



CMI

College of the Marshall Islands

Accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges

P.O. Box 1258
Uluga Campus
Majuro, Marshall Islands, MH 96960

Tel: (692) 625-3394/3291/4931
Fax: (692) 625-7203
Email: itcommittee@cmi.edu



The College of the Marshall Islands Faculty Senate

Regular Meeting, March 27, 2026

Supposed Meeting Start: 11:10 AM

Face-to-Face Meeting Location: RH 119 CMI Uluga Campus

Zoom Meeting ID: 211 006 2444 Zoom Passcode: cmi2022

Polycom-Rooms @ Arrak Campus & CMI D.E. Centers

Weblinks: ([Quorum: Simple Minority](#) [Vote: Simple Minority*](#))

MINUTES

Present During the Meeting: 30 (13 via Zoom, 17 face-to-face)

Not Present/Unexcused During the Meeting: 17

On Leave or Excused, Others: 2

Time Meeting Started: 11:10 AM

Overall Summary:

The minutes of the previous meeting was approved with necessary revision as suggested. The meeting discussed the lack of meeting invitations, with agendas now shared via email, leading to missed meetings. The academic calendar was updated, moving the midterm report to April 13 and adjusting faculty in-service days. The Faculty Senate proposed conducting adjuncts meetings at the beginning and end of the semester, with the possibility of electing a representative. The motion to revise bylaws to include these meetings was approved. Technical issues with audio and screen sharing were noted. The meeting also touched on the faculty survey results following the transition to an eight-week performance model.

The meeting discussed the results of a faculty survey on the effectiveness of the eight-week course format versus the traditional 15-week format. Only 22 out of 52 faculty members responded, with 42.3% expressing mixed to moderate satisfaction. Key concerns included reduced student engagement, difficulty in covering course content, and increased pressure on both instructors and students. The data suggested a return to the 15-week format might be more beneficial. Additionally, the discussion touched on student attendance policies, with some faculty keeping records for behavioral tracking but no official attendance policy in place. The survey report will be presented unofficially to the EC and interim College president. The Senate President will finalize a formal recommendation report for the Executive Council following an upcoming faculty review and vote.

I. Introductions:

Faculty Senate President: Viviana Uriona welcomed the Senate members and informed the body that the meeting is now in session and recording via Zoom will commence. She invited a **Faculty** to read the College's Mission statement. The president thanked the reader.

President Uriona appreciates the presence of all the Senate Members in face-to-face attendance and also acknowledged the presence of faculty via Zoom.

Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

- **FS VP-President:** Requested a final review of the minutes and asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the previous meeting. She read the summary of the minutes.
- **FS President:** Suggested the inclusion of the other FS Rep for the HRC in the proposed meeting minutes.



- **Faculty:** Made a motion to approve the minutes with the necessary revision as requested. The motion was seconded by **Faculty C**
- The minutes from March 27, 2026, FS Regular Meeting were officially approved with no abstentions.

II. Call for Reports from the Faculty Senate Representatives

President Uriona called for reports of the FS Representatives from their respective Standing Committees. The topics, discussions/deliberations follow.

Parliamentary Discussions/Debate

1. Academic Calendar Confusion-Published vs. Emailed Version

Summary:

During the committee reports, the Faculty Senate addressed significant communication gaps regarding meeting invitations, noting that some chairs have shifted to sharing agendas via Google Calendar rather than sending formal email invites, leading to missed sessions. Significant updates to the academic calendar were also clarified; specifically, the midterm progress report deadline has been moved to April 13, and faculty in-service days have been rescheduled to April 14–16. Despite initial confusion over which version to follow, the Senate confirmed that the version currently published on the college website is the official mandate to be shared with all departments, as it reflects the changes recently approved by the Executive Council for both the current spring semester and the upcoming summer terms.

Discussion/Debate:

HRC Rep 1: I was at the Education subcommittee meeting yesterday, but it was just a discussion about whether to support student with their studies in connection with their work and stuff like that. So no workload policies or any major things being discussed, I don't know. Is it worth mentioning here how they're calling meetings nowadays so that everybody's aware. The reason I'm saying it is because I missed the HRC meeting. HRC Rep 2 was there. I missed it completely because I got an email to comment three minutes before the meeting, I got an email sharing the agenda and asking me a comment on it, and I just sort of ignored it because at the time, because there wasn't an invitation to the meeting itself, right? And so when I looked at it, and then afterwards, and we went and looked at it closely, then we figured out that it was actually a call to a meeting. But the thing is, at the time, and anyway, like on Tuesdays, I was out, and I just observing a teacher, so there's no ways I would have been a meeting anyway. But it does seem that there aren't invitations being sent out to meetings anymore. It's just the agenda being shared. And if you get a shared agenda or a shared thing for the minutes or whatever that means your meeting is happening now, run kind of thing.

