

# Academic Senate of College of San Mateo



**Tuesday, January 13, 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 (absent)
Distance Education Committee	Jennifer Howze-Owens
Committee on Teaching & Learning	Rene Anderson

<i>Division &amp; Student Representatives</i>	
Student Representative	Ameer Dababo (absent)
ASLT / Library	Matt Montgomery
ASLT / Library	Susan Khan
Business/Technology	Vacant
Busin/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 (absent)
Language Arts	Tim Maxwell
Language Arts	Robbie Baden
Math/Science	Wendy Whyte
Math/Science	Beth LaRochelle (absent)
Counseling	Emily Cota
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	<p>Call to Order (2:33 )</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 (Before making his motion to approve the agenda Matt Montgomery asked about whether the search for the VP of Instruction would be discussed today. President Keller said that it would not be discussed since the item came in too late to be added to the agenda as dictated by the Brown Act. A motion was made by Matt Montgomery to adopt today's agenda. The motion was 2<sup>nd</sup> by Jennifer Howze-Owens. 10 Yes. 0 No. 1 Abstain.)</p>	President / Facilitator	~2:32pm 2 min	Action
1.3	<p>Adoption of Consent Agenda (A motion was made to approve the consent agenda by Susan Khan. The motion was 2<sup>nd</sup> by Daniel Rhyne. 10 Yes. 0 No. 1 Abstain.)</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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Approval of Faculty Appointment(s)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">CPL Liasons</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Senate Notes</a> for 10/14, 10/28, 11/11</li> </ul>	President / Facilitator	~2:34pm 5 min	Action
1.4	<p>Public Comment (Tim Maxwell had a letter to share that he sent to Danni Redding-Lapuz:</p> <p>Dear Danni,</p> <p>I hope that you are enjoying a pleasant new year and new semester.</p> <p>I'm writing to give you an idea of the consequences of the austerity measures the administration has imposed on instruction and students this year. It is clear to me that in some cases, especially in the ones that prompt this message, the cuts are resulting in far more harm to our students, our adjunct faculty of color, our programs, and our</p>	Public	~2:39pm 6 min	Information

mission than the potential cost savings could justify.

During the keynote on opening day, Chiara, my dean, informed me, as the Creative Writing Co-Coordinator, that she was canceling two of the four Creative Writing classes we were offering this semester.

I can more easily understand why it may have been necessary (though highly unfortunate) to cut Antonio's class in Half Moon Bay. He had only seven students enrolled by Friday. Yet, it is a shame that this talented instructor—the Poet Laureate of San Mateo County and a gifted instructor—never had a chance to re-establish creative writing on the Coastsde. Some years ago, before the budget cuts that resulted in the closing of the HMB campus, I taught an evening Creative Writing class and maintained high enrollment (as many as thirty) semester after semester. This was possible, I believe, because CSM had invested more in marketing and had the patience to let the program grow. Last semester, I had the privilege of evaluating Antonio's teaching, and I found him to be nothing short of inspiring. As a graduate of the Iowa Writers Workshop, a published poet, a doctoral student at Stanford, and a Latino who grew up in (and has written about) East Palo Alto, he might have been given more support in promoting his class and even the opportunity to let it run. Of course, I recognize that, with the class so far below the 15 minimum, Chiara and Manuel had little choice but to let it go.

However, I am much more dismayed that Chiara felt she had no choice but to cancel Aimee Suzara's Creative Writing class here on the CSM campus. As of Friday morning, she had 14 students enrolled, just one shy of the minimum and, I am certain, we could have found one additional student to bring her enrollment up to the minimum if we'd been given the opportunity in the first week. Yet, as she explained it to me, Chiara was forced to choose between cutting Aimee's class and addressing the long waitlists for two Comm courses. In other words, she canceled a viable course in a vulnerable program because she was prohibited from adding an additional Comm section. I understand she had no choice, but that does not make the pain any less.

