Tuesday, September 8 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	Julieth Diaz Benitez (Zoom)
Committee on Teaching & Learning	Rene Anderson

Division & Student Representatives	
Student Representative	Nicholas Costello (Absent)
ASLT / Library	Lia Thomas
ASLT / Library	Susan Khan
Business/Technology	Vacant
Business/Technology	Kimberly Salido
Creative Arts/Social Science	Lee Miller
Creative Arts/Social Science	Maggie de Vera
Kinesiology/Athletics/Dance	Vacant
Kinesiology/Athletics/Dance	Mike Marcial (in ≈2:45 and out ≈ 3:50)
Language Arts	Tim Maxwell
Language Arts	Kat Webster
Math/Science	Angel Pilar
Math/Science	Katryn Wiese
Counseling	Brandon Williams
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 (2:34) *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 (President Keller made a change with last item, 3.4 to be included as a discussion rather than an action item. A motion was made by Tim Maxwell & 2nd by Kim Salido to adopt Tuesday, September 8, 2026's agenda. 11 Yes. 0 No. 3 Abstain.)	President / Facilitator	~2:32pm 2 min	Action
1.3	Adoption of Consent Agenda (There were changes that need to be made to the minutes from August 25, so President Keller pulled them from consent to add the following: 1953 for Brown Act. In addition, Lee M. corrected Elinor Westfold's name spelling and 2.6 in the middle the treasurer has an "r" missing at the end. Katryn W. called attention to the fact that her concern in Section 3.3 was about lack of communication with faculty before WebSmart changes occur. Tim M. corrected the spelling Tymchenko. A motion was made by Lee Miller & 2nd by Malathi Iyengar to adopt Tuesday, September 8, 2026's consent agenda appointments. 14 Yes. 0 No. 0 Abstain. A motion to approve August 25th minutes with changes described above was made by Lee Miller and 2nd Daniel Rhyne. 15 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.*	President / Facilitator	~2:34pm 5 min	Action
1.4	Public Comment (Lia Thomas invited everyone to the AFT meeting on Wednesday, 9/9. The meeting was said to be scheduled for 2:30-4:30 in Room 18-206, per a Senate member's calendar note, though no confirmed room was announced on the AFT site. According to information from a Senator the Zoom link for the meeting was sent by Chet Lexvold in a recent email. Lia expressed frustration that the tentative agreement (TA) delivered to the Board in Friday's board packet omitted significant negotiated gains	Public	~2:39pm 6 min	Information

	for counselors and librarians specifically. Makiko Ueda added that the part-time faculty were also affected, in addition to the non-instructional faculty. Jennifer de la Cruz said she personally voted "no" as soon as she saw some of the bullet points, and felt disrespected/dismissed by a negotiating team member at a Q&A session last week — one reason many people avoid these meetings. Brandon Williams echoed these concerns, emphasizing that non-instructional faculty need to be represented equally in a fair contract, and urged people to attend the AFT meeting. Daniel Rhyne raised a separate item: veterans had brought to him concerns about AI being used to grade assignments incorrectly, requiring students to get incorrectly-marked work corrected. He asked that this be added to the Senate's list of discussion topics.) ● 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			
1.5	Highlights and Recognition (Lee Miller again raised awareness of Jason Holt, the spouse of a member of the Skyline faculty running for a place in the San Mateo Community College District Board of Trustees, representing Area 2 (Daly City, Colma, Brisbane, Broadmoor, and parts of South San Francisco). He is running against the incumbent Trustee Mike Guingona and received an almost-unanimous Democratic Party endorsement. Katryn Weise reminded the Senate of the Family Science Day on Saturday, 9/26 from 1-5pm which will include workshops, a Maker Space, hands-on geoscience activities (fossils, rocks, bay plankton). The Family Science Day is open to families and all ages. Go to the website for more information. President Keller pointed out that facilities fixed the air conditioner in our meeting room which had been a problem during the previous semester. Lee Miller thanked Secretary Butterworth for the detailed and timely minutes from the last meeting.) ● Share positive news about great things happening with our students, faculty, staff, and programs	Public	~2:45pm 5 min	Information
2.	**Standing Agenda**			
No.	**Item / Description**	**Presenter(s)**	**Time**	**Action?**