FS President: Okay, so we have this experience as EC members that we get the minutes and the agenda of mostly some minutes before we met, and we are not getting more in invitation. But if I check my calendar, my Google Calendar with CMI, the meetings that I have to attend, I am in some person organized this in a way, but they didn't communicate to us in a way, that you have this in your calendar for that, you have to take the Google Calendar A CMI employee, and then you will find there your meetings. But we can also, I don't know who, who has to address this, and to whom maybe we have to address this to Meitaka first, or..



FS-VP: Well it's a basic responsibility.

HRC Rep 2: In that meeting, it was discussed that who will be the chair of these meetings, so the HR director is leading them, so he can address to the HR director.

FS President: Yeah, maybe, we do that in every one of the different meetings committees that you take care of if they're sending an invitation, or if they're changing the kind of work of this, we will address this to our EC things.

HRC Rep 1: Ask the chairs to send the meeting invitation.

FS President: Yes or no. It depends, if you can work with this Google Calendar things that you don't need to get an invitation. It's just how they work. Okay, I'm very happy. Every email less that I'm getting, I'm much happier. This is why I can work with this Google calendar system, but we also never gotten an information that they are changing the modality. And this is, this is not good.

(inaudible)

(FS President made a second call for committee reps to share their reports to the FS body.)

ITC Rep: Meeting postponed

Physical Plant: FS Rep...none

EMC Rep: Tried to recall... Policies were shared to faculty that needed input but nothing pressing. The academic calendar. Only the summer semester has been changed. Summer schedule, or the summer calendar, has been accepted, the other dates that were put in the calendar, the other big changes will remain the same as we had requested. Can you show the calendar?

FS President: Yeah, but they did change something in the calendar.

EMC Rep: On the website, we'll see an approved calendar that was part of the calendar that was presented. And not sure we think we need to check with Dean Edward.

Faculty Sec: Displayed the calendar being discussed on the screen.

FS President: Okay, here they change here, these three - midterm process report to the April 13. And they also changed the faculty in service, 15 and 16, 14, and 15. And I did request this. That was also during the EC that I asked Elizabeth, is this right or wrong? And no one's couldn't understand what she answered. And Meria, I wanted to confirm this, honestly, waiting, okay, and but then Meria has sent this version, and this is a change, especially when we are doing the class.

EMC Rep: That's the change in the middle of spring.

Faculty 1: On April 2 on that calendar, there are no classes.

FS President: Foundation Day opening, no classes. Office this, April two, yes, and April 3 is also no classes, and then they change the midterm report from April two to April 13.

EMC Rep: So, I recommend, I suggest, that we request the dean of faculty to confirm which calendar are we actually following.

Faculty 1: Conversation with Dean Edward this morning, he said, follow that one. It's already on the website, because he instructed for him my conversation with Dean Edward this morning at nine o'clock. I asked him about this calendar, so we had confusion in our yesterday meeting about whether it was April 6 midterm or April 13, he told me verbally and he said he will confirm it to the chairs next week, Tuesday. But I got verbal confirmation with him this morning because I was confused, and he said. This is counted as week two, not week three, that Friday that we started does not consider as week one, because it's the point five, something, that my brain could not comprehend. He told me, because he printed it out, and I showed him this calendar, he had the same calendar, and he said the one on the website, that's official, so it, kind of contradicts what Meria says, because he's telling us something else, but that was my conversation.

FS President: It is not a contradiction for Meria. This is the calendar that Meria sent to us.

EMC Rep: It has some changes that's included in the new one that when we began. It's this spring. The dates were April. Six. Now it's April 13. Yeah, what I'd say it's including some of the changes



that's not supposed to be there, which we had requested. Yeah, we only, we only asked for the summer sessions.

FS VP: So, it's the summer session that we're supposed to focus on.

FS President: But they change things.

Faculty 2: Look at this term and focus on this term. Otherwise, you know, they show up on the wrong days.

