



Tuesday, April 28, 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 (Zoom)
Secretary	Yvette Butterworth
Treasurer	Makiko Ueda

<i>Standing Senate Committee Chairs</i>	
Curriculum Committee	Malathi Iyengar
Distance Education Committee	Jennifer Howze-Owens (2:50)
Committee on Teaching & Learning	Rene Anderson (2:45)

<i>Division & Student Representatives</i>	
Student Representative	Nicholas Costello
ASLT / Library	Matt Montgomery (absent)
ASLT / Library	Susan Khan
Business/Technology	Vacant
Busin/Technology	Kimberly Salido
Creative Arts/Social Science	Lee Miller
Creative Arts/Social Science	Maggie de Vera (at consent 2:37)
Kinesiology/Athletics/Dance	Vacant
Kinesiology/Athletics/Dance	Mike Marcial
Language Arts	Tim Maxwell (2:50)
Language Arts	Robbie Baden (after consent 2:39)
Math/Science	Wendy Whyte
Math/Science	Beth LaRochelle
Counseling	Emily Cotla
Counseling	Jennifer De La Cruz (at consent 2:37)
Enrollment Services and Support Programs	Daniel Rhyne

1. Opening Procedures				
No.	Item / Description	Presenter(s)	Approx. Start Duration	Action?
1.1	Call to Order (2:34) <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>	President / Facilitator	~2:30pm 2 min	Procedure
1.2	Adoption of Today's Agenda (Kim Salido motioned to adopted today's agenda and Daniel Rhyne seconded the motion. 10 Yes. 0 No. 0 Abstain.)	President / Facilitator	~2:32pm 2 min	Action
1.3	Adoption of Consent Agenda (10 Yes. 0 No. 0 Abstain.) <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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft Minutes for 2/24, 3/10, 4/14 for approval • Resolution to allow Treasurer access to Senate Account (links to Senate Meetings & Agenda page; see April 28, 2026) 	President / Facilitator	~2:34pm 5 min	Action
1.4	Public Comment (Kim Salido commented about the parking situation due to the student housing remodel. She is seeing students having issues with parking due to this interruption. Maggie de Vera asked about potential rides to distant parking from Public Safety. Jennifer de la Cruz said she has witnessed such assistance at CSM but it needs to be arranged in advance. Malathi Iyengar said she has seen ride assistance at other schools.) <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 	Public	~2:39pm 6 min	Information
1.5	Highlights and Recognition (Robbie Baden again announced the Writer's Ruckus that will be happening tomorrow, Wed., 4/29 from 1:30 to 3:30pm in the Bayview Dining Room in Building 10. He sent a follow-up listing all the writers who have been chosen to share their writing	Public	~2:45pm 5 min	Information

	<p>(Students: Asleigh Evans, Mary Beth Gray, Christopher Gray-Spight, Sophia Hunter, Kayla Jackson, Milo King, Ching Han Ko, Veronica “Nee” Navarro, Dominica Pezua, Alexis Rose, Carolyn Russo, Mazzy Seja, Dave Sulcer, Htoo (Nikko) Thadar, Jaysin Matlock (unable to perform), Ebony Moya (unable to perform). Faculty poet’s from our Marketing Department: Thuc Nguyen, Yoram Savion.).</p> <p>Daniel Rhyne highlighted and recognized the 2nd Annual Student Veteran Spotlight, an event that gave several of our student veterans the opportunity to share their stories and reflect on their experiences transitioning out of the military and into life at College of San Mateo. The event was created by Marcos Baluyut-Hand, our Veterans Program Coordinator. Although Marcos is not a veteran himself, he has shown a genuine passion for supporting, uplifting, and nurturing our student veteran community. It is not always easy to be accepted into the veteran community as an outsider, but Marcos has done an outstanding job earning trust and continuing to build on the strong foundation that Luis Padilla helped establish. As a veteran himself, he’s have been impressed by Marcos’s effort, dedication, and care for our students. He’s am excited to see how the VROC continues to grow under his leadership in the year ahead.</p> <p>Mike Marcial highlighted CSMs sports’ conference crowns. Men’s baseball will be in the Nor Cal playoff in Modesto. Woman’s Softball is number one seed in their playoffs. Track and Field’s reigning champion sprinter won another race at Chabot College last weekend. Two of CSMs star swimmers will go to the Nor Cal Swimming championships.</p> <p>Maggie de Vera recognized Gil Perez as the recipient of two awards for his contributions in the field of mental health services. One came from the San Mateo Behavioral Health Commission with the honor of the 2026 Tony Hoffman Community Mental Health Services Award. The second was the 2026 SAIGE Joe Norton award for exceptional service to the LGBTGEQIAP+ communities. Additionally, she announced the Friday, May 15, 6pm resource presentation for the Addiction Studies program.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share positive news about great things happening with our students, faculty, staff, and programs! 			
2. Standing Agenda				
No.	Item / Description	Presenter(s)	Time	Action?