2.1	Presidents' Report (District Academic Senate (DAS) will hold its first meeting next Monday, 9/14. Institutional Planning Committee (IPC) held it's first meeting. The meeting entailed orientation on shared governance for new members. IPC will discuss the CTL committee and it's possible connection with IPC. A temporary plan for CTL is being worked out. Most other committees have not yet begun.)	Daniel Keller	~2:50pm 5 min	Information
2.2	Curriculum Committee Chair Report (The committee held it's first meeting on Thurs., 8/27. The meeting consisted of training, so there is not anything substantive to report. Malathi reiterated an ongoing concern about quorum and whether the two ASCSM student reps should be voting members of Curriculum Committee. Currently the ASCSM student rep is designated an advisory, not voting, member of Senate and Malathi feels that if students were to vote anywhere, Senate (not Curriculum) would be the more logical place, since Curriculum requires a Curriculum ID login and course review that students often don't have time for. Malathi noted that last semester the committee frequently had close calls on quorum due to the inclusion of the ASCSM member's understandable absences. She noted that every meeting (aside from the training meeting) is high-stakes because they vote on approving courses, and voting members can't be expected to approve courses if they lack the necessary credentials and time to review the courses. Lee M. clarified whether the Senate should vote on a change to ASCSM student representative voting status. President Keller confirmed that this is the Senate's committee to manage and has plans to discuss the issue with the Student Academic student. Malathi said the committee would like the Senate to vote to make a change in this representation to non-voting and advisory positions only. Malathi suggested that the Senate may change the status of the student representative on Academic Senate to voting members if there was a concern about the change in Curriculum Committee. The SLOAC representation on Curriculum Committee was also discussed. There is a role in the Curriculum Committee for the SLOAC representative in tech review. Malathi asked for an update including how and when the position was advertised, a formalization of the role, to whom the position reports etc. Tim M mentioned that the student representative on Senate was nice. He'd like to see	Malathi Iyengar	~2:55pm 3 min	Information

	the student representative return to Senate as well. He agrees that the voting members of the Curriculum Committee have homework and this seems unfair for a student representative. President Keller indicated that he is planning to attend an ASCSM meeting to discussion representation. The next Curriculum Committee meeting will be held on Thurs, 9/10.)			
2.3	Distance Education Committee Chair Report (Julieth shared that the committee met for the first time on 9/2 and the meetings are just 1 hour. During the meeting the committee discussed CVC/OEI recertification. Faculty due to renew distance education training after completing QOLT Level 2 will go through a pilot program, ideally starting October this semester. About 28 CSM faculty signed up for the pilot program. Structure/logistics are still being worked out with college leadership and more clarity expected in the coming weeks. Another topic discussed is the role of AI in distance education, which led to a discussion mirroring Senate's — specifically around course modalities for asynchronous online courses. Julieth will work with co-chair Erica Reynolds on how to formally add this as a DE Committee agenda item.)	Julieth Diaz Benitez	~2:58pm 3 min	Information
2.4	Committee on Teaching and Learning Update (Senate will discuss this more later in agenda item 3.2. We can't really have the committee without a SLOAC. President Keller discussed the failed search due to several factors including the commitment needed for this role and the release of the information at a date that didn't allow a full-time faculty member to take on the full-time role without impact to their teaching commitment. This led to the current lack of SLOAC and the need to figure out a temporary solution for CTL. Malathi I. asked about the commitment, clarifying that it is only possible for a full-time faculty member to take on the position and not an adjunct because it is given reassign time and not considered as a paid position. She also asked about the supervisor for the role. Maggie dV. again brought her concern about adjunct faculty's exclusion from parts of shared governance due to the inability to pay them for their contributions. President Keller reminded the Senate that we formerly had an adjunct in the position and the position was paid a stipend that was not commiserate to the release time offered to a full-time faculty member which seems a very unfair ask for the workload. Katryn W. asked about whether non-instructional faculty could serve in the role as well, and President Keller confirmed that since they too have load that they can be granted release time for the position as well.)	Daniel Keller	~3:01pm 3 min	Information

