

# Academic Senate of College of San Mateo



**Tuesday, February 10, 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>	
<b>President</b>	Daniel Keller
<b>Vice President</b>	Rene Anderson
<b>Secretary</b>	Yvette Butterworth
<b>Treasurer</b>	Makiko Ueda

<i>Standing Senate Committee Chairs</i>	
<b>Curriculum Committee</b>	Malathi Iyengar
<b>Distance Education Committee</b>	Jennifer Howze-Owens
<b>Committee on Teaching &amp; Learning</b>	Rene Anderson

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

1. Opening Procedures				
No.	Item / Description	Presenter(s)	Approx. Start Duration	Action?
1.1	<p>Call to Order(2:37)</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 (The motion to approve the agenda was made by Beth LaRoche and Wendy Whyte 2<sup>nd</sup> the motion. 10 Yes. 0 No. 0 Abstain.)</p>	President / Facilitator	~2:32pm 2 min	Action
1.3	<p>Adoption of Consent Agenda (Two changes need to be made to the agenda: Add the ASLT committee and change to the make-up of the peer evaluation committee for Math/Science replacing Alyssa Wong from math with Catherine Ciesla from Chemistry. Move to approve changes Beth LaRoche &amp; Malathi Iyengar. 9 Yes. 0 No. 0 Abstain. With the changes as above the motion to approve the consent agenda Malathi Iyengar &amp; Lee Miller 2<sup>nd</sup>. 10 Yes. 0 No. 0 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> <p>Note: All consent agenda items are posted on the <a href="#">Academic Senate website</a></p>	President / Facilitator	~2:34pm 5 min	Action
1.4	<p>Public Comment (Makiko Ueda shares that we don't have a lot of money left in the bank account, \$2900 and change, which in terms of giving scholarships, it wouldn't be giving a lot and still having some funds remaining. She would like to see the funds used to collaborate with Sparkpoint to help with students' basic needs, thus helping more students. Makiko added that this is just something to think about for the future.</p> <p>Tim Maxwell brought the subject from the previous day's DAS. He had listened to Chancellor Melissa Merono's response to the 50% Law. He read the following...</p> <p>Melissa's "solution" to the 50% Law non-compliance issue was truly grim. She tried to come off like the District, weakened by past mistakes, is being victimized by an unjust</p>	Public	~2:39pm 6 min	Information

<p>law that is obsolete, for it fails to recognize how instruction has changed. How can we support instruction, she argues implicitly when technology costs so much and student support services are a better use of resources? She says we have no choice under these circumstances but to downsize, the term she used replacing "right-size." If I hadn't been there to provide a comment—which she didn't deign to respond to because it wasn't a question—the senate would have had little to say at all. The one question that was raised was a good one, definitely one I would like an answer to: how are fund 1 resources being allocated if not to classroom instruction?</p> <p>She seems to say that it's a zero-sum game, and that because faculty are demanding COLA in contract negotiations and that will likely be paid out, their "ambitious" plan to hire 20 new tenure-track faculty over three years had to be abandoned. We are looking at class cuts, the expansion of dual enrollment (less instruction is better for our students!), increasing reliance on cheaper adjunct faculty, and—with retirement incentives to be announced—even fewer full-time faculty to perform shared governance, promote professional development, advise clubs, develop curriculum, and maintain our programs. The long-term plan—in our renegade district that is using our basic aid status not to benefit our students but to reduce opportunities for them in the name of fiscal necessity in a crisis that still has not been adequately explained.</p> <p>What will happen when the economy does take a dive, as it inevitably will at some point, and we have downsized during times of relatively plenty? How will we serve students then?</p> <p>This is where the AFT's concerns and ours in the Senate do converge.</p> <p>I have discussed the failures of this Board and District leadership with David Laderman and Jeremy Wallace as well as others who agree that the time for a vote of no confidence is now. Let Melissa go to Sacramento to ask for an exemption for our poor, beleaguered district under the cloud of a faculty and Academic Senate that understands the destructive agenda behind the request.</p> <p>I ask that we develop a forceful response against the exemption from the 50% Law and discuss a vote of no confidence in the Board and the District leadership.</p> <p>Hector Sanchez was also in attended the DAS meeting yesterday. He didn't say anything during the meeting because he was afraid to speak up. He is now teaching dream classes and loves his job. He has no job security and when he was lucky enough to be</p>			
---	--	--	--