2.1	<p>Presidents' Report</p> <p>(President Keller needs a volunteer for a Transfer Experience speaker on May 6 from 4-6pm. Maggie de Vera volunteered.</p> <p>Budget Forum: President Keller heard from President Manuel that there were a lot of questions, over 100. They thought most questions had been covered, but with all the questions they changed the format of the forum to accommodate those questions, deviating from the planned themed setup to answer the questions posed. President Manuel will touch on this Senate meets next time.</p> <p>IPC held a brief brainstorming discussion focused on improving communication among campus committees, divisions, and the three Senates (Academic, Classified, and Student). It was noted that similar and parallel conversations are occurring across groups, highlighting the need for more intentional coordination.</p> <p>One proposal discussed was to hold a joint Academic, Classified, and Student Senate meeting, potentially on a Flex Day. This idea was previously raised in an earlier meeting and was also suggested by President Manuel. President Keller expressed interest in bringing this proposal forward for discussion at the first Academic Senate meeting in the Fall.</p> <p>Another suggestion focused on strengthening communication between divisions and the Academic Senate by establishing a more formalized role for Senators in reporting out to their divisions and bringing feedback back to Senate. It was noted that the over 100 responses to recent budget surveys indicate significant questions and concerns that may not be fully reaching Senate through current communication channels.)</p>	Daniel Keller	~2:50pm 5 min	Information
-----	---	---------------	------------------	-------------

2.2	<p>Curriculum Committee Chair Report (The last meeting was Thurs., 4/23. Malathi Iyengar reported on the Program Improvement and Viability process that was brought up by Lee Miller in the 4/10 Senate Meeting. Most colleges don't have a process of de-activating a course, and they don't feel like they need to.</p> <p>Malathi also reminded the Senators about the curriculum update cycle and noted that the next cycle is approaching. She encouraged faculty to be mindful of upcoming deadlines and to complete updates strategically, explaining that if a course update is due in a particular term but cannot be completed until the following term, it is preferable to submit the update early for the next cycle rather than late for the current one.</p> <p>She clarified that the Schedule of Phased Deadlines was first distributed in late April/early May of the previous year and has since been repeatedly shared with deans. She noted that the schedule is organized by division rather than by individual discipline, which may cause confusion. For example, Political Science is listed under the CASS division, not as a separate discipline.</p> <p>Lee Miller asked when his course updates were due, noting that he had not received a direct notification. Malathi explained that, in addition to the phased deadline schedule, Deb has distributed an Excel spreadsheet identifying courses due for updates in 2026–27, as well as a separate list of courses that are overdue from previous years. All of this information has been provided to the deans.</p> <p>Malathi advised faculty who are uncertain about their course update deadlines to consult their deans or division representatives, or to contact her directly for clarification.</p> <p>Lastly, an update was provided regarding Title 5 language, which reflects a new mandate requiring all colleges to have an explicitly stated process to ensure that IDEAA (Inclusion, Diversity, Equity, Antiracism, and Accessibility) principles are incorporated into course outlines.</p> <p>It was noted that a draft policy has been developed at the District level and will be shared with the local colleges for review and feedback. The College Curriculum Committee will discuss the draft at its next meeting and provide feedback, which will then be returned to the District. This process is intended to result in a unified District policy.)</p>	Malathi Iyengar	~2:55pm 3 min	Information
-----	--	-----------------	------------------	-------------