2.5	Student Representative Report (We did not have a student representative in attendance. President Keller plans to attend ASCSM's meeting next week to directly encourage participation.)	Nicholas Costello	~3:04pm 3 min	Information
2.6	Other Officer & Liaison Reports (Makiko Ueda, Senate Treasurer, reported that in the Spring, Senate voted to support SparkPoint over the summer by donating $2000. Treasurer Ueda has been waiting for information from SparkPoint about the logistics of delivering a check since SparkPoint doesn't usually receive paper checks. Treasurer Ueda just heard from SparkPoint today and will deliver a check tomorrow. SparkPoint has promised a report later detailing how the money was distributed to students. Liaisons are needed for Dual Enrollment, Rising Scholars/Project Change and Legislative & Advocacy needed. Emily Cotla from counseling previously held the Legislative & Advocacy Liaison role and it had become a very active listserve.) ● CSM Faculty Dual Enrollment Liaison: VACANT ● ASCCC CTE Liaison: Beth LaRochelle ● ASCCC OER Liaison: On leave ● ASCCC Rising Scholars Faculty Liaison: VACANT ● ASCCC Legislative & Advocacy Liaison: VACANT ● ASCCC IDEAA Liaison: Makiko Ueda ● ASCCC Part-time Faculty Liaison: Maggie de Vera ASCCC Credit for Prior Learning Liaison: Daniel Rhyne	Treasurer, Secretary & Faculty Liaisons	~3:07pm 3 min	Information
3. Senate Business	●			
No.				**Item / Description**

3.1	**Online classes and academic integrity**: We will follow up on some of the suggestions raised in our August 25, 2026 meeting and discuss what actions we might pursue. The chair may request a short-term ad-hoc committee to be formed if the body wishes to write a resolution or seek further information (As a reminder, we discussed how this could be handled during the August 25th meeting. Though an AI detection company's "foolproof" tool was discussed, this was not a viable resource. The most promising direction remains modifying course modality. The current CSM course modality list was just re-approved by the district, but Chris Collins indicated an openness for further discussion. Two competing models were presented for comparison: • **CSM's current "Online with Flexible In-Person" (RSI) model** — allows online testing via proctoring software (e.g., Proctorio) or other means; instructors are not required to hold mandatory on-campus meetings. • **Glendale Community College's model** — scheduled in-person exam dates/times/locations required; off-site proctoring available at instructor's discretion. Katryn W. favored the Glendale model because of its perceived flexibility but would like further clarification on the logistics with information included from those on campus who have used the OFI model. Katryn also suggests a blend of the models for the best model at our institution. She would be concerned about adding information that would limit options. Katryn offered her assistance in this process. Discussion Points: • The campus Learning Center currently proctors one-on-one and could not accommodate large numbers of students needing proctoring simultaneously — suggests exams should default to in-classroom administration, with the Learning Center as a fallback only for individual conflicts (as is already standard practice). Lia T and Lee M had input regarding this point. • Dual enrollment students (in high school, taking CSM online classes) might benefit from being able to test at their high school rather than traveling to a CSM learning center — there is already someone with prior experience with this kind of arrangement who could advise. Lee M and Tim M had input here. • Concern raised that requiring proctoring software installation at home could	President	~3:10pm 15 min	Discussion