FS President: We know now, we had the verbal confirmation to you that we follow this calendar with the change that we have in April. Yeah, please share with your department because can you go down please? Because they put this sentence here at the end. Here, please know the approval applies for the summer terms one and term two. This is the only one that was a confusing this is not true. Okay. We have three changes for this spring semester. The midterm due is April 13, and we have the in service. And the other meeting in state, 14 and 15, and 16.

Faculty 4: It is probably reasonable, isn't it? Because it aligns more with like the middle of the semester.

Faculty 5: So, this is E.C. approved. So, this is the calendar that we need to follow but not whatever version available somewhere.... Yes.., So, this is what Dean Edward have asked us faculty to follow.

Faculty 1: That's the one he told me to follow.

Faculty 6: This is already posted out there. What we have to realize is that the published version is the one we follow. Yeah, they are keeping up on that.

FS President: But when Meria has sent the email, it wasn't published at this moment, but now it's published.

FS President: Made a last call for committee reps to share their report/s. None shared and so the meeting proceeded to discuss the next item on the agenda.

Motion: None

2. FS Governance of CMI Faculty Senate Members-Adjuncts

Summary:

The Faculty Senate addressed the long-standing disenfranchisement of adjunct faculty, who are recognized as members in the bylaws but rarely attend meetings due to scheduling conflicts. To improve shared governance and oversight, the Senate approved a motion to revise the bylaws to include mandatory meetings with adjuncts at the beginning and end of each semester, scheduled for 5:30 p.m. to accommodate their work hours. These sessions, organized by Senate officers but open to all members, aim to provide a platform for adjuncts to voice concerns and to facilitate the election of an adjunct representative to participate in regular Senate meetings. The discussion also highlighted the need for IT to provide accurate mailing lists for the 40 current adjuncts. FS made efforts to address technical (audio) difficulties that briefly hindered participation from faculty members attending via Zoom.

Discussion/Debate:

Faculty Sec: The next item in our agenda is about the governance of the Faculty Senate with the adjuncts. In our bylaws, the adjuncts are members of our Senate. Now let me ask you this. Why in my 15 years here at CMI, I haven't seen an adjunct attend our senate meeting?



Faculty B: You never will, because their work in CMI happens after their work hours. They come after they've done with their work.

Faculty Sec: Very good point, and so this is the proposal to address that clear issue.

Proposal context:

Adjuncts are recognized as members under the FS by laws, yet they remain functionally disenfranchised. This lack of engagement constitutes a negligence of our duty by the Faculty Senate. By failing to provide a platform for adjuncts, the faculty senate inadvertently cedes its authority thereby compromising the Senate's role as a check and balance.

Proposal:

There is a proposal that we need to meet with the adjuncts twice in a semester. This will be a combined Faculty Senate session. A full-time faculty with the adjuncts meeting in order for us to actually execute what is in our bylaws for the adjuncts to conduct their election of their representative. Of course, as Faculty 1 have pointed out, they are mostly able to come after five o'clock. So, the proposal is to conduct this meeting with them at the beginning of the semester, 5:30pm to 6:30pm. and one more meeting at the end of a semester.

FS President: But at the same time, they have a possibility to decide to have a rep that can assist to our meetings during the semester.

Faculty Sec: In addition to the context of the proposal: So, imagine this. We've been receiving minutes and agendas. The adjuncts haven't, because they're not part of our group mailing list, but in our bylaws, they are. And so we need to decide whether we still want them to be part of the Senate or to just continue to ignore them.

Faculty C: Because we have them in our meetings. Yes, we update them in department meetings about stuff too.

Faculty Sec: This proposal, says the superior path is to nourish participation, because they're part of the shared governance. If not, then we need to revise our bylaws.

Faculty C: Another consideration could be the Faculty Senate offices to meet with them at the beginning and at the end of the semester. So maybe they'll be more comfortable speaking with you.

Faculty Sec: Furtherly on the context, about a week ago and because the adjuncts and overload contracts were done, FS Officers communicated with HR to give us a list of all the adjuncts to update our FS group mailing lists and because they are currently members of the FS. There are 40 adjuncts.

Faculty D: Is the number outside CMI?

Faculty Sec: Both- from outside and inside of CMI. Yes, there are 40 but we have not included the adjuncts from the Upward Bound program.