full-time, he was happy and felt stable. Now that he is an adjunct, he is working on a reduced load of 9 units, and he doesn't know what that means in terms of his job security. He left CSM as a student 11 years ago and was so excited to come back. He is willing to take on extra work for no pay, reduced pay for the work that he does, and he feels he is doing what is the best for the students. He is now questioning whether he should stay or whether he should find another job that will offer job security and better pay. He was excited to come back and see the full-time faculty that he knew and respected when he was a student. He feels that flooding the teaching pool with adjunct faculty cheapens the experience for students, because those adjunct faculty won't likely be around when and if a student returns to the school as Hector did.

At this point, President Keller reminded the Senate about the ad hoc committee on the Budget. He invited anyone to email and join in.

Lee Miller said that there is no logic to the Chancellor's comments. He says that if the District that has more money than anyone else in the state, then it seems strange that we struggle to expend 50% of our budget on instruction. He feels the complaint from the Chancellor doesn't make sense. President Keller invited him to join the work group, but Lee declined due to current work load and commitments.

Susan Khan has a PD planning meeting coming up for discussion in a later agenda item. However, she reminded us to keep an eye out for April 16<sup>th</sup> Flex Day proposal requests and reminded us that the applications are due by February 27<sup>th</sup>. She said that as we look at program reviews today, that perhaps we could highlight some of those programs that are using assessment practices to drive meaning change during the April Flex. Susan also noted that anyone unable to join the committees lunch time table talk she reminded everyone that there was a 10-minute Flex Day planning survey that everyone has been asked to fill out. Very few feedback forms came back for January, so she asks that everyone please fill the survey out. Here was what Susan put in the chat:

Help shape our upcoming Flex Days! Make sure your perspective counts by helping the [All-Campus PD Committee](#) in our planning efforts:

- Please [submit April 16 Flex Day session proposals](#) by Friday, **February 27**.
- Help us highlight people, programs, & departments that use assessment practices to drive meaningful change for a special showcase on Flex Day. [Recommend yourself or others](#) by **February 27**.
- If you were unable to participate in our lunchtime "Table Talk/Feedback Activity"

	<p>at our last Flex Day, please complete our <a href="#">10-minute Flex Day Planning Survey</a> by <b>February 20</b>.</p> <p>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions/comments on non-agenda items</li> <li>• If more than one public commentator is present, comments may need to be limited to 1-2 minutes to accommodate everyone</li> </ul>			
<b>2. Standing Agenda</b>				
No.	Item / Description	Presenter(s)	Time	Action?
2.1	<p>Presidents' Report</p> <p>(President Keller said the following about the DAS meeting from Mon., 2/9: He agreed with Tim Maxwell's summary of the Chancellor's statement about the 50% Law. He added that the Chancellor said the District will be making progress toward meeting the requirement by not adding full-time positions and by cutting administrative positions. The Chancellor said the District will be cutting what used to be seven Vice Chancellors down to just two Vice Chancellors. The Chancellor also discussed promoting early retirement to be discussed during the February 25<sup>th</sup> Board Meeting. The following was copied from the minutes of DAS for 2/9: "Chancellor Moreno anticipates a longer window for choosing to take the retirement incentive if they are eligible (90 days rather than 60 days). With regard to resign or retire options, Moreno anticipates that both will be an option for individuals choosing the incentive (resign if they seek employment at a different District or retire if they want to fully enter retirement." The following was also copied with regard to the 50% Law statement from Chancellor Moreno: Chancellor Moreno notes we have already moved from around 40% to 42% compliance. District has been working closely with the State Chancellor's office, which is an improvement. There have been significant changes in Community Colleges since the law was passed in 1960s, most notably the increase technology costs. If we get an exemption from the State Chancellor's office, then we won't be breaking the law. The exemption would be for a year and need to be resubmitted each year if we are still out of compliance. Moreno believes that the Chancellor's Office will grant exemption if they see that we are moving towards compliance." There was also to be a vote on the Academic Calendar, but there was not a vote because the calendar was not ready. There was discussion of the revisions to the faculty screening guidelines that HR is</p>	Daniel Keller	~2:45pm 5 min	Information

