Governance Council (DPGC) they are moving a lot of board policy into administrative procedure which are not discussed in the same way. In summary, Teeka hopes that after discussion that others will feel as she does and the Senate will at the very least move forward with a strongly worded letter showing that there is a failure to consult faculty and that the sequence of steps that should be taken are not being taken.</p> <p>Todd Windisch, District Academic Senate President and ESL faculty at CSM, discussed that the DPGC process is the same for board policy and administrative procedure. As Todd listened to the issues that Teeka brought forth, he feels that some of the issues brought up by Teeka could be brought forth as a separate</p>			
---	--	--	--

<p>resolution and not a no-confidence resolution. To ask for information such as budgets verses the actual money spent; this is something that would be needed for the evidence finding phase of the vote of no-confidence anyway. Another resolution, suggested Todd, could be to ask for an explanation of the Chancellor's letter for why we don't have to meet the 50% Law and in addition to write a resolution of how CSM's opposes her conclusions/opinions. He feels that we need to think of first steps that will get us more information as we are developing a resolution for a vote of no-confidence. Todd also cautioned us that we have to be very aware of the difference between district level and college level because at one point the comparison was made about Mike Claire's handling of the budget crisis, but he was President of CSM and not Chancellor when that occurred. Teeka responded that perhaps we could create two letters, one for the College President and one for the Chancellor. Todd agreed and said that was going to be his suggestion and added that some of the concerns voiced thus far would be better received at the College level than at the District level.</p> <p>President Keller followed up that he feels that the best next step would be to write a letter that would contain specific concerns, documentation, and then invite Chancellor Moreno to come and speak with us directly about our concerns. Teeka feels that the two things she'd like to express to the Chancellor at this time is the lack of consultation with the 10+1 items.</p> <p>Malathi Iyengar felt that the Chancelor had blamed the lack of compliance to the 50% Law on the previous administration, giving numbers that supposedly supported how bad it had been and how she had made it better. We need to find out if these allegations and her claims are even correct. Malathi also questioned the movement of money from Fund 4 to Fund 1 and then back again. She wants to know who is consulted with these moves and if there is money in Fund 1 and who decides how money gets spent. Beth LaRochelle added her concerns about the blame placed on CSM for mismanagement of our budget when there was a District administrator, Richard Storti, placed in charge of CSM during the time CSM supposedly began having budget issues. Beth suggests that we ask questions and find out more information about where and how these budget issues began. President Keller said that this is what Todd made a comment about and he feels that the question that Beth raised needs to be addressed by Manuel, and not in a vote of no-confidence resolution, but simply in a fact finding or informational request. He said that he doesn't understand this discrepancy</p>			
--	--	--	--

either. Tim Maxwell doesn't feel that we will be able to get a straight answer from anyone because they are trying to sell us a story that allows them to fundamentally change the college and the way the college works. Melissa said that we are downsizing, with a plan to create better completion number by creating a different college that the Board wants to see. The Board selected Chancellor Moreno and it seems that she is probably doing exactly what the Board wants, so a vote of no-confidence presented to the Board would end up going no where. Tim brought up the reserve fund and said that if the District has \$37,916,748 in reserve for a budget contingency, emergency response, and cash and that the District is instead of helping us out is forcing us to downsize because they want us to downsize. Lastly, Tim doesn't feel we are truly in a budget crisis, but that the crisis is manufactured to bring us in alignment with Skyline's load. Tim feels that the softening of the tax assessments is not a truth, since the tax base increases by 6.5% reliably. He feels it is ridiculous that the District being one of the richest in California can't meet the 50% Law and smaller, struggling districts across the state can meet the law. The District is wanting to create a program without the oversight of the State. He adds that the program the District is trying to construct would not be approved by the State, and that the only reason they have the freedom to construct such a program is because we are a basic aid district. Todd Windisch thinks that resolutions are a great idea to ask for information. He feels that by getting information as a response to a resolution, we have something that we can further disseminate to the rest of the faculty. He feels it also gives people more time to craft a more through response and can then avoid town halls and meetings by asking for written responses to resolutions. He used Tim's point about the reserve fund as a point that could be made in a resolution asking the Chancellor to form a written response to the resolution. President Keller added that in order to make formal statements about votes of no confidence, there must be documented questions and lack of responses, which is to Todd's point. Robbie said that we should use our Senate minutes and conversations in Senate to document what we are being told and failures in communication. He added that our minutes document what Gerardo said about cuts to summer school and he feels the DAS minutes are lacking in documenting the comments reported to us about the Chancellor's discussion of downsizing. Todd clarified that the downsizing comment was with respect to administration. Teeka ended with thanking Todd and the rest for hearing her concerns. She wants to make sure that we have people who can verify