2.3	Distance Education Committee Chair Report (The committee has not met since the last Senate meeting. Their final meeting of the semester is next week. Jennifer will request some time on the May agenda for an update on the proposed redesign of QOTL based on the updated CVC-OEI rubric.)	Jennifer Howze-Owens	~2:58pm 3 min	Information
2.4	Committee on Teaching and Learning Chair Report (We will hear more from CTL later.)	Natalie Alizaga, Rene Anderson	~3:01pm 3 min	Information
2.5	Student Representative Report (Nicholas reported a little on his trip to DC as a part of the representation for the Student Advocacy Board. He said that they had a great trip and learned a lot. He had no other updates.)	Nicholas Costello	~3:04pm 3 min	Information
2.6	Other Officer & Liaison Reports (Emily Cotla said there were a lot of bills that are being put through from Southern California schools. Quite a few focused on Bachelor Degrees at community colleges while others focused on special focus programs. She will pass the email along to President Keller. Maggie encouraged part time faculty to take advantage of PD being offered through the State Chancellor's office. She can forward the information if anyone needs it. Beth will provide an update next meeting since the Zoom audio was not working correctly today.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CSM Faculty Dual Enrollment Liaison: Leo Cruz ● ASCCC CTE Liaisons: Beth LaRochelle ● ASCCC OER Liaison: Mohammed Akhoirshida ● ASCCC Rising Scholars Faculty Liaison: Wesley Hingano ● ASCCC Legislative & Advocacy Liaison: Emily Cotla ● ASCCC IDEAA Liaison: Makiko Ueda ● ASCCC Part-time Faculty Liaison: Maggie de Vera 	Treasurer, Secretary & Faculty Liaisons	~3:07pm 3 min	Information
3. Senate Business				
No.	Item / Description	Presenter(s)	Time	Action?
3.1	CSM Senate Budget: We will be able to begin collecting Senate dues again next Fall. Meanwhile, we have a balance that we could spend now. Should the CSM Academic	Makiko Ueda	~3:10pm 15 min	Action

<p>Senate allocate \$2000 of it's \$2,978 existing funds to support students through SparkPoint?</p> <p>(President Keller introduced the item. A motion to begin discussion was made by Robbie and seconded by Daniel R. The motion passed by consensus, and discussion commenced.</p> <p>Makiko explained that Academic Senate funds have historically been designated for student scholarships. However, due to difficulties accessing Senate funds this year as a result of a frozen account, the Senate was unable to contribute to student scholarships. Makiko proposed that the Senate consider an alternative use of funds for the current year.</p> <p>Makiko proposed allocating \$2,000 to SparkPoint to support student needs during periods when SparkPoint's funding falls short, particularly during the summer term, when SparkPoint will not be operating due to funding limitations. She explained that under this proposal, SparkPoint staff would identify students with demonstrated need, approve requests, and directly provide support. As an example, she suggested assisting 10 students at \$200 per student. Alternatively, she noted that the Senate could choose to retain the funds and contribute a larger amount to scholarships in the following year. Makiko asked the Senate to consider the proposal.</p> <p>President Keller reminded the Senate that the by-laws do not restrict how Senate funds may be used, though historically the funds have primarily supported scholarships.</p> <p>Wendy Whyte asked about the anticipated number of students who might require this type of assistance. Maggie de Vera raised questions about the timing of need, particularly summer versus fall, and asked whether students could access other community or county resources during the summer. Makiko stated that she was unsure and reiterated her request for Senate consideration.</p> <p>Tim Maxwell expressed concern about delaying scholarship funding and emphasized his view that scholarships best align with the Senate's teaching and learning mission. Makiko responded that access to food and basic resources also directly supports student learning.</p>			
--	--	--	--