Because of the low-percentage chance that we could not find one additional student, we had to deny 14 students the opportunity to work with Aimee, herself a published poet, a Filipina and instructional lead in Katipunan, and, like Antonio, a relatively recent adjunct hire. After cutting the class, Chiara took the time to call all of Aimee's students and offer them the choice of taking my Monday evening section, Hector Sanchez's MW section

(which already had 26 enrolled), or abandoning Creative writing for the semester. While some Comm students may yet find a place and I am glad for that, the administration's effort to balance its books with austerity will result in the following:

- Hector's class could swell to well over 30, making this "workshop" course (which should have a much lower cap) into something more like a lecture, denying students the close community and close attention to their writing they deserve
- Students choosing (or needing to take) Creative Writing this semester will likely either have to rearrange their schedules and interrupt their ed plans or take my evening section, which is not feasible for many.
- Students pursuing their Certificates of Achievement in Creative Writing may be unable to complete their coursework before graduation this Spring
- The Creative Writing Certificate of Achievement, which we created and have developed (entirely without release time) and which has resulted in dramatic increases in enrollment in Creative Writing and Literature as well as unprecedented persistence in our 3-course sequence, will suffer a serious setback
- Students will lose confidence in the program and CSM more generally
- The Creative Writing ecosystem that includes a popular club, Labyrinth, the Writers' Ruckus, and the Literature, Film, and DGME programs will be affected
- Students will lose an important opportunity to learn close, critical reading, use language for creative expression and deep self-reflection, develop confidence in their voices, and improve their capacities for empathy and self-reflection.
- Part-time faculty of color will be undermined (even if Chiara was able to reassign Aimee to three units in the Writing Center)

All of this could have been prevented if Chiara had had the flexibility to add a section of Comm without having to amputate a limb.

I am reminded of a keynote a few years back by Heather McGee, the author of *The Sum of Us*, who talked about how the enemy of equity was zero-sum thinking like this. And, it was ironic that I was informed of this cut during Dr. Alexis Riley's keynote address on

Friday, for she was speaking about how liberatory education can happen when educators and institutions are responsive to the socio-cultural lived experiences of their students. This work is precisely what happens in Creative Writing classes.

It is urgent that our administration at College of San Mateo do some sincere self-reflection about its harmful cuts to our educational programs, especially in light of our mission statement: "College of San Mateo creates access and inclusion, fosters academic excellence, and ensures equitable outcomes so students can realize their full potential." Let's do more than pay lip service to these ideals.

Robbie Baden also added that he has heard that students aren't able to get classes at CSM. Jennifer from counseling also said that counselors are seeing this as well, especially in terms of math and English classes.

Maggie de Vera also added during the Executive Round Table last Friday, 1/9, that the main issue in the budgetary crisis is from the lower cap size for the classes and now they are trying to "right-size." Before they were trying to invest and numbers grew, but now that we have right-sized as the administration calls it, and cut classes, we are seeing a decline in enrollment again. Maggie doesn't feel that this is a coincidence; she understands changes are needed, but she feels that there needs to be more transparency and discussion. She also added that the heartbreak extends beyond the canceling of classes. She feels making the administration aware of our concerns helps their understanding. She also added that prioritization of hiring was also not transparent, and that assurances that faculty input would be used to make the decisions, were just a joke, and not fair to the faculty who put time and effort into support of their positions during division meetings and in the Senate.

President Keller suggested that we think about using this type of share-out involving consequences to our students if we have continued conversations with the administration in Senate around budget concerns.)

- 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 (There is a handout included for the CTL Liaison position. The CTL Liaison position had push back at the Plenary in November 2025. This push back must have been successful because there is training and a stipend (see the handout for details) being offered. The most common issues related to CTL have to do with the Credit for Prior Learning. President Keller asked for interest from Senate and Daniel Rhyne expressed interest. Maggie de Vera asked if this liaison position is open to adjuncts and President Keller said he believes so. This position doesn't need to be a member of Senate, but would need to communicate with President Keller to transfer knowledge to the campus, or bring it personally to Senate.)</p> <p>The Vice President search has been announced and Jennifer Howze-Owens asked if we would be discussing this more. She understood that this had been addressed earlier, with a question from Matt Montgomery, and that it wasn't a topic for today, but asked if we would have input later. President Keller indicated that it will not be discussed further today since the suggestion didn't come until it was too late to put it on the agenda.)</p>	Daniel Keller	~2:45pm 5 min	Information

