

Academic Senate of College of San Mateo



Tuesday, March 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>	
President	Daniel Keller
Vice President	Rene Anderson
Secretary	Yvette Butterworth
Treasurer	Makiko Ueda

<i>Standing Senate Committee Chairs</i>	
Curriculum Committee	Malathi Iyengar (3:15)
Distance Education Committee	Jennifer Howze-Owens
Committee on Teaching & Learning	Rene Anderson (after agenda approval)

<i>Division & 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 (after the consent agenda approval; Zoom)
Kinesiology/Athletics/Dance	Vacant
Kinesiology/Athletics/Dance	Mike Marcial
Language Arts	Tim Maxwell (after agenda approval)
Language Arts	Robbie Baden (after agenda approval)
Math/Science	Wendy Whyte
Math/Science	Beth LaRochelle
Counseling	Emily Cotla
Counseling	Jennifer De La Cruz
Enrollment Services and Support Programs	Daniel Rhyne

1. Opening Procedures				
No.	Item / Description	Presenter(s)	Approx. Start Duration	Action?
1.1	<p>Call to Order (2:32)</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 (President Keller commented that the 3.3 Discussion of the letters was given the remainder of the meeting time. He is unsure if we will be able to complete both today, but he goal for the action is to vote in order to send one or both of the letters after it is discussed and changes are made. Beth LaRochelle made a motion to approve today's agenda. The motion was seconded by Daniel Rhyne . 10 Yes. 0 No. 0 Abstain.)</p>	President / Facilitator	~2:32pm 2 min	Action
1.3	<p>Adoption of Consent Agenda (President Keller removed the links for Approval of Faculty Appointments and CPL Liaisons because they were from the last agenda and weren't meant to be included on this agenda. He added the minutes from 2/10/26. He asked for a motion to add the Feb 10 minutes to the consent agenda. Beth LaRochelle made a motion to approve adding the with the addition of 2/10 minutes and removal of the last meetings items. The motion was seconded by Daniel Rhyne. 13 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approval of Faculty Appointment(s) • CPL Liaisons 	President / Facilitator	~2:34pm 5 min	Action
1.4	<p>Public Comment (Daniel Rhyne shared that the new VROC (Veteran's Resource and Opportunity Center will be celebrating the opening of their new space tomorrow, 3/11/26 from 12pm to 1pm in 15-151. Lee announced that CSM Democrats and other students are organizing a No Kings walk on Saturday, 3/28/26. They are expecting 5000 people in this one and are working with local high schools. Robbie Baden shared that the CSM Book Club is putting on a marathon read of The Castle of Otranto on Saturday, 3/14/26 at 1pm in 18-206. He invites anyone to join the students in this public reading.)</p>	Public	~2:39pm 6 min	Information

Meetings of the Academic Senate are open to all members of the public. Materials are posted on the meeting page of the Senate website.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions/comments on non-agenda items • If more than one public commentator is present, comments may need to be limited to 1-2 minutes to accommodate everyone 			
1.5	<p>Highlights and Recognition(Mike Marcial the head men’s basketball coach talked about his teams’ five of six winning seasons since the team re-instatement in 2018.The team again made it to the second round of playoffs this season. He is looking forward to seeing where his players will be transferring after their success here at CSM. Mike also shared the success of our women’s basketball team who also made it to second round after a very rocky start with lots of injuries. He gave a shoutout to Coach Warner, the women’s basketball coach for her 23 years of service at CSM and for her wonderful mentorship. Mike added news about our baseball and softball teams who are currently playing. The women’s softball team is number one in the state. They are playing the number two team in the state today – West Valley.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<p>Presidents’ Report (</p> <p>DAS had a presentation from Chris Smit and Aaron McVean about the criteria for approving software in general and AI in particular. President Keller felt is was a fantastic presentation and was reassured that the district is not making rash decisions about AI integration. President Keller offered to invite them to present here if we would like to hear more about software review criteria. There was also discussion of a tech issue related to Faculty Door Cards. The old software/program is out of date and will be replaced. The new one will be tested at the DAS 4/13 meeting. After the new software/program is approved by DAS,it will be rolled out to all faculty. Beth LaRochelle clarified that any faculty can attend that meeting by Zoom, and President Keller acknowledged that anyone can join those meetings. There was a discussion about DAS elections and the timeline for those elections. The committee also had a presentation from Jennifer Howze-Owens on the resolution from District Teaching and Learning</p>	Daniel Keller	~2:50pm 5 min	Information