	raise equity issues for students taking online courses due to lack of time/resources. rier. Brandon W and Maggie dV had input on this topic. • Being forced to come to campus/a facility could also introduce an access barrier just as required proctoring software could. The requirements that a course not have a required in-person component for inclusion in the California Virtual Campus (CVC) were also raised and whether CSM classes are included in the CVC. President Keller, Tim M, and Lee M contributed to this point. • Proctorio is currently the only vetted/district-approved proctoring software (per Julieth Diaz Benitez) — vetting is led by IT. Some concern was raised about Proctorio's historical issues detecting darker skin tones (unclear if resolved) and about privacy concerns that have led other institutions (e.g., UC Berkeley) to restrict its use. Brandon W, Katryn W, Lia T, Susan K, Lee M had input on this topic. • CTE/nursing programs reportedly use some proctored software solutions already. • Discussion of who currently sets the final exam schedule — likely a district-level (DPLC) function requiring consistency across all three colleges; historically, campuses required every class (in-person) to have a final exam slot. There may already be a mechanism for scheduling final exam slots for online classes. Additional concerns about final exams arose this Fall with the new WebSmart inclusion of final exams. Yvette B, Kat W, Lee M, and Brandon W had input on this topic. • General agreement that proctoring software should be a last resort, not the default option, with in-person exams as the preferred default and Learning Center/off-site software as fallback options. President Keller reminded Senate that this topic is a long way off from approval. At this point the information will need to go back to the will bring CSM's feedback to the District DAC (Distance Education Advisory Committee) meeting on October 8th and share with District Senate as well, hoping to get buy-in from all three colleges. President Keller will report back at the October Senate meeting(s). Senators are encouraged to email President Keller with additional feedback before then.)			
3.2	**Committee on Teaching and Learning:** While this committee is "on hold" until we have a full-time SLOAC coordinator, we will review the bylaws as we need to create a	President	~3:25 pm	Discussion

	committee that performs some of the CTL's functions for at least the Fall '26 semester. (Background: The committee is "on hold" since losing its full-time SLOAC (Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Coordinator) and part-time SLOAC support. A request was granted to allow re-assign time for a new SLOAC, but it came too late to allow a full-time faculty member the opportunity to apply, be considered, and logistically switch from a full-time load to the SLOAC position duties. Natalie Wakefield (former CTL lead) is in attendance to provide background and answer questions as needed. Here are the questions to discuss: 1) What function of CTL do we need to ensure are ongoing this semester? 2) What membership would the CTL need in place to ensure these functions continue? CTL oversees, coordinates and reports on activities to promote continuous improvement in teaching and learning. This includes support of SLO/SAO/PLO/ILO assessment reporting, review and approval of faculty inquiry project applications, an alternative to conventional SLO assessment which the English and Library faculty have used as an option, collaboration with the PD committee, advising the AS President and Vice President and VPI on academic/professional matters related to assessment, and oversees the program review process, likely its biggest function. For context of why this is a concern, consider that there was an accreditation concern last year noting that several departments were not doing SLOs consistently or doing them in a "whimsical" way. The college needs some form of ongoing learning assessment, though it doesn't necessarily need to be the old, rigid, three-year assessment cycle of the past. The proposed due date October 16th (not yet finalized), to give deans adequate time to respond (deans requested more time this cycle for more thorough responses). Programs due this semester: Counseling, Cooperative Education, and Language Arts (Library Studies received an extension due to an alternative project proposal). Without a lead, there is no one to answer program review questions or handle faculty inquiry project requests.		25 min	