<p>discussing and President Keller will bring those to us during the next meeting. They do want feedback from all colleges from those who have served on a screening committee, especially recently. The DAS appointed 2 new people appointed to the housing board. Jennifer Howze-Owens made a presentation on the challenges of using AI and her attendance to the State Webinar. She noted that the State Chancellor's webinar was underwhelming and not super helpful. The topic of AI will be addressed in a later agenda item, so further discussion can wait until later today. Please look to the <a href="#">DAS website</a> for more information or to read the full agenda and/or notes for yourself.</p> <p>The only other topic President Keller addressed at this time were changes that have been made to our Senate website. West Valley Academic Senate highlighted and showed us how you agenda items can be created based on faculty recommendations through a button on the Senate website. In addition, the West Valley Academic Senate website is much more visual streamlined. He showed our Senate website in comparison and highlighted the clutter of our site. He also shared the button to share a meeting agenda item. President Keller will be meeting with Val Tyler to work on redesign and updates. He will bring changes to the Senate before he makes any changes. )</p>			
---	--	--	--

2.2	<p>Curriculum Committee Chair Report (The chair, Malathi Iyengar, said that aside from their regular work the committee is working on the 50% rule for certificates. She discussed this during the last meeting of Senate and she would like to remind Senators to have people from your divisions get in touch with concerns around the 50% rule.</p> <p>Malathi updated Senate on 8-1111. There is a delay in Phase 3, so that timeline will be delayed, which is not a bad thing. There was an issue with articulation in the past phases and thus they have paused to check and make sure that articulation will be seamless after the required updates are made for Phase 3.)</p>	Malathi Iyengar	~2:50pm 3 min	Information
2.3	<p>Distance Education Committee Chair Report (<i>Note: This agenda item was completed after 2.6.</i> The last meeting was Wednesday, 2/4 and the meeting was heavy on policy. The ACCJC Team visits begin in September. There will be an open college forum on March 12. The Peer Review Team review meeting will be March 17. The committee has received information about the sample that will be pulled for RSI and they have been working with the appropriate deans, the VPI, and President Manuel to make sure everyone is up-to-date and knows what work needs to be done to prepare for the visit. Their update was given in the Friday, 2/6 newsletter from President Keller and is shown via a screen capture below, and Jennifer asked to make sure that all Divisions are aware of these dates as related to the ACCJC visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ <b>March 17, 2026:</b> Peer Review Team ISER Review Meeting (Virtual).</li> <li>◦ <b>April 6, 2026:</b> Review of Possible Core Inquiries.</li> <li>◦ <b>Week of September 28, 2026:</b> ACCJC Team Visit Site Visit. ACCJC team will visit the CSM campus during the week of September 28, 2026. <i>If needed a second Distance Ed RSI Sample will be pulled from the Spring 2026 online courses.</i></li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>RSI Resources for Continued Growth in DE</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ <a href="#">CSM RSI LibGuide</a></li> <li>◦ <a href="#">CSM: Regular and Substantive Interaction Policy Training</a></li> <li>◦ @One Webinars <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <a href="#">March 2: RSI and You: Tips for Simplifying Contact with Your Students</a></li> <li>▪ <a href="#">March 19: Building Online Community and Connections through Regular and Substantive Interaction (RSI)</a></li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Title II Requirements</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ <b>Activity: Site visit: March 17, 2026</b></li> <li>◦ <a href="#">ADA Title II Changes: What to know</a></li> <li>◦ <a href="#">Adopted ACCMM Model (led by District ITS)</a></li> <li>◦ Professional Development Resources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <a href="#">Register for WebAIM Accessible Document Training</a></li> <li>▪ @One Webinars: <a href="#">Accessibility in Online Learning</a></li> <li>▪ <a href="#">Accessibility Center Self-Paced Microcourses</a></li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Jennifer Howze-Owens	~2:53pm 3 min	Information