	<p>Committee's recommendation on approved AI tools and technology. The statement was approved. President Keller read a portion of it so he was sure to get the statement correct. Essentially the resolution is aimed at reminding faculty that AI tools must be properly vetted prior to recommending them to students so as not to lead to issues of FERPA, ADA, California ECHO Title I policy, privacy, and security violations.</p> <p>President Keller updated us on the banking situation just after Makiko gave her liaison report. The bank account is still in process of being transferred over from East-West Bank to Premier One Credit Union. This has been an ongoing process taking over 6 months now. Once the transfer is made we can begin collecting dues and funding scholarships again.)</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

2.2	<p>Curriculum Committee Chair Report (This update came after the Brown Act update. Committee Chair Malathi Iyengar reported that the ADTs are also out of alignment in the 50% Rule. They will be agendizing the vote on this matter. She'd like to hear more from faculty about their thoughts on ADTs as well as the certificates. She explained what she meant by the 50% Rule. At the other colleges the 50% Rule means that 50% of the coursework must be completed in the district. At CSM we require 50% of coursework to be completed at CSM. She explained that ADTs and Certificates could be considered differently, so they will be voted on separately. Tim Maxwell asked if we at CSM can vote to continue to have a different rule than the other campuses. Malathi said CSM can have a separate policy, but we must have a vote. It has been discussed for an entire year, but it hasn't been voted on and that vote is needed. Malathi wants public comment so that a call can be made for a vote by the end of the semester. Emily Cotla asked about the alignment. It was her understanding that we were already 50% in the district. Lee Miller asked if the other colleges are upset with us. Someone asked if these were under contention. The Certificates apparently are, but the ADTs are uncertain. Maggie de Vera wants to know if there is a certain form factor by which the committee needs to hear from faculty. Malathi would like people to come for public comment, though faculty could email her and she could share faculty's comments with the committee.)</p>	Malathi Iyengar	~2:55pm 3 min	Information
2.3	<p>Distance Education Committee Chair Report (Committee Co-Chair Jennifer Howze-Owens reported that the committee last met on March 4th. There were several talking points one of which will be discussed later today as a separate agenda item. One talking point was the support and responsiveness of faculty in regard to the accreditation body gaining access to the course sample. The team worked hard on Friday to get the information back to the accreditation folks, ensuring that their questions were answered. On April 6th we will know more. Because of how the spring break falls DEAC will not have an April meeting, but they agreed to put a place holder for a 30 minute meeting on Wednesday, 4/8 in case there needs to be a response to the 4/6 accreditation feedback. Another topic discussed concerned students who've been dropped that are still showing up in Canvas as needing to be graded. They've discussed this issue with Canvas and will make a change to inactive instead of deleting the students. Inactive students can't access a course, see the course announcements, and they'll be hidden in the gradebook. Tim Maxwell asked if the faculty will have to make the students inactive. Jennifer was not sure how to answer that question and said that we could ask the technologist to come speak with us. Matt Montgomery added that</p>	Jennifer Howze-Owens	~2:58pm 3 min	Information

	when a student dropped in the past they just disappeared, so that probably is a back end process still for the drops. Beth LaRoche asked if we know what is happening with updates. Jennifer said no, it is much like what happens with a cellphone update—you don't know until you see it for yourself.)			
2.4	Committee on Teaching and Learning Chair Report (The committee didn't meet.)	Natalie Alizaga, Rene Anderson	~3:01pm 3 min	Information
2.5	Student Representative Report (There was not a student present to report.)	Ameer Dababo	~3:04pm 3 min	Information
2.6	Other Officer & Liaison Reports (Makiko Ueda said IDEAA had webinar opportunity announcements. How to Disaggregate North African and Middle Eastern Populations Data. President Keller will include this in his Friday email. He also mentioned that this was something that was voted on in Plenary as it is especially important in some colleges where they have large populations of students from these areas.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CSM Faculty Dual Enrollment Liaison: Leo Cruz ● ASCCC CTE Liaisons: Beth LaRoche ● ASCCC OER Liaison: Mohammed Akhoirshida ● ASCCC Rising Scholars Faculty Liaison: Wesley Hingano ● ASCCC Legislative & Advocacy Liaison: Emily Cotla ● ASCCC IDEAA Liaison: Makiko Ueda ● ASCCC Part-time Faculty Liaison: Maggie de Vera 	Treasurer, Secretary & Faculty Liaisons	~3:07pm 3 min	Information
3. Senate Business				
No.	Item / Description	Presenter(s)	Time	Action?
3.1	Updates on the Title II (ADA) and ACMM (Accessibility Capability Maturity Model) requirements (Jennifer Howze-Owens presented Title II and ACMM requirements. She mentioned that there are two reviews coming. The major one is the accreditation, but there is another for accessibility for all websites including Canvas. Jennifer wanted to bring the concerns to us. There is a concern over transparency with the faculty on these	Jennifer Howze-Owens	~3:10pm 15 min	Information