	Senate really needs to know what is and is not working. When we had the tri-chair model last year there were options to choose something other than evaluation of SLOs. There is a separate professional development committee, but this is still part of the job of CTL. President says the biggest issue is overseeing the Program Review process. The following is the Program Review this semester and the Oct 16 deadline for these is soon approaching. A discussion ensued of stopgap solutions for the Fall 2026: • Suggestion made by President Keller: Dean of PRIE, Alex Claxton, serve as temporary lead for the semester (already informally discussed with him — he did not decline), with Rene Anderson continuing as co-chair/VP representative. • Another Suggestion from President Keller: Possible stipend for someone (potentially a part-time faculty member with prior SLO experience) to serve as an advisor on SLOs in the interim. Katryn W. also had input on this topic from her experience at City College. • Discussion of whether this could become a shared/split position (e.g., someone handles Curriculum Committee-related tasks while another runs meetings) rather than requiring one person to give up their full course load — full-time is very difficult to fill since it requires putting one's teaching career on hold while serving in this capacity full-time. Katryn W., Malathi I., and Maggie dV. all contributed to this topic. • Senate was reminded that Skyline has had a dedicated full-time SLO coordinator for 20+ years; the position is highly specialized. • Natalie Wakefield noted that Cañada uses a different long-term model: a Program Review subcommittee under their version of IPC, including Academic Senate, Classified Senate, the Dean of PRIE, VPI/VPAS, and general administration — similar to CSM's proposed short-term structure. President Keller confirmed the long-term goal is to move CTL under IPC (a proposal was floated with Manuel/administrators over the summer with positive interest), but the immediate priority is getting through Fall 2026. • Malathi I. also raised a concern about the impact of not having a SLOAC on the Curriculum Committee. The Curriculum Committee handbook states that SLOAC is a part of the curriculum committee and no one did that in the previous year, so if we aren't going to have someone this year, she feels a change to the Curriculum Committee handbook should be made to reflect the			

	lack of a SLOAC position. She wants to make sure that the job description includes the required Curriculum Committee duties. • Consequences of inaction: No immediate crisis this semester, but in the long run this creates accreditation risk, since CSM has stated in accreditation reports that it performs ongoing SLO assessment. Katryn W. shared her personal experience helping City College of San Francisco recover its accreditation after nearly losing it, underscoring the seriousness of program review/SLO gaps. Maggie dV. also shared concerns. • Question raised (Lee M.) about precedent for an administrator chairing an Academic Senate committee — no clear precedent found; the proposed structure would keep it as a co-chair model (Dean of PRIE + Rene Anderson, at minimum). Susan K was also concerned about the leadership. Natalie W. contributed her thoughts on the Dean of Prie being part of leadership on a temporary basis; she didn't feel this would be a problem as long as there is someone for faculty to talk with concerning Program Review. • Maggie asked for a written job/duty description for open committee roles — President said that's not ready yet; for now, the goal is simply to identify interested people ("feelers"). President Keller reminded Senate that the proposed leadership is not meant to be permanent, that this is just for the semester so we can make sure that the things move forward this semester. He will bring a more specific proposal in next meeting for a vote after clearing the plan with IPC.)			
3.3	**Process for full-time faculty prioritization:** We will return to some suggestions from last semester about how to improve our process for prioritizing full-time faculty requests: we will review the areas of concern and look at some alternative models. (The Senate discussed this topic during the last academic year. Please refer to the Senate notes for further information on this topic. There is information on the topic in the January 27, 2026 notes with a visit from Cassidy Ryan, AS President at Skyline, and follow-up occurred in the May 12, 2026 notes. Position prioritization will still occur this year even though we won't have any positions open this academic year. This is typically done in November and is scheduled for November 6th through the 10th. Here are some problems that happened and caused issues:	President	~3:50 pm 15 min	Discussion

	The following process problems were identified: • Deans/administrators, Academic Senate, and Classified Senate each ran separate, uncoordinated prioritization meetings, often on the same day, without communicating with each other — leading to confusion (e.g., the President once received a call about information from a deans' meeting that he couldn't share because the Senate agenda had already been posted). • Misinformation about which positions were actually available/guaranteed. • Resulting priority lists across groups were "completely different" due to inconsistent information. • Fairness concerns: in one past semester, one department (Communication Studies) was allowed on the agenda to make a direct appeal for a new position when no other department got that same opportunity. Proposed alternative was to adopt a model similar to Skylines FTEFAC (Full-Time Equivalent Faculty Allocation Committee). This is a single, separate committee (3-year terms) with a faculty co-chair, the VP of Instruction, and ~10 members from Instructional and Student Services divisions. Faculty/deans present their case directly to this one committee, which then meets a second time to deliberate and make recommendations — recommendations at Skyline are reportedly very rarely challenged and considered "the best thing Skyline does" per their Senate President. For further information on Skyline's FTEFAC please see their website. Even though there is a hiring freeze this year, President Keller would like to create and use the process this year as a trial run. Maggie dV. shared her frustrations about prioritization last year that was then ignored. She feels it defeats the purpose of seeking support if the input is then ignored. Katryn W. and Kat W. feel that it is really is important to develop a system proactively. Makiko U. added her thoughts on why the changes may have occurred. President will run the proposal by Skyline again and then take it to IPC. His plan is to bring a formal proposal to the next Senate meeting.)			
3.4	**Academic Senate Goals for 2026-2027:** Building on our discussion from 8/25/26, we will create a list of prioritized goals for the year ahead	All	~4:05 pm 25 min	Action