Faculty D: So, the outside cmi adjuncts are supposed to have CMI email as well.

Faculty B: But we only need to worry about the outside?

Faculty Sec: In addition, our current bylaws, does not specify that the internal adjuncts (e.g. Directors, SLT, Administrators & Staff) email (accounts) will be part of our mailing Faculty Senate group mailing list while they are also member or even officer of their own senate. (Staff Senate).

Faculty E: Our minutes is it made public? Is it on a website like as adjuncts, they can access it?

Faculty D: And if they are members of the adjuncts mailing list they will be able to access it?

FS President: Yes, however, we do not have editing access to the adjuncts mailing list and so when the adjuncts are changed at any point of the semester the integrity of the mailing list becomes questionable. So sometimes when you email the members in the list are there no more members.

Faculty D: If we request the IT to make a group for us then they can do that for us.



Faculty C: *I prefer for the faculty office officers to meet them in the beginning and the end. Yeah, they can be more open without their chairs so they can voice out their concerns. And then you can tell us about their issues and concerns.*

Faculty D: Is that a motion.

Faculty C: Yes, it's a motion.

FS President: We have a motion to approve the change of the bylaws with a meeting at the beginning and at the end with the full faculty at least, at least the officers, yes. Is this okay? So yes, that it's open for everyone, but the officer have to be there.

Faculty D: Can I just include in there? That throughout the semester, it's the responsibilities of the department chairs to reach out to the adjuncts pertaining to faculty so that they are not just waiting for those two meetings and ended up being lost.

FS President: We forgot a step that we also have in the proposal to motivate them to figure out a rep that will be part of the faculty senate meetings to elect a rep. We have a big motion then.

Faculty Sec: Can we please revise, consolidate the motion and other inputs into one motion for clarity in our minutes?

FS President: I can do it. The motion from Faculty 2 was to:

Motion:

“Move to change the bylaws with the inclusion of a meeting at the beginning and at the end of the semester with the adjuncts. Such a meeting will be conducted by the faculty senate officers with open attendance for all FS members. Faculty Senate officers will organize the adjuncts for the election of their representative/s who will be a part of our faculty senate meetings throughout the semester.”

FS President: Conducted the voting of the FS members for the proposed motion which have been seconded by Faculty 5

Faculty F: (Via Zoom-Audio) stood opposed to the proposed motion.

FS President: The motion passed and all votes have been counted.

Faculty G: (Via-Zoom-Audio) Reiterated the opposing stance of Faculty 6 which was not heard by the voting body at the time due to audio or technical malfunction since the start of the meeting.

Faculty F: Can you hear me? No one wants to hear me?

[\(Click here: Retrieved Zoom Participants Chat Record\)](#)

Note: The following 4 minutes and 20 seconds was spent by Faculty trying to troubleshoot the sound problems being experienced in the meeting. Chat message shows that at least one Faculty member opposed the motion.

3. Results of the Survey 8-week vs. 15-week Course format

Summary:

The Faculty Senate reviewed results from a recent survey on the eight-week course format versus a 15-week course format which, despite a moderate response rate of 42.3%, revealed a consistent pattern of concern regarding reduced student engagement and the excessive pace of the accelerated model. Faculty reported that the compressed timeframe hinders the ability to cover course content effectively and places significant pressure on both instructors and students, leading to a preliminary recommendation to return to the traditional 15-week system to preserve academic quality.



Additionally, the meeting addressed concerns over student attendance and the lack of a formal college-wide policy, with members noting that while attendance is tracked for behavioural data and waitlist management, the primary focus remains on counselling interventions rather than automatic drops. The FS President intends to formalize the results findings into a report for the Executive Council and the Interim President, pending a final faculty review and vote on specific recommendations.

Discussion/Debate:

FS President: I would like to briefly present the results of the faculty survey we conducted. We conducted following survey on the transition from the 15 weeks to the eight weeks doing the focus on how our experience with the eight-week performance is? Okay, and I want to start by saying, clearly that, I'm pretty sure that every one of us is not against changes. What we wanted to understand with this survey is the real impact even institutions need to improve and change.

We need to figure out which kind of approach and how this change will be made if we want to still have a good quality or standards as a College. This chart shows how this changes work under our real teaching positions, and our learning students, engagement, course testing, participation and overall success, and we better understand the experience behind the numbers. I will refer all these topics, even it is a graph. And I'm not finished with the report, but I'm finished with the overall I'm not finished to take some exercise or some example that you can figure out why we get to this conclusion, okay.....