<p>issues.</p> <p>ITS has been leading the accessibility review of the all campus websites and Canvas has adopted the ACMM. This is related to the Title II updates which gave all community colleges two years to make the required accessibility requirements, and we are at the end of that two year period. Last week there was a meeting that Jennifer was unable to attend that the Chancellor, all college Presidents, and select campus leaders were invited to attend for an introductory preview. Next the following meetings are scheduled:</p> <p>3/17 3.5 hour training for district administration and others</p> <p>3/18 Three 90-minute ACMM Assessment meetings (for 3 separate groups, see the presentation; Jennifer is a part of the Educational Materials and Technology group)</p> <p>Concerns were brought by Lia Thomas, Library faculty, about the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lack of broader faculty representation in inquiry process, since it currently includes only ASLT• No formal communication to faculty from the top-down about Title II deadline• No existing position to support accessibility• Workload issues down the line without new positions-expertise and scope of recommendations <p>President Keller asked if we as faculty are legally responsibility for knowing what we do or don't have to do. Jennifer was unsure. Tim Maxwell asked about who is in charge of inviting people, meaning what body oversees this process. Jennifer said she isn't sure, but there is a rumor that it there are designated people from each campus with CSM's VPI, Canada's ASLT Dean, and maybe Chris Smith from IT being a part of those designated. Lee Miller asked what would happen if we failed this inquiry. Matt Montgomery added that Librarians were required to be at these meetings. He said that we have the deadline of April 24th and that there was a suit in Southern California and the community college lost the suit. There was a discussion about the common practice of law suits in the K-12 arena, and that this practice is less common in the higher ed realm. This is not just an issue in our state, this is a federal issue.</p> <p>Jennifer presented a summary of issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Accessibility is the job of all faculty and all divisions			
---	--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More faculty voices are needed in these rooms • Principles of shared governance are needed: Inclusive information sharing and decision making • April 24, 2026 is the deadline. What does that mean? <p>Jennifer wants to know if we would like to have more information about what this April 24th deadline means for faculty. Beth wondered if we know what we need to do with regards to this task? Jennifer said that her understanding is that it will be like accreditation; they will review our sites and make recommendations or issue violations in compliance, since we don't know what is out of compliance yet. Lee Miller wondered who was responsible for making sure these deadlines were met and compliance was complete. Susan Khan has heard that this ACMM compliance was coming from the State Chancellor's office. President Keller said that it does seem like we need clarity on what this April 24th meeting means for our faculty. President Keller will reach out to our VPI Danni Redding-Lapuz to find out if she can come so the Senate can ask further questions. Robbie Baden asked if a single faculty member could be held liable? Wendy Whyte asked if this was related to accommodations. Jennifer said that it isn't the same as accommodations and it relates to our materials in Canvas or public facing materials. President Keller asked about the Chat Bots that someone has been using. Jennifer said she is unsure, but there are some resources. Beth LaRoche wondered if Marketing was part of this, and Jennifer said that they are a part of the second group which included communications.)</p>			
3.2	<p>Updates and reminders on Brown Act policies governing Academic Senates (A general review and reminders about the Brown Act.)</p> <p>Updates from the session led by the ASCCC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most updates affect eligible legislative bodies, this is mostly about large city governments <p>Everyone is supposed to have access to the Brown Act. We do, it is on our Senate Website under the Resources Section. President Keller posted a summary version of the Brown Act. It contains examples and it is not written like a lawyer writes things. He has also posted this on the Senate website.</p> <p>Reminders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We can't discuss anything that would be voted on as a quorum of members. We can't have a quorum in email or in person. Robbie Baden asked about 	President	~3:25 pm 10 min	Information