President Keller added the following information as part of his President’s update, but as it relates to Jennifer’s comments, he added it here. For the upcoming accreditation and President Keller warned that the administration may not be widely available during the March due to the demands on their time. He highlighted that the ISER report was well received. In early March, there could be a request for more information. Also he wanted everyone to be aware of the open forum on March 12 where the ACJC accepts public comment from the faculty, classified staff, and students:

## Overview of Spring 2026 Accreditation Activities <sup>1</sup>

Date	Event
Month of January	ISER first read
Thursday, January 29 <sup>th</sup>	First Peer Review Team (PRT) meeting
Friday, January 30 <sup>th</sup>	Distance Ed RSI sample delivered
Early March	Additional evidence request
Thursday, March 12 <sup>th</sup>	Collegewide Open Forum
Tuesday, March 17 <sup>th</sup>	PRT ISER review meeting
Monday, April 6 <sup>th</sup>	Review of possible core inquiries

Jennifer brought up a second important topic of discussion in the meeting – the required Title II accessibility website updates. Most may not be aware, but there has been a requirement over the past two years that all colleges make all materials on websites meet accessibility requirements. There have been on-going meetings in this District wide group during this two-year period working on a website with materials updates. There will be a visit from a body to review the accessibility and then feedback will be given. The date of that review was scheduled on one of the same day as the ACCJC visit in mid-March. Again, the newsletter shared resources to support this update.)

2.4

Committee on Teaching and Learning Chair Report (*Note: This report came prior to 2.3 as Jennifer Howze-Owens prepared her presentation.* There was no update since Natalie was not present at this time and neither the Vice President or President were in attendance due to a conflict with another meeting.)

Natalie Alizaga,  
Rene Anderson

~2:56pm  
3 min

Information

2.5	Student Representative Report (There was not a student representative present.)	Ameer Dababo	~2:59pm 3 min	Information
2.6	<p>Other Officer &amp; <a href="#">Liaison Reports</a> (Note: This report came prior to 2.3 and after 2.4 as Jennifer Howze-Owens prepared her presentation. Makiko Ueda shared the IDEAA sent an email to encourage submitting articles for the ASCC which is published three times a year. There are also a couple of trainings through IDEAA during this month and the next. One training is entitled <i>Planting the Seeds of Systemic Change: Incorporating the IDEAA in Faculty Evaluations</i> which will be held via Zoom on 2/12 from 12 to 1pm. Another will be held on 2/19 called <i>Realize the Pride</i> which will be a panel discussion with the CCC faculty also from 12 to 1pm. The last one is <i>Weather the Seas of Change: Supporting the Evaluation Process with IDEAA</i> on March 12 from 12 to 1. These were sent to Daniel and will be in the Friday updates.)</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>Screening committee approval—not listed on consent as this may require some discussion (The back page of the packet includes the screening committee. This was added after the resource requests were made. There was a retirement and a resignation. There is a special process that must be upheld due to accreditation requirements at both the state and national level that lie outside the regular college accreditation. These accreditation bodies have various requirements on the makeup of the faculty of the department. Due to these requirements if the two lost positions are not replaced the accreditation of the department is a risk. This is why the request is late and after resource requests and is being approved even when others were not approved for Fall 2026. Beth LaRochelle moves to approve the committee &amp; Malathi Iyengar 2<sup>nd</sup>. 11 Yes. 0 No. 1 Abstain.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two replacement hires for Nursing</li> </ul>	Chirs Walker	~3:05pm 15 min	Action
3.2	<p>Drafting an Academic Senate statement on AI: review of the San Diego City College “<a href="#">Statement on the Use and Misuse of AI:</a>” Should our Senate create a similar resolution? (President Keller would like to make a statement on AI a position paper rather than a resolution. A resolution is usually concise. The proposed AI position paper has 14 recommendations, verses a resolution that usually has four “where-as” statements. Senate read through the 14 recommendations and was asked what we might want to do (see the Agendas and Minutes for 2/10 meeting on Senate’s <a href="#">website</a>; on page 8 of the 3.2 agenda item document link). President Keller reminded the Senate that a lot of what is contained in the document is already happening in various locations across the District, and that we are looking at the document to get ideas with a focus on the recommendations, to try to decide what we as a Senate would like to work on or write up as a formal resolution about AI. President Keller highlighted some of the recommendations made in the document and how we are already doing those in the District as well as some that we might also consider for our resolution. For instance, he highlighted: Having Senate as a starting place for technology recommendations. We do have a resource hub already. We also have an AI syllabus policy, which Beth LaRochelle clarified and President Keller added policy isn’t a requirement and that the recommendations came from District. We don’t have anything on Academic Freedom and he felt that was worth reading. We don’t have a</p>	President	~3:20 pm 25 min	Discussion

permanent AI work group as described, even our proposed work group isn't as extensive as described in the document, but this would be something the Senate could vote on if we feel that a more extensive committee is needed.