.....But we can see a consistent pattern of concern across multiple categories. (inaudible)

.....it present, if considering the eight week courses and potential, returning to our previous 15 week system,

I will show you now the overall results so that you can also see there.

Background, or why we made it. We wanted to have a kind of data to give us your feedback, and not only what David and I suppose have to be and with discussions that we have individually from everyone of the faculty. The methodology was the faculty responded to questions that we discussed together to figure out and put in this survey, like our scale and comments and focus on engagement, passing and success, 22 from 52 faculty members answering the survey.

But personally, I'm very disappointed, because it's something that address every one of us. But even though this is 42.3% of the full faculty, and because I know that not everyone is aware to how we can analyze this kind of data, if is not more than 50% I want to bring to you sources that explain how to work with this kind of results and you can check. Even when the response rate is less than ideal, identifying consistent patterns among respondents can still provide valuable insights into the subject of study,

....when we check the data, we find not strongly and higher positions, but we find a tendency, and I want to show you in samples, the overall satisfaction is mixed to moderate satisfaction with clear concerns concerning the eight week format. Okay? The people say, first of all, very few high satisfaction response that they are happy with the eight week format. This is why I wanted to bring you these two sources, because even we don't have a majority, and it's a lot of facts, why you decide to say, well, it's okay, it's not too bad, because you are also under pressure. If you can be flexible enough to change your teaching, okay? And this is why people and this is why when we are analyzing data in this way we think about that, even if people are not taking a very clear



decision, because it's concerning, also their performance. They cannot lie all the time. And this is what we find in the data. They say, well, it's not too bad. And we find, for example, they say the students are not there, but then they say is not too bad. This is a contradiction, okay? And we analyze this in a sociological perspective, because the pressure on your performance is higher at the moment when you have to do this survey, even you are doing it anonymous. The section "Other feedbacks". That was the possibility to put some comments to every part. Respondents raise concerns, but not common themes.

This is difficult. This is the most difficult area when you are doing a qualitative analyzing of surveys, because everyone put whatever they want, and one of you put exactly the same sentence and every comment, that makes a kind of data analyzing very difficult.

Strong concern based too fast is challenging to cover all content. They can put significant pressure of both instruction and students, a strong concern that emerge is that the pace is too fast, which can make a change into cover all the content and impact also on, your teaching because, limited flexibility, how you can adapt your lesson and activities or assessment to the students needs. This is something that we found in the data that you share with us. Student success, 15 weeks better, completion and attendance, a 8-week higher, drop off, risk. I want to thank you for your honesty, because you can see here, no one of you say that you don't have any problem. Every one of you decide to say, Well, I have a little bit more, very much or higher. Question of whether [accelerated](#) formats place pressure on expectations in ways we don't get fully capture. We can say how instructors adapt when students struggle to keep up the content, how we are able to change the quality, if we figure out the student cannot get it, and this is something that we have to address separately to the full survey that we made.

This is something that usually in a college will be addressed to, the Vice President of Academic Affairs, okay, if we go down with the quality, we will have much students they pass, but when they are going out to work, they cannot do anything. Okay, the last three things, synthesis, a 8-week format compressed learning, reduce engagement and lower perceived success. We found this in the data and conclusion and recommendations, also, the survey response was moderate. I want to stress that, yeah, the faculty doesn't probably support the current eight-week model. This finding suggests it may be worth reconsidering the accelerate format and exploring a return to the traditional 15 week system to better support teaching and learning. And the recommendation is return to the 15 week format, such as faculty workload, reevaluate the accelerated format, provide additional support system, continue consultation with the faculty. This is what at the end, is coming from the participation on the survey that you also can check for your own.

Okay, my last slide. Thank you. And because of the time, I am doing a very fast question and comments, and of course, we will share this with you. But as I said, I'm not finished. I want to write a report that we can present at EC and directly to the interim president, because they are waiting for this information, this confirm what we are saying since semesters that an 8-week format are not working well with every course.