	<p>daisy-chaining meetings. Tim Maxwell clarified that we couldn't run down ideas via email.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agenda 72-hours in advance • Must specify time and location of the meeting • Posted location that is freely accessible • No secret ballot voting. Malathi Iyengar brought up an anonymous vote on a personnel issue. President Keller was unsure if that type of a vote would be allowed, and said he will look into this. President Keller added that an exemption for closed sessions was allowed when prompted by Lee Miller. • Teleconferencing must be just cause with a cause being noted. It is also limited to 5 meetings per year since we meet 2 times per month. Anyone with a verified disability can always teleconference. This has been extended through January 2030. Maggie de Vera clarified that 5 meetings per year were allowed for Zoom. • Policy about public access being disrupted. President Keller said that he will make an addition to our by-laws. Robbie Baden asked about being able to just make a motion to delay. Lee Miller reminded us that we usually have a quorum in the room, so it shouldn't be an issue. President Keller said that we didn't usually have a large number of Zoom participants, so he isn't really concerned, but wants to make sure this is in our by-laws. <p>Tim Maxwell wanted to know the consequences of minor violations of the Brown Act. President Keller wasn't sure, but thought that it could invalidate votes. No one on Senate except the President could be held accountable other than the repercussion of invalidating a vote. President Keller reminded us that the Zoom option for those members with disabilities is an important note for our Senate, but many of the updates didn't apply to Senate. President Keller reminded us that the update came as some of the discussed items were due to the pandemic and were set to expire at the end of this calendar year. They were all updated and are now set to expire January 1, 2030.)</p>			
3.3	<p>Review of draft letters to President Perez and Chancellor Moreno: We will review, discuss, and vote on sending the letters posted on our website with today's agenda (President Keller would like to begin with the letter to the CSM President and if there is time to move forward to the letter to Chancellor Moreno then we will do so. He has attached a 50% Law statement for Senate's reference. Robbie Baden added</p>	President	~3:35 pm 55 min	Action

information as to how out of alignment we are. For instance, in the 2023-2024 year there were four colleges out of compliance (Compton, Marin, Napa Valley, and us). The other three colleges were around \$2 million out of compliance each, but we were \$18.5 million out of compliance. Jennifer Howze-Owens said in the February DAS that the district would be in compliance by 2030. Robbie Baden cited the 50% as defined in Ed Code 84364 and CA code of regulations section 59200 requires each district to spend at least half of its current education expenses each fiscal budget on salaries and benefits of classroom instructors and that districts can file for exemptions under limited circumstances. Chancellor Moreno filed for an exemption from the 50% Law this year. Tim Maxwell asked if we have ever filed for one prior to this year or if it was only after being out of compliance for so many years that we decided to file. President Keller wasn't sure, but Tim said that due to the 2024 audit they had to respond and Chancellor Moreno asked for an adoption extension from the current board and her next step is to go to Sacramento and ask for the exemption from the Board of Governors. He feels she shouldn't be going there alone. In addition, he feels that she has a difficult case to make and that her primary talking point is that this Law isn't something that we should have to comply with.

The following was what inspired the letter to President Manuel. President Keller and Natalie Alazaga have been attending division meetings. They have attended Kinesiology, LAD, Language Arts, and Business Technology already. Next they will be attending Math and Science at the end of this week, CAS next week, and Counseling after spring break. He has not heard back from ASLT, so he doesn't know when he can attend one of their meetings, but he will happily attend when he receives an invitation. President Keller and Natalie have been giving a 3-question survey at the division meetings and he shared the following

Q1)

Responses to survey questions as of 3/9/26—after visits to BUS-Tech, LAD, and KAD:

1. To what extent do you feel you have been informed about the budget situation at CSM?
 - To a great extent: 3%
 - Good extent: 30%
 - Very little: 63%
 - Not at all: 5%

Q2)

2. If you have been able to attend any of the budget forums or discussions on campus, did you find the information:

- Very helpful: 3%
- Helpful: 3%
- Somewhat helpful: 33%
- Not at all helpful: 8%
- I was aware of the forums but was unable to attend: 45%
- I was not aware of the budget forums: 10%

There is a consistent theme. Faculty want to know how we got into this budget crisis, why CSM is being penalized, and why is the District not stepping in to help. One of the major concerns is the lack of transparency.

