



OFFICIAL MINUTES

Acronoyns used

**M (motion), S (second), U (unanimous),
P (passed), ASP (academic senate president)**

I. Call to Order

ASP mitchell called the meeting to order at 9:01AM after the reading of the land acknowledgement.

II. Roll Call

Present: Sarah Gross, Julie Graboi, Katrina Tamura, Kristine Arquero, Sean Davis, Alexis Tucker Sade, Ghada Osman, Jeff Murico, Leigh Cotnoir, Sunny Cooke (ex-officio), Robin Allyn (Coordinating Officer), Jim Sullivan (President-elect), *curry mitchell* (Academic Senate President). (**Brian Page, Afifa Zaman**)

Absent: Krista Warren

Public: Daria Davis, Alain Joachin, Elizabeth Lurenana, Ellie Keene, Israel Pastrana, Erica Duran, Joanne Gonzales, Kathy Rodriguez, Lilah Shoukry, Manuel Arcero, Mary Gross, Paul Clarke, Olivia Elmer, Rick White, Stephanie Tatakawa, Karen Wong, Adrean Askerneese, Bridget Files-Herrin, Sona Wolfe, Daniel Ante-Contreras, Scott Fallstrom, Denee Pescarmona, Emmanuel Price.

Note: Brian Page and Afifa Zaman were absent for Roll Call but entered the room after and were in attendance for the remainder of the meeting.

III. Persons Wishing to Address the Senate

Members of the public shall have an opportunity to address the committee either before or during the committee's consideration of each item of business to be discussed at regular or special committee meetings, including closed session items. In addition, with limited exceptions, the committee will provide an opportunity at regular meetings to address the committee on any other item of interest which is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Academic Senate. In order to efficiently manage the business of the committee, the committee chair may limit the amount of time.

Osman shared remarks from constituents, her first remark was from former academic senate president, Leila Safaralian, who asked that the Academic Senate consider placing the conversation around changes to the Academic Proctoring Center on a future agenda. The topic was regarding the district's decision to limit faculty's use of the academic protoring centers beginning in fall 2026; Senator Osman added another comment by another constituent who questioned why the APC was part of Student Services instead of Instruction?

Fallstrom asked, "what's the difference between a good joke and a bad joke?, "timing." To let faculty know of major changes that will affect them without considerable planning and non collaborative and do not build on collegiality. The decision to limit faculty access to APCs could have been a decision effective Fall 2027 noting that this sort of decision-making erodes the relationship between faculty and administration.

Tucker Sade shared that she also heard from faculty colleagues within her constituency on the topic of . APCs limiting hours to faculty and wanted to make that apparent.

Arquero shared that the STREAM Festival is coming up on, saturday, April 25th, and all who may want to register a

table activity need to do so by April 10th. This event is student focused and a great opportunity to share Science and Tech with the local community.

Lori Rawleigh, an Associate faculty member who teaches Critical Thinking joined the meeting to share relevant initiatives proposed on this year's ballots that may be of interest to faculty and students and wanted to bring them to the attention of the Senate. Some notable ballots are backed by the CA Teacher's Union; highlighting the proposed Billionaire Tax, Home Affordabilit, and a ballot to stop new taxes on Teachers' Retirement Accounts.

Sullivan shared that he received a comment from full-time faculty member John Phillips that would add further context to what's been shared around the Academic Proctoring Center. Phillips' message conveyed support for keeping faculty's use of the APC noting key advantages and disadvantages that the decision would cause. Highlighting that the change could impact recruitment and retention of associate faculty members.

IV. Changes to Agenda Order

None.

Consent Calendar [Time 9:20]

mittchell pulled Item B. for discussion and A motion to approve (Page/Davis) item B passed after discussion.

A motion to approve MSU (mittchell/Allyn) items A,C,D, and F were approved unanimously.

mittchell pulled item E., for context of correction needed on the Emeritus List Recommendations and it will be seen on the agenda for April 17th.

A. Approve Minutes of the Regular Meeting of March 6, 2026

Discussion: *Zaman* asked that the minutes be amended to reflect that she was present at the March 6th meeting. It is important to note that this request was made after the vote to approve Items, A, C, D and F were passed.