	(Please see the list that was included with the minutes which is building on the discussion from August 25th. President Keller noted that the draft goals list is intentionally ambitious and historically the Senate only gets through some of the items due to the number of business items that come up throughout the year that must be dealt with in a timely manner. The following suggestions and additions arose: • Makiko U. felt it important to add a section on student housing, and its impact on the library/wellness center/student services. • Katryn W. asked to add a registrar communication item — ability to ask questions and get explanations of policies/consequences directly from the registrar (e.g., late adds, schedule overlaps, WebSmart outages during grading periods, unclear final exam date labeling, unannounced AI feature rollouts in classes). Yvette B., Lia T., Kat W., and Lee M. contributed on this topic as well. • Tim M. wants to have an enrollment management / course load discussion. His concern is that the Honors Symposium (15 min/35 max enrollment) is being pressured toward the higher end of its cap, which undermines its intended small-seminar nature (Tim feels ~20–25 max is more appropriate); broader discussion needed about how "load" is calculated as an average and whether special/small programs (e.g., Nursing's 12-student cap) should be protected differently. Discussion may warrant an informal meeting with incoming VPI Lauren Servais, but Senate should discuss internally first. • Kat W. has interest in inviting Classified Senate and Student Senate representatives for a joint meet-and-greet, possibly during a Flex Day session in October (though attendance concerns were raised since not everyone can attend Flex Day). President Keller reminded us that we considered a Flex Day session with a meeting of the Senates. Maggie reminded Senate is not everyone is able to attend the Flex Day in October. • Lee M. is curious about the money being spent at Coastside especially in conjunction to what is being spent on the main campus. • Lee M also expressed interest in a Dual Enrollment update, including how much of high school teachers' salaries (for those teaching CSM concurrent/dual-enrollment classes) are covered by the district. Tim M said that this is something of interest to him.			

	• Tim M expressed concerns about the last commencement ceremony — felt rushed (three commencements in one day for the Board of Trustees), with no acknowledgment of student achievements, affiliations, or honors (e.g., Puente students, 4.0 GPAs). President Keller will invite Alex Guiriba/Gariva back to discuss commencement format and possibly require faculty attendance (this was tabled last year pending contract resolution). • Susan K. asked about student conduct concerns. Workplace violence prevention policy discussion, prompted by a specific faculty member's experience (not from Flex Day) involving confidentiality concerns after a student previously removed from campus for violence/harassment was placed in her class without official notice. ASCCC has proposed a more specific workplace violence protocol; CSM already has one, but President Keller would like clarity on it and plans to invite HR and possibly someone regarding lower-level student conduct/emotional concerns that don't rise to violence. Makiko U. would also like to raise the issues of a lesser level than the workplace violence. • Rene A. also raised a concern about inability to access certain systems (e.g., emailing students — access denied errors); President will assign this to the next meeting agenda and invite ITS to explain. President Keller will bring a full list as a voting item for the next meeting. From that point forth a list of unresolved items will be tracked at the bottom of each future set of minutes.)			

4. Closing Procedures				
No.	**Item / Description**	**Presenter(s)**	**Time**	**Action?**
4.1	Final Announcements (President Manuel will come next meeting. He will be our first agenda item.) *President or facilitator elicits final announcements about upcoming deadlines, events, scheduling changes, etc.*	President /	~4:30pm 0 min	Information
4.2	Adjourn (4:26)	President /	~4:30pm	Procedure