A discussion followed about the letter to President Manuel with questions and potential changes as noted:

Tim Maxwell said that in bullet point two the Coastside campus is clearly taking from our budget since there are instructors there who are teaching courses that are low enrolled.

Beth LaRochelle added that the with respect bullet point two. She would like to have any projects that have been funded by a previous or outside source noted. She said it would be helpful to know about this funding to assist with understanding the connections to the current budget or the fact that the costs of certain projects aren't adding to current budgetary issues since they were funded by previously earmarked money.

Matt Montgomery asked about how specific verses general we want to be in this letter. He said that as we have seen at budget forums when we ask a question we don't get great responses. He proposes sending a list of very specific questions like how did the budget issue arise, was there overspending and by whom, and indicate that we want answers to these very specific questions. Pointing to the first bullet point Matt questions the more general statements citing that we've been asking about the district's fiscal responsibility at every meeting and the questions are dodged in his opinion. President Keller turned to Jon Kitamura (Kit) who said that there was a few bullet points that had questions and some that didn't so Kit wanted to know if we could make a question for each bullet point. He suggested bullet point one use the

questions that that President Keller was asking in the division meetings. Kit agrees with Matt's assessment that if we don't ask very direct and specific questions that we will continue to get the same word smithed and hashtag type responses that we have been getting. He suggested we invite only President Manuel and leave Gerardo out of the discussion since our President should be able to answer very specific questions without leaning on Gerardo. Kit went on to request a draft for a very specific question in bullet point one, a question that would make sense to all. He feels that a list of questions that could be attached or offered as an appendix to bullet point one, questions that ask for specific information. Beth was unsure if we need to bring specific questions in the letter because one purpose in inviting President Manuel is to open a line of communication and she feels by asking questions in an open dialogue will open communication. President Keller doesn't feel that we need an exhaustive list of questions that we needed answered, but that we need the key points as mentioned earlier as the how, who, why, and what is being done questions. Tim Maxwell added that statements made by Chancellor Moreno have formed a set of priorities and he feels this is integral to the budget issues at CSM. Tim dismissed President Keller's assertion that we aren't dealing with the issues of Chancellor Moreno at this time, citing that it is her policy of making the fiscal decisions to take money from the general fund, allocating it as she sees fit, and not using it to support the individual colleges and teaching that is driving how President Manuel will be responding to in our questions. Tim moved to bullet point three, citing that the projects mentioned there are taking away from (the budget) and called upon statements from Steven Lehigh from an earlier meeting. President Keller indicated that communication during a summer session and when Gerardo visited Senate faculty were told that the funds for the special projects were not coming from instructional funds, but there seems to be a serious miscommunication as evidenced by the money co-opted by the District and then used disproportionately across sites. Stephen Lehigh added his note about the money contributed to some of these projects like the student housing that has been taken away from Fund 1 as a slush fund. He explained that the district is changing the formula for fund allocation. The new funding formula would have taken away more money than ever because we are losing FTE with the loss of the students. The district is using the money that they are taking away as a slush fund for all district projects. Steven agrees with Tim's assertion that the Chancellor's agenda/priorities are intertwined with the questions we are asking in this letter. He pointed out that all the issues of moving money around from reserve funds and reallocating it as the District sees fit shows a lack of transparency, one that has been brought up at the budget

meeting and dismissed at that point as having already been discussed at a board meeting, instead of taking the opportunity to report to the constituents. Tim added a little more about the Chancellor had indicated that her decisions to fund programs like Fee College were making it easier for students in the county to access college and thus she feels it is at her discretion to choose how to spend these funds as they fit her priority. There is \$12.5 million from the general fund being spent on Free College and Tim wonders what proportion of the budget that represents.

Bullet point one new question added after discussion: "What decisions were made, and by whom, that led us to this budget crisis?"

President Keller brought the discussion back to our letter and the second bullet point, hoping to complete the letter to President Manuel by the end of the meeting. Lee Miller wants to ask where this money comes from. Lee wants to know about Coastside in this second bullet point since it seems to be disproportionately funded with respect to enrollment numbers at that site. Additionally, Tim would like more information about Dual Enrollment because according to a presentation made to Senate we are paying the teachers, but we have also been told that there are funds at that high schools to pay the teachers for teaching Dual Enrollment courses. President Keller proposed a fix for the bullet point and Daniel Rhyne asked to add the word EXACTLY to how much for each of the projects. Steven added that the student housing and free college are not topics that President Manuel will potentially be able to answer because they are District oriented projects. Matt added that student housing has effects on CSM like library hours and services provided in the housing, and Steven agreed that there is confusion surrounding CSM's obligation in the cost. More discussion occurred between Matt, Steven, and President Keller surrounding these topics and it was decided that we really didn't need to further clarify questions at this time because we could ask follow-up questions that are relevant at the time President Manuel is present. Malathi Iyengar said we seem to be confused about what is competing against what, and suggested that it might be useful to clarify what we do and don't know and then ask very specific questions. Matt, Kit, and Rene said that they agree that asking where the money being taken away from instruction is going is an appropriate question to ask.