	<p>Jennifer de la Cruz shared an example of a student who experienced housing and food insecurity, stopped eating in order to pay rent, and ultimately withdrew from classes due to inability to focus. She described the significant academic impact of food insecurity. Maggie de Vera and Jennifer de la Cruz both noted that students often do not apply for available support programs for a variety of reasons.</p> <p>Wendy Whyte asked how the Senate could ensure that funds provided would be used as intended. Daniel R. clarified that SparkPoint directly purchases needed items on behalf of students rather than distributing cash.</p> <p>Maggie de Vera noted that multiple resources are available within San Mateo County to support students and emphasized the importance of connecting students to those services. She referenced several existing programs available to students experiencing basic needs insecurity.</p> <p>Lee stated that SparkPoint staff will be available during the summer to administer this type of assistance on behalf of the Senate. He emphasized the need to ensure students are referred to alternative resources when SparkPoint is unable to provide food assistance directly.</p> <p>President Keller suggested that SparkPoint be invited to present to the Senate in Fall 2026 to provide an overview of available resources and services. Malathi commented that certain emergency resources, such as hotel funding, had previously existed but were no longer available, and she expressed a desire for clearer communication about such changes.</p> <p>Tim Maxwell expressed concern about the broader lack of support for students and individuals unable to meet basic needs, while reiterating his view that the Senate's primary role is instruction. Makiko and President Keller highlighted the importance of smooth leadership and financial transitions within the Senate to prevent similar issues in the future.</p> <p>The vote was initiated for the earlier motion. 13 Yes. 0 No. 0 Abstain.)</p>			
3.2	<p>Last date of attendance reporting requirement: Lee Miller will begin a discussion of the new requirement that faculty enter a last date of attendance on student-initiated drops from courses.</p>	Lee Miller	~3:25 pm 15 min	Discussion

<p>(The Senate discussed a recent change in WebSMART requiring faculty to enter a last date of attendance when a student drops a course on their own.</p> <p>Lee Miller questioned the rationale for requiring faculty to supply this information when the student initiates the drop and expressed concern about the increased faculty workload. Wendy Whyte echoed this concern, noting that in some cases she no longer has access to records indicating a student's last participation once the student is removed from Canvas.</p> <p>Maggie de Vera commented that faculty concerns regarding workload and accountability do not appear to be adequately supported by the administration. Malathi Iyengar expressed similar concerns.</p> <p>Robbie raised issues related to the loss of Canvas access, noting that faculty may be asked to verify information for students after they have dropped, even though the relevant records are no longer available. Tim Maxwell and Wendy Whyte also voiced concerns regarding faculty responsibility in these situations.</p> <p>Jennifer de la Cruz noted that there may be a way to view the student's drop date in the system, but this reinforced the concern that the administration already has access to this information, raising the question of why faculty are required to re-enter it.</p> <p>Tim Maxwell asked whether discrepancies in reported dates could create issues for faculty. Robbie raised concerns specific to asynchronous online courses, questioning how faculty are expected to determine a student's last date of attendance in such formats. Lee Miller added that Canvas activity records can themselves be inconsistent.</p> <p>Daniel R. highlighted potential consequences for veteran students, whose benefits or pay may be affected based on recorded drop dates. Robbie questioned how the timing of the date entered affects students and whether earlier versus later dates create different impacts. Malathi Iyengar noted uncertainty regarding which outcome is preferable for students.</p> <p>Lee Miller requested clear guidance or policy clarification from the administration explaining both the purpose of the requirement and faculty expectations in complying with it.</p>			
--	--	--	--