B. Approve Minutes of the Regular Meeting of March 13, 2026

Discussion: *Allyn* noted an error in the Minutes on her motion to split the equivalency applications and vote on each one separately, the minutes did not reflect the vote properly that was **MS (Allyn/Graboi)** to approve the equivalency applications as separate items. *Allyn* asked that the minutes reflect that she asked to change her vote to an abstention instead of a no vote as the minutes currently reflected.

C. 2026-2027 Materials Fee List

Description: The materials fee list is updated every year to reflect changes to materials fees in the fall when curriculum is approved. The list is also sent out in early spring to department chairs for review and updates or requested changes to course materials fee.

D. 2025-26 Curriculum Approval Part III

Description: Each year CPC reviews and submits curriculum approval in multiple parts. Part III contains all remaining course and program modifications and deletions.

E. 2026 FT and AF Emeritus Recommendations

Description: According to APs 7280.4 and 7280.5, the Academic Senate shall vote to nominate eligible faculty eligible for board approval granting emeritus status.

Discussion: *mittchell* questioned the accuracy of the List with regard to years of service for one faculty colleague, and a reply had yet to be received, so this item will be pulled and reviewed at the next agenda.

F. [Sabbatical Leave Reports](#)

Description: The Sabbatical Leave Committee has approved eight sabbatical reports from faculty who were on leave in Fall 2025, and these reports are now presented for the Academic Senate's review.

V. Action Item, First Read

- A. AP 4025: Philosophy and Criteria for Associate Degrees and General Education [Time 9:25; 10 minutes]
Description: Language in the AP was updated to state that GE courses must be completed with a C or better, and Area 1A and 1B courses should not be taken with P/NP. This change, supported by the Counseling Department, addresses problems for students transferring to the universities. CCLC recommendation for the baccalaureate has been moved to AP 4025B. Sentence added to first paragraph per CCLC recommendation. Minor update to some wording and some formatting cleanup.

Revisions to AP 4025 were presented to align with CCLC recommendations and ensure compliance, including requiring a grade of C or better for general education courses and advising that Area 1A and 1B courses should not be taken Pass/No Pass. Counseling faculty supported these changes due to ongoing transfer issues, noting that students who complete GE courses with Pass/No Pass may be required to retake them for CSU or UC transfer. Senators discussed the implications of this guidance, including concerns that students may unintentionally limit transfer opportunities (Page), as well as the continued value of Pass/No Pass for non-transfer, exploratory, or community-based learning (Cotnoir, Allyn). The use of advisory language (“should” rather than “must”) was discussed as a way to preserve flexibility while encouraging informed decision-making. **Next Steps:** No objections were raised; AP 4025 will return for a second read on a future agenda.

- B. BP 4025: Philosophy and Criteria for Associate Degrees and General Education [Time 9:35; 2 minutes]
Description: Recommended CCLC language added to the second paragraph. Last paragraph changed "assure" to "ensure." Review was triggered by a CCLC update, however, that update was for the baccalaureate and that information was moved/added to BP4025B.

BP 4025 was presented with minor compliance-based revisions, including the addition of CCLC-recommended language, a change from “assure to ensure” and the relocation of baccalaureate-related language to BP 4025B. Clarification was provided regarding the policy revision process (Fallstrom) in response to a question from Sullivan. Senators also discussed implications for syllabi updates, noting that such updates may be encouraged at the department level but cannot be required (Leigh, Fallstrom). **Next Steps:** No objections were raised; BP 4025 will proceed through the review process and return for a second read on the next agenda.

- C. AP 4025B: Philosophy and Criteria for Baccalaureate Degree and General Education [Time 9:37; 2 minutes]
Description: Minor update adds language identifying how the program targets local and regional workforce needs; some formatting cleanup.

No comment on this AP the description is straightforward. This AP will proceed through the review process and return for a second read on the next agenda.

- D. BP 4025B: Philosophy and Criteria for Baccalaureate Degree and General Education [Time 9:39; 2 minutes]
Description: Minor update adds language identifying how the program targets local and regional workforce needs; some formatting cleanup.

No comment on this BP the description is straightforward. This AP will proceed through the review process and return for a second read on the next agenda.