	<p>statements being made by administration, in the real time, like Steven Lehigh did with the budget discussion in Senate. Beth appreciated the information and also wanted to remind everyone that on the day that the President comes to our meeting that everyone should be prepared with the questions we want to ask and stay focused on getting the requested information. She emphasized that we should set the expectation of a unified answer to the questions we ask. Tim encouraged everyone to be well versed on the budgets. Teeka said that the District has a 10 year history of “padding” the budget and saying that they are not good about telling us what happened to that padding even though the money wasn’t spent; she believes Steven Lehigh called it the actuals.</p> <p>President Keller will bring the Senate a drafted letter so that we can discuss at the next meeting and then invite the Chancellor to meeting after that.)</p>			
3.4	<p>Drafting a resolution on AI: Building on our discussion of the San Diego City College AI statement, we will look at a (very) early draft of a resolution on AI for approval at our next meeting</p> <p>(The following is a simplified, bullet pointed list of concerns created by President Keller. These are based on the document from San Diego City College that Senate discussed in the 2/10/26 meeting:</p>	President	~4:05 pm 25 min	Discussion

Possible content for “Whereas” statements—or for just a documentation of concerns

- Detecting/designing against AI adds significant workload for faculty (AFT workgroup is currently focused on this issue)
- Companies are profit-driven—may not always have students’ best interests in mind (example: “Einstein”)
- Presents serious challenges to fair grading and assessment
- AI tools are difficult (impossible?) to regulate *especially for online faculty*
- Create a climate of mistrust—faculty feel they have to “police” student work more than in the past
- Detection tools are unreliable—but not all faculty (or administrators) are aware of this
- Unreliable detection tools may penalize students who have legitimate, permitted use of AI for some tasks (eg DRC students)
- AI tools may produce biased, inaccurate, and harmful information
- AI tools may violate copyright laws, or use intellectual property of faculty or students without their awareness
- Research on educational technology in general suggests most tools—including many purchased at great cost--do not enhance student learning
- There is a lack of research on educational benefits, possible harm of AI use
- Research on AI specifically shows these tools may decrease critical thinking skills, reduce confidence, and create dependency
- Some tools may present risks to student data security
- District has committed \$*** to funding work specifically on AI

Possible “resolved” clauses—or just recommendations

- Appoint a full-time position to communicate and plan policy specifically for AI (district level—reports regularly to academic senates, division meetings or and/or other governance)
- Identify and establish one AI Teacher Leader from each department or discipline
- Hire instructional designers with expertise in AI use/misuse
- Provide compensated faculty/staff professional development focusing on AI use *and misuse*
- Create regular training around ethical considerations
- Other ways to communicate....?

<p>President Keller was concerned about an AI agent called “Einstein,” not the one from Salesforce, he cautioned us. He is concerned about the upcoming conference about AI and the lack of discussion surrounding cheating in such conferences. Even one of our administrators didn’t know that Turn-It-In doesn’t do the a great job catching AI.</p> <p>President Keller turned to the list above and asked the Senate to review and decide what we wanted to include and what we don’t want to include in our resolution. Beth LaRochelle wants to know what our sister schools are doing about the misuse of AI. President Keller only knows about what is happening at the District level. He said that DTLC, which are District Teaching Learning Council Groups. He said there are three groups at this level. Two are on use and one is on ethics. In addition, Jennifer Howze-Owens has created advisory papers for overview in the ethics committee. Malathi Iyengar said that there don’t seem to be any experts on AI at CSM and admits that it might be hard to find an expert since AI is constantly changing. She also feels that having a full-time hire wouldn’t be feasible since we can’t hire faculty. She’d prefer seeing teacher leaders. President Keller agreed that teacher leadership would be a good idea. Robbie Baden likes the first item in the San Diego document. He feels that it is to the point that the Senate is in charge because it is a 10+1 item. It would be nice to know the money spent on tech, since he doesn’t know that. Tim Maxwell said that the first 6 bullet points in the district priorities highlight technology and its expense. He feels that we should be asking for release time to deal with all these changes in the realm of technology, especially with the prioritization of online classes. Lee Miller agrees with all that has been said. He is not sure what the guidelines should be for students with respect to AI. Susan Khan brought up the differences in guidelines for AI use between classes, but that we have at least agreed on some minimal guidelines that everyone can have. In addition, she wonders if there should be an institutional learning outcome as to what students get at the end of their education here. Malathi said that there are many people that are learning about AI, but we should not encourage a position because then that person will be telling us how to use AI in our classroom. She would like to have the Senate set up guidelines and not allow this to get out of control in terms of future oversight.)</p>			
---	--	--	--

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 (4:31)	President	~4:30pm	Procedure