	<p>The discussion concluded with a call for administrative clarification regarding the policy and its implementation.</p> <p>Tim wondered if this is about “policing” financial aid which led to the following information from Jennifer de la Cruz and Emily Cotla on clarification regarding new federal financial aid regulations and their impact on student enrollment, majors, electives, and certificates.</p> <p>They explained that financial aid eligibility is tied to a student’s declared program requirements, not to the total number of units required for degree completion. While students may need additional units beyond their major requirements, financial aid may not cover elective coursework that falls outside the approved program of study.</p> <p>It was noted that most majors include a limited number of electives due to prerequisite structures, and courses taken beyond those requirements—particularly in later semesters—may not be eligible for aid coverage.</p> <p>The discussion also addressed certificate programs, noting that financial aid eligibility varies depending on certificate length and status. Some certificates may not meet minimum unit thresholds for aid, resulting in reduced or no financial aid for students pursuing them.</p> <p>Additional complexity arises when students have multiple majors on record. Additional majors generally cannot be added within the same semester, and doing so may affect financial aid eligibility. These limitations were emphasized as federal requirements, not local institutional policy.</p> <p>Jennifer de la Cruz and Emily Cotla confirmed that students may pursue sequential (serial) majors, completing one major before declaring and pursuing another, and remain eligible for financial aid provided each major follows federal guidelines.</p> <p>Faculty were encouraged to be mindful of these constraints when advising students, particularly those considering electives, certificates, or multiple majors.</p> <p>)</p>			
3.3	<p>Possible changes to the Committee on Teaching and Learning: We will be sharing some possible options for changing the structure of CTL and are seeking Senate feedback.</p>	President, Natalie Alizaga	~3:40 pm 20 min	Discussion

	<p>(President Keller and Natalie Alazaga provided an update regarding anticipated changes to the Committee on Teaching and Learning (CTL) in light of upcoming staffing changes.</p> <p>It was shared that Natalie Alazaga's position will be eliminated at the end of the current semester. As a result, the CTL will no longer be able to operate under its current tri-chair model. In addition to this loss, the committee may also lose the SLOAC tri-chair, further impacting the existing leadership structure.</p> <p>President Keller reviewed the current composition of the CTL committee and noted that, without Natalie's role, the committee's structure will need to be reconsidered. One option under preliminary consideration is a model similar to the structure used at Cañada College. Any such change would require revisions to the Academic Senate by-laws to formally adjust the committee's makeup.</p> <p>It was noted that potential changes may include greater involvement of deans in the committee's work to ensure continuity and information sharing.</p> <p>Due to time constraints, the Senate will not be able to fully discuss or act on these changes in May. The issue was therefore brought forward for awareness and initial discussion and will be revisited in Fall 2026.</p> <p>)</p>			
3.4	<p>Revised Equivalency Procedures: District Academic Senate is looking for our feedback about the proposed changes to equivalency processes.</p> <p>(See the file attached on the Senate Website for April 28, 2026.)</p> <p>Todd Windisch provided background and an update on proposed changes to the faculty equivalency process, noting that this work is being conducted through a District Academic Senate (DAS) workgroup. Highlighted items in the proposal represent suggested revisions under discussion. Any proposed changes approved by the Senates would be forwarded to DPGC for further review, with an anticipated timeline of several months.</p> <p>Todd reviewed the background on equivalency, explaining that faculty minimum qualifications for California Community Colleges are established by the State Chancellor's Office. When applicants do not meet the minimum degree requirements,</p>	President, Todd Windisch	~4:00 pm 15 min	

they may apply for equivalency. The current equivalency process was described as **cumbersome and inconsistent**.

Under the existing model, each equivalency applicant requires a **five-person committee** consisting of:

- Three discipline experts
- One equivalency expert
- One dean

Two primary issues were identified with the current process:

1. **Timelines**, as committees are difficult to convene quickly
2. **Inconsistency**, as equivalency rules are applied differently across committees

Todd explained that the proposed changes would shift away from forming a new five-person committee for each applicant and toward a **standing equivalency committee** model. Under this approach:

- A smaller group of **equivalency experts** would meet regularly
- **Discipline experts and deans** would still be consulted as needed
- The goal is to reduce last-minute committee formation while improving consistency and efficiency

Todd emphasized that the revised process would **allow applicants to be interviewed**, not guarantee hiring.

In response to a question from Tim regarding whether the changes were intended to facilitate hiring of **dual enrollment instructors**, Todd clarified that the proposal was **faculty-driven**, not an administrative effort to increase dual enrollment staffing.

Todd further explained the role of the **equivalency expert**, noting that this role focuses on expertise in equivalency standards and process rather than disciplinary content alone.