- E. Faculty Leadership Institute, Budget Planning Approval [9:40; 15 minutes]
*Description: A proposal to recruit 10-12 full time and associate faculty to attend the 2026 ASCCC Faculty Leadership Institute June 11-13 at an estimated cost of \$1500 per person (total cost up to \$18,000) funded by the Academic Senate's auxiliary fund. **Sullivan pulled Item E from further review at this time.***

A proposal was presented to fund up to 18 faculty members (4-5 associates, 13-14 full-time) to attend the 2026 ASCCC Faculty Leadership Institute in Long Beach, CA this summer, using Academic Senate auxiliary funds. Sullivan described the institute as an intensive, short-term leadership development opportunity aimed at early-career faculty, with an emphasis on building community, strengthening governance knowledge, and expanding leadership capacity, particularly among newer faculty and faculty of color. The intent is for participants to return and build local leadership development efforts. Support was expressed for the opportunity's potential to broaden participation in governance and develop future leaders (Zaman, Page) and DEqCC Chair, Pastrana spoke in favor of the idea.

Senators raised significant concerns regarding the selection process and potential unintended impacts. Questions were raised about how participants would be identified, including how "faculty of color" would be defined and ensuring the process is transparent and equitable (Sade, Osman). Senators shared the importance of maintaining open access and avoiding the appearance of exclusivity or bias (Osman, Cooke). Others noted the need to ensure opportunities reach less-connected or less-visible faculty (Osman). Concerns were also expressed about placing additional expectations on faculty of color, with some noting existing fatigue and disproportionate service burdens (Tamura, Cotnoir, Arquero). Discussion also included whether participation should be based on demonstrated interest and questioned what the overall value to the institute would be (Davis).

Sullivan acknowledged the concerns and noted the challenge of implementing a formal selection process within the limited timeline, while maintaining the importance of fairness. Suggestions included developing a short, transparent application or interest process to broaden access (Allyn). Overall, senators expressed support for leadership development opportunities while maintaining the need for clarity, equity, and sustainability in approach. **mittchell made a motion MS (mittchell/Zaman) to extend the discussion by five minutes.**

VI. AP 4240 Academic Renewal [10:00; 10 minutes]

Description: Revisions align with new Title 5 regulations for academic renewal and create greater flexibility for students utilizing the academic renewal process. These changes include a reduction to the minimum units completed with at least a 2.0 grade point average before a student can petition for academic renewal, from 15 units to 6 units. Changes also allow students to petition for academic renewal after one term rather than one full academic year.

Revisions to AP 4240 were made to align with updated Title 5 regulations and expand access to academic renewal by reducing the required units from 15 to 6 and shortening the eligibility timeframe from one year to one term. The senate engaged in a thoughtful discussion regarding the intent and language of the policy, particularly, the phrase "student's ability." Senators raised questions about how a ability is defined and measured (*Tucker Sade*), and whether GPA accurately reflects a student's current or future potential. The revisions were generally understood as a shift from a time-based model toward a more forward-looking, growth-oriented approach. While the changes were viewed as supportive of students, some Senators expressed the need for caution to ensure the policy cannot be misapplied in ways that could disadvantage students (*Tucker Sade*). It was clarified that the term "ability" is drawn directly from Title 5 and aligns with a broader growth mindset framework (*Graboi*). The Senate agreed to revisit the item after further consultation with counselors and stakeholders to provide additional clarity and context. There were no objections to bringing the item back for future consideration. *mittchell* gave special recognition to Senator Gross for her efforts in bringing about this change to the policy.

VI. Discussion

A. Discussion, Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) Report and Goals [10:10; 10 minutes]

Description: The Academic Affairs Committee will share about their work this semester and the goals they are pursuing. This discussion is intended to strengthen how the Academic Senate coordinates and collaborates with Academic Senate

Subcommittees in our shared responsibilities as recommending and decision-making committees.