At this point Senate began to offer their viewpoints. Malathi Iyengar wanted to think about their statement rather than look at their recommendations. President Keller really wanted to do what Malathi recommended next time. He'd like to look at what we'd like to take away and use so he can draft a resolution. Lee Miller wondered if we should perhaps model something more like the document we were reading.

President Keller prefers that we read the entire document before we begin trying to craft something like it or something more concise like a resolution. His hope from today's session was to get ideas for the whereas statements in a resolution to create a rough draft so that we could look more deeply at the details at the next meeting. He is feeling that perhaps the Senate should take the document home for a more thorough read and thoughtful response to his inquiry of Senate's next steps for a document or resolution of our own.

Robbie Baden wondered about how much money is being spent on AI decisions, especially considering the budget crisis in our district. Both Tim and Lee made comments about technology costs as stated by Chancellor Merino in her discussions of financial concerns in our district and with respect to the 50% Law. Jennifer Howze-Owens added that in terms of technology, there is a need for conversation about what the district is paying for versus what the school is paying for, versus what is needed for special needs through programs such as the DRC where she is thinking of technology like as Otter AI, versus what is already embedded in programs that we are currently paying for such as Canvas. While Jennifer is willing to be part of discussions around these conversations, she is not willing to be on a work group about the budget due to time constraints. President Keller pointed out that here is a mention in this recommendation in the document about the lack of research on the detrimental effects of AI and Ed Tech on education that Lee brought up. Robbie Baden added commentary about a discussion he had with his students. He said that the outcome of the discussion was that the students rather not have AI at school. Jennifer Howze-Owens said that the District Teaching and Learning Committee is doing student focus groups this semester and they are going to be investigating whether the students want

AI. Jennifer added that the Flex in January brought up the concern from faculty that they felt that they were being tasked with teaching AI in our classrooms. Lee Miller felt that we need to distinguish the difference between using AI to study and AI to essentially cheat. Beth said that recommendation ten in the document feels like something that was being done at Skyline, something along the lines of comparing what the best practices from among the schools are. President Keller said that he wasn't sure and more investigation is needed. He also added that this won't necessarily happen in the next semester. Tim Maxwell wonders if there is an acknowledgement that guarding against AI reducing critical thinking and how we can still encourage critical thinking instead. He lamented that fact that doing this work increases workload and it would be nice to acknowledge that additional work and potentially even compensate faculty for doing the work of using AI to increase critical thinking skills. President Keller commented, in response to Susan Khan's comment about student facing policy, that the problem with getting feedback from the Student Senate is that they are not necessarily representative of our general population students. Beth suggested using Learning Communities instead of focusing on the student leadership. Malathi has a concern that students that don't/can't really engage in technology are going to be disadvantaged with the emphasis on technology. Malathi had brought up her concern about the lack of available hotspots and laptops for student use in a budget conversation earlier in academic year. She felt the answer she received regarding that concern was a misrepresentation of the student needs due to the person who dismissed her concern listening to the wrong voices. She feels that the focus groups can sometimes be used to further an agenda or deny something that has been put forth as a need. Jennifer Howze-Owens wondered if Malathi was talking about the planned focus groups she had just mentioned for the District Teaching and Learning Committee, and Malathi said not in particular, but this was just a general observation about focus groups and how they are formed in our district. Tim felt that an ad hoc committee for creation of questions for surveying students in order to alleviate some of the concerns. President Keller asked Natalie Alizaga. whether we could ask all students in general about anything. Natalie said it isn't a problem to ask all students, but it is just more difficult to make sure all students get them handed in and reminded the Senate that there are protocols in place in each of the school PIRIE offices for how surveys/polls are disseminated. Susan said that the focus groups are important, and intimated that perhaps more would be nice. Looking at recommendation eleven from the document, Natalie was reminded about something that came up in CTL these past few weeks. The concern is monitoring how student