Lee Miller shared concerns based on a prior personal experience in which an equivalency request was denied, followed by what he perceived as a different outcome years later when an administrator supported a specific candidate. Todd noted that **Jeremy Wallace** had previously led efforts to revise the process, which may have addressed some of those earlier concerns.

Malathi Iyengar raised concerns about **inappropriate practices in Ethnic Studies** related to equivalency decisions. Todd acknowledged these concerns and

	<p>reiterated the importance of maintaining a balance between discipline expert input and equivalency expertise.</p> <p>Todd also stated that the proposal includes removing the President and Vice President of Instruction from the equivalency decision-making process.</p> <p>Maggie de Vera expressed frustration that in areas without full-time faculty, even program directors may be excluded from participation in equivalency discussions due to full-time faculty requirements. Todd suggested that this concern may be more appropriately addressed through the screening process.</p> <p>Todd noted that he had not yet received significant feedback on the proposal but committed to incorporating the concerns raised by Lee Miller and Malathi Iyengar. He invited additional feedback from faculty who wish to contribute.</p> <p>)</p>			
3.5	<p>Revised Screening Procedures: DAS is also seeking our feedback about proposed revisions to screening procedures.</p> <p>(See the file attached on the Senate Website for April 28, 2026.)</p> <p>President Keller and Todd Windisch provided an update on concerns related to the District's adoption of new hiring software, which was implemented by Human Resources in Summer as a temporary solution through the current year. While HR did not intend for the adoption to have negative repercussions, faculty were not involved in the implementation, which resulted in challenges as hiring committees were formed and new procedures were applied across the District.</p> <p>Multiple issues were identified, including changes to Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities (KSAs) and limitations imposed by the software on established screening practices. It was emphasized that the software constrains how processes can be carried out and that the focus has been on adapting procedures to function within those limitations. One notable change discussed was the prohibition of AI use in the screening process.</p> <p>HR recommended that the Dean serve as the default screening committee chair in order to off-load administrative tasks to administrative assistants. President Keller stated that he does not view the committee chair as holding disproportionate influence and</p>	President, Todd Windisch	~4:15 pm 15 min	

therefore did not see this change as problematic. He also raised the question of whether individual committee members' use of AI would be an issue.

Todd Windisch noted that this work is being reviewed through a **District Academic Senate (DAS) workgroup** and emphasized that **faculty feedback is being actively solicited** on all aspects of the proposed changes.

Concerns were raised regarding **screening committee composition**, with Maggie de Vera referencing earlier questions and Lee Miller reiterating those concerns. Todd clarified that **part-time faculty are not excluded** from participation and that, upon further review, part-time faculty may serve on screening committees under **extenuating circumstances**.

Further discussion focused on proposed revisions to the **KSA evaluation process**, including:

- Changes to available KSA options
- Standardizing ("norming") the **0–1–2 scoring rubric**
- A recommendation to **remove minimum qualifications from the initial screening stage**, so that all applicants are treated equally in the first round

Under the proposed model, **minimum qualifications and equivalency** would be reviewed only after candidates are advanced for interviews. It was noted that equivalency determinations must occur **prior to interviews**, and this sequencing is intended to **streamline and speed up the hiring process**. The group has **not yet made recommendations regarding interview procedures**.

Todd Windisch additionally highlighted a limitation of the current software: **screening scores cannot be modified once submitted**. As a result, committees are unable to adjust rankings after discussion and must work solely with the initially generated list when determining interview cutoffs. A recommendation under consideration would allow committee members to **revise scores only with written justification** documenting the reason for the change. Todd noted that **HR expressed concern** that allowing score changes could introduce bias, particularly if scores were altered to intentionally elevate specific applicants.

	<p>President Keller reminded the Senate that KSAs were previously discussed at the February 24 meeting. Todd reiterated that no final decisions have been made and invited additional feedback from faculty and committee participants.)</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

4. Closing Procedures				
No.	Item / Description	Presenter(s)	Time	Action?
4.1	<p>Final Announcements (President Keller reminded everyone that the President Manuel will be at the May Senate meeting and that everyone is welcome to attend.) <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 (4:30)	President /	~4:30pm	Procedure