2.2	Curriculum Committee Chair Report (The chair was absent today so there was no report.)	Malathi Iyengar	~2:50pm 3 min	Information
2.3	Distance Education Committee Chair Report (The committee will meet on February 4 <sup>th</sup> . Meetings are held on the 1 <sup>st</sup> Wednesdays of each month. Anyone is welcome to attend. Many people attend who aren't voting members.)	Jennifer Howze-Owens	~2:53pm 3 min	Information
2.4	Committee on Teaching and Learning Chair Report (No meetings have been held this semester.)	Natalie Alizaga, Rene Anderson	~2:56pm 3 min	Information
2.5	Student Representative Report (There was not a student present. President Keller will reach out to check whether the same student will be attending Senate or whether a new representative will be appointed.)	Ameer Dababo	~2:59pm 3 min	Information
2.6	<p>Other Officer &amp; <u>Liaison Reports</u></p> <p>(Emily Cotla, the ASCCC Legislative &amp; Advocacy Liaison reported that someone had made comments to the Listserv in December. There were updates from the budget schedule and deadlines, legislative schedule deadlines, public budgets, and the main one that came in December talked about the bills that were introduced. Of the 2,350 bills introduced, 154 were specific to community colleges, of which Governor Newsom agreed to 13%. One highlight that a bachelor's degree in nursing pilot at the community college level was passed. There were also updates on councils that would be implemented and grant programs that were signed. There was a Brown Act update. It seems that the updates came after complaints in Plenary, so President Keller feels that the complaints may have had an impact on the sharing of information.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CSM Faculty Dual Enrollment Liaison: Leo Cruz</li> <li>• ASCCC CTE Liaisons: Beth LaRochelle</li> <li>• ASCCC OER Liaison: Mohammed Akhoirshida</li> <li>• ASCCC Rising Scholars Faculty Liaison: Wesley Hingano</li> <li>• ASCCC Legislative &amp; Advocacy Liaison: Emily Cotla</li> <li>• ASCCC IDEAA Liaison: Makiko Ueda</li> <li>• ASCCC Part-time Faculty Liaison: Maggie de Vera</li> </ul>	Treasurer, Secretary & Faculty Liaisons	~3:02pm 3 min	Information

3. Senate Business				
No.	Item / Description	Presenter(s)	Time	Action?
3.1	<p>Position requests: Revising our process to improve accuracy and fairness (Cañada has a similar set of complaints that CSM has with respect to position requests. Only Skyline seems to like their process. President Keller put together a Power Point for the Senate to share his thoughts. He feels that there are two major issues: accuracy and consistency. After those, the fairness of the process was an issue. First, President Keller was told during the Dean's meeting that some of the position requests contained inaccurate information. For example, one department claimed that they were serving more students than they were while another claimed that their program was threatened and their dean claimed it was not. President Keller felt the process felt absurd if good information on which to make decisions was not being provided.</p> <p>This led President Keller to the following questions:</p> <p>How can we assure that the information is accurate?</p> <p>How can we improve the consistency of the requests?</p> <p>Thoughts from the Senate on these two questions:</p> <p>Wendy Whyte: Develop guidelines to accurately track information such as how many students, where do the students "go" after graduation or transfer.</p> <p>Lee Miller: Consistent data from a controlled source like PRIE. Information consistently passed down from the Deans. The information should be consistent so that consistent context is given. The data should be neutral and the person explaining the context using accurate data. It was hard to compare because of the discrepancy in presentations. The decisions about who isn't being considered by us due to outside funding should be removed in advanced. Lee is worried about the disparity between those positions represented by Senators verses those not represented in Senate.</p> <p>Jennifer Howze-Owens: In terms of the data, she feels it should come from PRIE, and PRIE should come to Senate to verify the data or pre-verify, suggested Daniel Rhyne. The Deans should meet much earlier than Senate to discuss this, so there is space between the two discussions, more than the four hours that existed this past Fall, and they can be used to help with the decisions in Senate. Revisit what is asked on the form and stating that explanation given is for context. The question of additional</p>	President	~3:05pm 20 min	Discussion