	<p>outcomes are affected based on generative AI use. In particular, the concern is grade inflation due to AI use. Robbie asked about using on-line classes to do surveys or to track the surveys based on G-numbers to get a better representation.</p> <p>President Keller wrapped up today's discussion indicating that he plans to bring some draft form of a resolution back for Senate to read on February 24<sup>th</sup>. President Keller added that Foothill and DeAnza College have an emergency resolution based on the Agentic AI embedded in Canvas and he will bring that back to us as well.)</p>			
3.3	<p>Program review: The "Great Read" discussion: Groups will have time to discuss the assigned program reviews; we will discuss any insights about our programs as well as the review process (President Keller started by inviting groups to contribute</p> <p>Group 1(Jennifer Howze-Owens, Makiko Ueda, Maggie de Vera, Beth LaRochelle): Jennifer Howze-Owens reported for the group reviewing Astronomy, Communication Studies, Learning Center, and Student Life were the program reviews in this group. Outreach events throughout the programs was one common theme of note, but Astronomy especially stood out in their outreach. Astronomy had outreach to high schools and the community at large. Communication studies improved outreach through their student support labs where they require one-on-one meetings with students to directly identify support needed by individual students. The lab support and collaboration with PTP(?) and Puente are all changes that they have made within the past few years. They noted that the embedded and peer tutoring was positive as it reduced the stigma associated with needed assistance in your course. Student Life has an entire board dedicated to equity affairs and partnerships in which they are involved. Like Communication Studies, Student Life is using small groups and learning community partnerships to promote equity. In addition, the Learning Center had PRIE conduct a couple of surveys to help in the assessment of their programming. As a result, the Learning Center is planning to change their training for students. In terms of challenges, Astronomy is having difficulty finding funding for technology, for the licensing fees. The Communication Studies program was denied a second full-time faculty member, which keeps the program from growing. The Learning Center is also challenged by limited staff. Some positive examples that were found in Astronomy was a significant increase in the enrollment of Black students and their resulting success. Success in Communication Studies was the increase in one-on-one time between faculty and students based on the communications lab. The Learning Center was able to increase the subject areas covered, expand evening hours, offer workshops in</p>	President	~3:40 pm 45 min	Discussion

spaces outside the center, and in addition collaborate with marketing. Finally, Student Life was able to move their forms to an online format which improved their processing times.

Group 2 (Emily Cotla, President Keller, Matt Montgomery, Mike Marcial): Emily Cotla reported for the group reviewing Math, Biology, the ESL Center, and UMOJA. Emily's group members were not all present, and most of what she reported were her takeaways. She explained that the lens through which she looked at the program reviews was the lens of students. She took away some very positive things being done in these programs. In Biology, Family Science Days allowed interaction with other programs and outreach to the community increasing the awareness of their program. Another thing that stood out in the program reviews was the work being done through partnerships in these programs. For instance, Math is working with MESA to provide Academic Excellence Workshops for math and science students struggling with some math and study skills. Another Math program that Emily would like to have seen more data about was Bootcamp, as it did seem like a great program supporting our students, but there was a lack of information about collaborations and support for students from STEM pathways. She emphasized that Math is doing a lot to support the students, especially in light of the curriculum changes due to AB-705 and AB-1705. ESL had specific details about numbers and Emily was interested to learn that there is a lower Hispanic population and a higher Asian population using the ESL center. One program she felt worth noting was ESL's book club for the Regent Plus students. She was excited to see that the ESL Center has Saturday support hours which is fantastic since they support many working students. The Support Center has an 81% return rate and that rate has stayed consistent through the past few program reviews. Some concerns from the ESL Center were budgetary constraints limiting the support staff and student assistants, but she noted that despite these challenges they were still having successes as mentioned. The program review from UMOJA was a little older and was a little lacking in information. The takeaways were that the program serves more males with a great variety of majors. Emily added from her own experiences as a counselor that UMOJA is a great resource for our students since they do a lot of outreach to the African American and Black student population. She noted that the program review didn't reflect the outreach as much as she felt it could have. President Keller added that Biology has been negatively impacted by budget cuts and they stated directly that it was an impediment to equity. Due to the lack of funding for instruction Biology