President Keller pulled the focus back editing the letter in hopes to meet the 4:30 deadline for end of discussion. There were no suggested changes in the preamble of the letter. President Keller was not satisfied with the question in bullet point one because it seems to be pointing a finger about what happened in the past. He'd like to formulate something that captures the idea of why the faculty aren't being involved in

the conversations. He like to see a series of questions as shown earlier to captures questions that we want responses to after initial questions are answered. He is seeing the second bullet point as the last now.

Beth suggested and Kit agreed that we should use the questions that were being asked of faculty in the division meetings be incorporated into this letter. Steven brought up the issue of the power vacuum from the loss of nearly all our administration. The VPA and CFO weren't replaced for an entire year. We had Richard Storti from the district act as our President and he was also in charge of our budget, and he wants to know why there isn't a responsibility for any budget issues created at that time being owned at the district level. Robbie, based on the comments from Steven, wants to know if President Manuel has asked the District for funds. President Keller feels that is getting to the last bullet point about how the college leadership is advocating for the financial health of the institution beyond making cuts to the classroom. President Keller is questioning the need for the first bullet point at all, he picked four topics since resolutions typically have four resolves. Mike Marcial likes it for context and the faculty voice that is present in the bullet point. Lee wants to add the feeling that CSM instruction, faculty, and students are seemingly being penalized for district administrative decisions. Tim suggested that we ask for an accounting of the reallocation of Fund 1 resources for "student-first priorities" especially free college, dual enrollment administration costs, zero textbook costs, elimination of parking fees, health fees, asking specifically how many of these line items are putting us on the wrong side of the 50% Law line. Tim feels President Manuel and the District should both be able to address these questions. He feels that this will pin-point that President Manuel's decisions rely on the priorities of the District. Lee wants to know if the Coastside campus should be included, and Tim feels that this is appropriate. Kit wants just a line-item accounting of the spending including which funds they are coming from trying to delineate the reallocation of Fund 1 resources. Mike Marciel wants to know how many accounts we can see and know what can and can't be transferred from. Mike says he has different accounts as the basketball coach and he knows what he can and can't pull from, and he wants to know what accounts the District and school have and what can be pulled from and which ones we can't pull from. Mike feels that they should be able to tell us exactly what accounts they have and what can and can't be pulled from each. If they say that can't tell us what funds exist, then we can question why that information isn't available. Emily wants to make sure that the instructional voice isn't just the traditional instructor's voice and while she understands the

<p>discussion of 50% Law is different. Emily said that the Coastside doesn't necessarily offer courses of true value to the population coast side, so their push that Coastside is important for equity and inclusiveness is not hitting its mark as student serving in the coast side population. In addition, she feels dual enrollment isn't necessarily touching the populations that we say need to help either. This includes not tapping grant money at the high schools for dual enrollment and not focusing efforts on schools with low-income, first generation populations that we need to support. Beth gave a very impassioned statement about keeping this letter direct and to the point. She doesn't want to allow the administration to have the chance to make nice shiny explanations without getting to the heart of the matter. Wendy Whyte wants to see ledgers so we know specifics since those types of information are not typically given in public forums.</p> <p>We didn't have a chance to discuss the Chancellor's letter or to vote on the letter to President Manuel. President Keller will bring the edited version of President Manuel's letter back in the next meeting in a form more ready to bring for a vote. He invited suggestions to be emailed to him for potential incorporation.)</p>			
--	--	--	--

4. Closing Procedures				
No.	Item / Description	Presenter(s)	Time	Action?
4.1	Final Announcements (None.) <i>President or facilitator elicits final announcements about upcoming deadlines, events, scheduling changes, etc.</i>	President /	~4:30pm 0 min	Information
4.2	Adjourn (4:33)	President /	~4:30pm	Procedure