4. Addressing Attendance Issues, Related Policies and Best Practices

Summary:



The Faculty Senate discussed the challenges of managing student attendance, particularly the lack of an official college policy mandating attendance or automatic drops for absences. Faculty members expressed frustration with students appearing late in the term after being reported as "no-shows," leading to a clarification that while the college moved away from punitive attendance requirements to avoid disenfranchising students for factors beyond their control, tracking remains vital for "behavioural accounting" and waitlist management. The discussion emphasized that the first week is critical for coordinating with the Registrar to fill seats from waiting lists and highlighted the role of the Counselling Department in conducting outreach for absent students rather than enforcing administrative withdrawals. To mitigate confusion, faculty were encouraged to maintain personal records and proactively email absent students during the add/drop period to ensure enrolment accuracy and prevent unnecessary financial charges.

Discussion/Debate:

Faculty X: I have question yes, because, based on my observation for few weeks of teaching, how the how do the College Address the students attendance, most especially the first day of class. Because what I observe, we already have so many meetings, and then there come one to another student coming in, but I already give the report to the registrar that these people are not showing, and then they will show up. So what's the how the college address that kind of issue.

FS President: Monica, need this report that the people are not in class because mostly of us have a waiting list, and they need to know which students are not going to class.

Faculty X: No, they did not give a strong rule on that, or policy like they have to be there on the first day of class.

Encouragement...but the students are not really...

Faculty Y: It's not an official policy, no, and we can't. I mean, there used to be a thing like that in the past when I first started working, but we had to drop it, because there was a time where even in our syllabus, and when we would give our students our syllabus, we would have a thing about attendance in there eventually we had to take it out, because there are community colleges that do attendance where attendance is required, but we're not one of those because I think under that system, like, if a student misses three classes or something, then yeah, they get of course, you know? And so we really don't want to, want to be in a position where we have to take students out for situations beyond their control, you know, if they're not attending classes and stuff, and that's why that they're working so hard to strengthen the counseling department so that, you know, if students are absent from classes on a regular basis, then the student services can go after them and try and figure things out, but the counseling department can get, we can send their names to counseling department. You know, let's try and get you back into classes, just to increase, if we did attendance, there might be a finding or it would be a finding....

Faculty Z: But there is some confusion. I've had some conversations with some people, and I keep attendance so that at the end, well, some people thought we didn't need to keep them at all. I've had the conversation, but it's good to actually track your data because it supports behavioral accounting of what's happening.

Faculty X: Actually, I do that. But if there's a rule, like, if they committed three absences already, they are dropped automatically. That's why, when I, I sent them to the registrar and then they are sent back to me, and then they get added again, okay.

Faculty Y: That first week is critically important, and so it is really important that, you know, we do follow up with the registrar during that first weekend and on those first days, like they said, so we can get the waiting list. You know, if students aren't showing up, the waiting list can come in, but we should still email students and be like, Hey, are you still taking this course? Because they only have that week to decide whether they're taking that course or not, and so they either they have to come in



and come to class or they have to drop it, yeah, because if you know, if, if they don't, either way, then either they're stuck or their Pell gets charged if they then stop coming, kind of thing.

No Motion:

(...Continuation of Topic 3 Discussion/Debate:)

FS President: I guess we have to move the conversation concerning of the report for the next meeting, or report, the survey, report, yeah. I will still working on this, to share with you the information, and then we will discuss this by the next faculty senate meeting. It is sad, because that's mean that I cannot present this by the next EC meeting, which is sad because they are waiting since last month. I can present this as an informal...I don't know if we need a motion here for such.

FS-VP: Could we consider having the report sent out by email so that faculty are informed.

Faculty Y: Sorry, the email will have to be sent out to the next EC meeting. Is what on next week's next week, next week. So, so we would have to online voting, Monday, Tuesday kind of thing.

Faculty W: Oh, the presentation is just the results, or are we making recommendations with it. If we are making recommendations, we need to vote first before it goes to EC, if it's just going for update on the results, I think that's quite fine. So if it goes through recommendation, we need to put it in motion.

FS-VP: Or comment on the document report.

FS President: Okay, I will send for the next faculty meeting. Thank you very much for coming.

No Motion:

III. Closing: FS President: Gave thanks to the Honorable Members of the Faculty Senate for their high participation and attendance and expressed words of encouragement for FS representatives.

The March 27, 2026 Faculty Senate regular meeting was adjourned at 12:20 PM

Submitted By:

Concurred By:

Approval Date:

Curtis Vila
Faculty Senate Secretary
SY 2025-2026

Vivian Uriona
Faculty Senate President
SY 2025-2026

???? , 2026