Ante-Contreras shared that he is nearing the end of his term and has intentionally built in time for reflection within the committee, including opportunities for icebreakers and philosophical discussion. He noted that Stacey left the committee in a very organized state and emphasized the strength of the current team. Committee contributions were highlighted, including: Robert Kelley, who brings accessibility to calendar discussions - color coding and ensuring a publicly accessible calendar. Lauren McFall, who has led efforts on textbook affordability, including ZTC and OER, and related process updates. Gianna Carey and Darlene Burke (Nursing) who contribute important nuance to discussions around class structures, Darlene Burke serves as the AF representative on the committee. The hiring request ranking process has historically excluded AF representation; it now includes one AF member on the ranking committee. Julie (Noncredit), Liz Garcia Gonzales, who supports minutes and process, and Daria Davis, who also supports Liz and leads the syllabus checklist work. Some SAS language and elements of the checklist that are currently under review for revision or removal. The Academic Calendar remains a major upcoming agenda item. The calendar workgroup met for the third time on April 3 and is working to streamline the process. *Sullivan and Mitchell* are collaborating to develop multiple calendars simultaneously, currently working on 2027-28 and 2028-29. There is some discussion of a new calendar model. The plan is to bring the 2027-28 calendar to Senate and the Board, while bringing 2028-29 to Senate only to allow flexibility for revisions. Regarding the Hiring Request (Prioritization Process), the committee is reviewing how a new system may impact the process and how to support departments with pending requests. Full changes are on hold until the new system is implemented. It was noted that significantly less is now being required of department chairs, which is viewed positively. This item will appear on an upcoming agenda. Ante-Contreras also referenced a recent newsletter by *CO Allyn* highlighting committee activities such as ornament-making to build community and encourage discussion. He invited feedback on what members like to see moving forward. *Davis* expressed appreciation for Ante-Contreras' recognition of individual committee members and their contributions, *Sullivan* asked whether the new software – Anthology – would be used for the hiring process. *Tucker Sade* raised concerns about the clarity of roles in the hiring process. Based on personal experience, she noted confusion around who defines the process and observed inconsistencies in rankings, as well as instances where recommendations from other bodies overrode AACs determinations.

B. Student-centered Scheduling and Classroom Design [10:20; 30 minutes]

Description: This discussion will focus on how a student-centered schedule can be effectively supported through thoughtful consideration of classroom technology and room design. Senators and representatives from Administrative Services and the Office of Instruction will collaborate to discuss how design planning can support teaching and learning as well as advance student-centered scheduling goals.

The Senate discussed how classroom design and technology support student-centered scheduling, alongside broader concerns about instructional modality balance and campus planning. Senators raised concerns about a perceived reduction in in-person instruction and Futures Education Plan drafts that appear to prioritize non on-ground modalities (*Murico, Tucker Sade*). Senators emphasized the need to revisit the Educational Master Plan, ensure sufficient on-campus student campus, and consider how classroom proximity and design support faculty-student engagement. A broader discussion followed on whether the current distribution of instructional modalities aligns with institutional goals (*Mitchell*). While well-designed, media-rich classrooms are important, shifting student demand toward online learning must be considered, and it was stressed that intentional design and inclusive input in planning processes is vital (*Cotnoir*). Additional points included the need for professional development related to scheduling structures (*Allyn*) and continued use of bond funding to improve learning spaces aligned with pedagogical needs (*Mitchell, Pescarmona*). *Pescarmona*, shared feedback from VP Elba Gomez, refocused the discussion on learning spaces, sharing examples of how flexible, technology-enhanced classrooms can positively influence pedagogy. She noted the need for clearer design principles, broader awareness of FF&E standards, and timely use of bond funds (within 14-16 months) to update facilities. Input is being collected via a shared document with *Mitchell* and *Sullivan*, with

departments also contributing through rentership guidelines. mitchell invited senators to follow up directly with additional questions.

Reports

mitchell ([access report](#)) noted that the Oceanside Campus Clocktower now tells the correct time. Called out (Keith Dunbar) who over many years of encouragement and with VP Elba Gomez's support made this happen; crediting Gomez with many other cool changes small and large across campus.

Cooke ([access report](#)) provided several updates in her report.

Streagle ([access report](#)) provided several updates in her report that were summarized for Senators.

Jaimes ([access report](#)) provided several updates in her ASG report.

Senator Reports – ([access report](#)) Murico shared a report and provided survey feedback from five constituents regarding mitchell's handling of the Office Derby, highlighting positivity and full faith in the communication transparency and handling of the process.

VII. The meeting adjourned at 11:00am