classes were cancelled both in distance education and in-person formats during the Spring 2026. This negatively impacts students ability to get the classes that they need. President Keller wanted to add this because he feels these statements are especially important to share with the administration who is claiming student first focus. He likes the simplicity and importance of one of Biology's assessment questions. The question pertains to literacy, specifically scientific literacy, but this is an important question he feels in todays world where there is so much misinformation and knowledge that students are trying to process. The question asks, " Can students judge the quality and reliability of data?" Furthermore, it asks, "Can students interpret data and draw conclusions?" He likes the specificity of the questions.

Group 3( Rene Anderson, Lee Miller, Wendy Whyte, Jennifer de la Cruz): Wendy Whyte reported for the group reviewing Biotechnology, KAD, Financial Aid, and Veteran's Services. Wendy gave a summary for the group citing that supplies aren't being provided for Biotech. She felt that Biotech is teaching things in their classes that should be taught in regular Biology courses. It seems that they are fundraising successfully and succeeded in raising \$100,000 to buy their own supplies for lab classes. The program provides workshops to support Biology and Nursing, and they are having issues with numbers in those workshops citing that people are not aware of them, which Wendy disagreed with. Wendy indicated that Skyline is doing a great job of recruiting high school students and seems to be taking students from our program. Wendy cited the loss of jobs in tech, biotech, and sciences due to cut-backs and lay-offs may be a reason that the program is struggling to get students and indicates that perhaps more data is needed. Kinesiology, Veteran's Services, and Financial Aid did a great job with fantastic plans. Jennifer de la Cruz added that she would highlight the multi-lingual workshops being provided by Financial Aid for students to get help with FAFSA and the Dream Act. She noted that they are also doing a lot in the community in terms of presentations as well as their work at Coastside and other community workshops are being provided. She feels that they are really educating people about the nuances in financial aid.They are rising to the increased demand.

Group 4 (Yvette Butterworth, Susan Khan, Robbie Baden, Daniel Rhyne): Susan Khan reported for the group reviewing Chemistry, Geology, Health Services Center, and the Writing Center. Susan noted that important work in equity and assessment from

<p>Chemistry and Geology. Chemistry’s adoption of OER, redesign of Organic Chemistry to include culturally relevant course work, and the Stanford Internship program were things that she felt really stood out. She would like to know more. The Geology department had a great student outcomes assessment that was conducted through SFIT, which led to some concrete changes in their program. There were challenges across the board with staffing issues. This caused issues in terms of lab activities and mentoring. Another result from this lack of staff was that they had to focus on teaching and couldn’t do normal outreach activities. There was also an emphasis on the skills that students entering Chemistry and Geology come into their courses lacking. Online instruction isn’t working as well due to AI and they are turning to Hybrid and in-person courses to reduce issues. The Geology used hybrid labs to increase knowledge of math skills.</p> <p>Group 5: (Malathi Iyengar, Tim Maxwell, Kim Salido) Malathi reported for the group reviewing Engineering, Katipunan, and Project Change. The group felt like the programs were looking at the wrong things. For instance, when they looked at the success rates, they were having issue with the percentages based on small numbers and that made the data hard to interpret. Malathi commented that it would be nice to have a checklist for this process so there aren’t as many confusions about the data.</p> <p>President Keller said he planned to send any insights gained through this process out in his Friday newsletter. He invited anyone with further comments or insights to email him personally with those thoughts so it could be added to the Friday update.)</p>			
--	--	--	--

4. Closing Procedures				
No.	Item / Description	Presenter(s)	Time	Action?
4.1	Final Announcements (There were no final announcements made.) <i>President or facilitator elicits final announcements about upcoming deadlines, events, scheduling changes, etc.</i>	President /	~4:30pm 0 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.*

4.2	Adjourn (4:32)	President /	~4:30pm	Procedure
-----	----------------	-------------	---------	-----------