	<p>outside funding should also be added.</p> <p>Daniel Rhyne: Guidelines for the blurbs so they are consistent. If there are positions that are receiving outside funding, that should be noted when brought forth for discussion.</p> <p>Maggie de Vera: Make sure that we know the guidelines behind the decisions. The underlying issue seems to be transparency. Any type of unfair advantage needs to be considered, thus removing the challenge for Senators.</p> <p>Makiko Ueda: Make sure that it is understood that not all programs, like Personal Counseling, use PRIE data.</p> <p>Questions of Fairness:</p> <p>How do we ensure that ALL position requests have a representative?</p> <p>Who should represent divisions?</p> <p>Thoughts on questions of fairness:</p> <p>Lee Miller: Lee feels that not just a division representative should present, but instead a person directly representing the position request. *The secretary took the liberty of changing the question to take this point into account, because President Keller actually felt this was important as well.</p> <p>Tim Miller: Again, Tim feels this is about transparency. Being transparent about the administrations' priorities in choice, such as replacement of retirements, is key to being able to make informed recommendations. Having requirements will make it easier to have consistency in reading the position requests. For instance, in the last set of requests, some were long and some were short which made it difficult to separate which were important and which weren't.</p> <p>Wendy Whyte: A concise statement about the position would be easier to use in determining priority.</p> <p>Maggie de Vera: Consistent statements from all would be best. It is difficult being both a Senator and a Director; it makes being fair difficult.</p> <p>Daniel Rhyne: A hiring committee could be put together in advance and they could pitch the hire. The same standards for everyone will make it fair.</p> <p>Matt Montgomery: Consider that small departments will potentially have a Senator that will presenting for a position thus making it difficult to have fair representation.</p>		
--	--	--	--

	There was a couple of final comments about how nice it is that we have some input. President Keller would still like to see change in the process before we do this again.)			
3.2	<p>Update on district-level IRB proposal: we will vote at our next meeting to forward the proposal to the district. (Jennifer Merrill, Professor of Psychology at Skyline, and Dr. Pia Walawalkar, professor and librarian are joining Senate today. They came in the Fall 2025 and shared with us and the Senate at Cañada as well. They are hoping to gain our support to recommend passing this IRB proposal at the District Academic Senate. The following information was requested from those meetings:</p> <p>Question 1: How many students would potentially need IRB approval?</p> <p>The estimate based on the three campuses' honors transfer program estimates that there would be approximately 16 from Cañada, 25 from CSM, and 40 from Skyline each semester.</p> <p>Question 2: What would the time commitment and workload be for faculty participating in the IRB?</p> <p>The thought is that an ad hoc committee would be created consisting of five people from each school, representing different disciplines. They feel that most reviews will be exempt and wouldn't require full reviews, but instead just a few that would require a meeting of the entire committee to make a decision. By exempt, Dr. Walawalkar explained that the projects pose minimal risk to participants because the topics are non-sensitive and the responses are confidential. In these cases, the applications could be divided among the committee members so that all members wouldn't be involved each time, but instead, if there were 40 applications and 5 members on the committee, then each might have to review 8 applications, and most would be exempt.</p> <p>Question 3: What about training?</p>	Pia Walawalkar Jennifer Merrill	~3:25 pm 15 min	Information

There are five modules from the Human Research Protection Foundational Training that are required. Dr. Walawalkar and Professor Merrell completed the certification and believe in all it would take most people about 5-6 hours to get a certificate through the US Department of Health and Human Services. They said that the training is a little more rigorous than the Keenan trainings that we do for the district.

Question 4: Would there be compensation for serving on the committee?

Professor Merrill felt that this would be viewed as another committee that is taken as part of our workload.

Question 5: Would the District and BOT need to approve the IRB decisions?

The District doesn't need to approve the IRB decisions because these are strictly IRB approvals to which the District has no input. This led to concern over the coverage of IRB activities and those sitting on the IRB. There are protections for those on the IRB under district policy and as long as normal policy conditions are met, mainly being an employee of the district then there are protections.

Question 6: What about confidentiality?

Not everyone can look at the IRB proposals, only those on the committee are able to view the IRBs. Furthermore, IRBs can't be retroactive, they must be approved or exempt before the data collection begins.

Questions from the Senate:

President Keller's spouse is dealing with an IRB process in an elementary school and it has been delayed for 4 or more weeks. Could this be something that could happen in our students' IRBs? President Keller's concern centered around the fact that our students are on a semester timeline and any extended delay could be a concern. The response was that the intention is to have a fast turn-around to prevent such issues. In

	<p>addition, the students would be working with a faculty, and that collaborative process should make sure that the process goes smoothly.</p> <p>Professor's who are not in honors, could they also access this process? The presenters said that all students would have access, but the Honors students are easier to capture in terms of numbers.</p> <p>President Keller asked the presenters to make a statement for the Senate to read and approve and vote on during the January 27<sup>th</sup> Senate meeting.)</p>			
3.3	<p>Program Review—Review of past practice and discussion of how we should approach the “Great Read” this semester (The 2021-2022 forms for the Great Read were given to the Senate members. The process won’t be conducted in one meeting. The intent is to be broken into multiple steps. We want to continue the process and use the information to help us write things like the ISER. We need to read 9 instructional program reviews and 12 student services reviews this time. We will definitely be doing this as a group project as we have in the past. That means that everyone doesn’t have to read all of each review report, but instead we break up the work load and report out on what each group found in their assigned reads. Program review is tied to accreditation, documentation of current initiatives, alignment of institutional goals, and allows us to identify professional development needs. For instance, the finance committee considers program reviews before making finance decisions. Program effectiveness can be evaluated and assurance made that resource requests align with effectiveness. In addition, if a program is being considered for discontinuance, program reviews are supposed to be a part of this process. These are the statements that were made in the ISER report, at least.</p> <p>President Keller would like the Senate to consider what in the current forms is still valuable and what we might want to change or eliminate. For instance, there is a question about COVID, and that probably isn’t valid anymore, so maybe we want to eliminate that questions, but would like to add a different one.</p> <p>Susan said that there is a revised version from this 21-22' version handed out in Senate today. She said that there is a Formstack already out there, and maybe that information can be made available. Susan also said that the Reviews were broken down between reviewing committees so not all were reviewed by the various</p>	President	~3:40 pm 25 min	Discussion

	<p>committees. In addition, each committee was reading for very specific questions rather than reading the whole review for general take-aways. She explained that in CTL they read specifically for professional development.</p> <p>President Keller asked if the group tasks would still be reasonable? The groups would read maybe 3 to 6 and write comments. President Keller suggested that we might work individually and share out via email or in meetings outside the Senate meetings.</p> <p>Submission deadlines are not decided at this time, but they must be done this semester.</p> <p><b>Looking at the handout for the questions of interest, is there anything to add or take out?</b></p> <p>President Keller ran down some of the guided questions: What's being done in department that promotes equity, What are the challenges around student learning, Narratives for best practices, Calling attention to people who are doing great work, Calling attention to programs that are doing innovative and interesting things, COVID questions which could probably be eliminated, there were also sub questions that didn't always get answered, but may have been thought provoking.</p> <p>Lee asked a follow-up question about the specific aspects of those sub questions.</p> <p>Susan added that IPC did a Great Read last year, but Senate did not. She will send some more information to President Keller with what she found from the IPC 2024-2025 Great Read.</p> <p>Wendy asked about the equity question and if socio-economic/location data was used.</p> <p>Robbie wondered if the SEAP is being incorporated.</p> <p>President Keller wonders if the Statement of Solidarity could be revisited and asked a little differently.</p> <p>Tim wonders about the tracking and mentoring of the students who don't pass our classes on a consistent basis. President Keller said that such a question is not asked in Program Review so we can research that aspect, though we could look for trends. Use COVID area to discuss AI impacts.</p> <p>Jennifer Howze-Owens wants to add best practices such as sabbaticals and faculty or departments that have received grants or received awards for innovative work within the last three years.</p>		
--	---	--	--

President Keller would like to re-incorporate a question about SLO assessment. He wants to hear more because he feels it would be informative in how others are using SLOs in a meaningful way.

Susan said that when SLO was a question, the answers were vague. Tying SLOs to student learning and where there are deficits in the student learning can be very informative, so Susan would like to see more in this area of SLO questions. If professional development doesn't get specifically addressed, maybe it can be addressed in a different way based on challenges experienced in meeting the SLOs and what professional development can be used to assist the challenges. IPC gave feedback last year about items that were not addressed. Her concern is that feedback can be difficult.

Jennifer de la Cruz wanted SAOs to be included too. Feedback should be provided from the program review from outside perspectives which help to form better practices.

Wendy Whyte mentioned comparing to other schools or other districts with similar programs. This might help to see where programs are duplicated or how others are being more/less successful in getting students through their programs. She also mentioned challenges like cheating and President Keller tied that into AI.

It seemed that Maggie de Vera wants to give program review a better reputation, and not just something that is dashed off and put on a shelf as was indicated when she first participated.

Robbie Baden wanted more information on anecdotes and what that might mean. The ideas were that student achievement anecdotes could be shared so that we can use them in accreditation reports.

President Keller would like to use positive practices and not best practices. He also mentioned mode of delivery in these questions.

Jennifer Howze-Owens would like for more patterns that are emerging since COVID. For instance, there may be study skills and procedural knowledge that may be lacking due to COVID education. She wants these issues addressed in addition to AI issues that were mentioned as well. Tim Maxwell agreed with that and added that personal accountability is important. Makiko Ueda added budget issues could be addressed in trying to address these concerns. President Keller said that maybe Post COVID issues might be broad.

	Next time President Keller will bring back a more fleshed out set of standards for our review.)			
3.4	<p>Agenda setting for Spring '26—Quick review of our work last semester and planning for this term (Jennifer Howze-Owens wants to know if we have the goals available. The goals are on the <a href="#">Senate website</a>, see August 26<sup>th</sup> meeting for notes from Flex Day, but the big three are budget issues, artificial intelligences, and academic freedom.</p> <p>Lee Miller wants to know how the political climate is affecting all of us at CSM. This could be ICE concerns as well as budget concerns. Additionally, Lee was concerned about the way hybrid classes are defined and Jennifer Howze-Owens said there is a definite difference in set-up based on how they are defined.</p> <p>Robbie Baden wants to know more about the discussion on class modality. It seems that more classes are being taken on-line, but many of our faculty are hesitant to have more on-line classes. President Keller added that discussions have been underway about concerns that are related to AI issues in asynchronous classes. There are many questions surrounding modality and this was discussed by Jennifer Howze-Owens, Tim Maxwell, Robbie, and President Keller, including concerns about AI and ghost students with the potential for district wide conversations about in-person final requirements.</p> <p>President Keller suggests an ad-hoc Senate Committee on budget issues. Potential focus would be a resolution about the allocation of funds and the impact on students. Is there interest? Tim Maxwell added that he spoke with Todd Windisch and he suggested that a resolution on budget allocation would be a good approach. Maggie de Vera wanted to assure that the Senate could help determine the goals and objectives. Tim wants to make sure that the 50% law is discussed in terms of budget allocation.</p> <p>Jennifer Howze-Owens said that the DAS is talking about the way information is shared. There is a Listserv that the administration shares, but how does that get shared out. Also, just how does the information go out from Senate to the divisions. As a result, Jennifer would like to revisit communication across the campus.</p> <p>Wendy Whyte said Jennifer's statement is true across organizations. She said that it is</p>	President	~4:05 pm 25 min	Discussion

	<p>hard to get information from the BOT and it takes a lot of work.</p> <p>Budget concerns were further discussed by Tim Maxwell and Robbie Baden. Concerns were around the budget discussions from last fall where Danny Redding-Lapuz discussed increasing class caps and looking at instructor release time to get instructors back in the classrooms to reduce budgetary concerns.</p> <p>Daniel Rhyne brought the solidarity statement back up as well.)</p>		
--	---	--	--

4. Closing Procedures				
No.	Item / Description	Presenter(s)	Time	Action?
4.1	<p>Final Announcements (None)</p> <p><i>President or facilitator elicits final announcements about upcoming deadlines, events, scheduling changes, etc.</i></p>	President /	~4:30pm 0 min	Information
4.2	Adjourn (4:22)	President /	~4:30pm	Procedure