



Academic Senate Council Agenda
 October 23, 2026, 1:30-3:30pm
 San Luis Obispo: 2609; North County: N1128
 832 Dogwood Dr. Murphys, CA 95247
 Guest Zoom meeting access:
<https://cuesta-edu.zoom.us/j/83108745151>

President	Erich Tucker	Present/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
Vice-President	Ryan Lowenstein	Present/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
Curriculum Co-Chair	Matt Knudsen	Present/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
Secretary (non-voting)	Vacant	Present/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
ASCC (non-voting)	Yanelly Cardenas	Present/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
CCFT President (non-voting)	Greg Baxley	Present/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
Child Development, Education, & Ethnic Studies	Melina Simonds/Brittany Wiley	Present/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
At Large, Full-Time	Dina Hallmark	Present/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
At Large, Part-Time	Marie Goeritz	Present/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
At Large, N.C.C.	Ron Clark	Present/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
Agriculture	Seth Abugho	Present/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
Biology	Devon Bradley	Present/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
Business		Present/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
Skilled Trades & Technology	Jonathan Blackketter	Present/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
English	Stacy Kimmey	Present/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
Fine Arts	Canguo Liu	Present/ Absent / AB 2449 remote

Movement and Health Sciences	Kate Haisch	Present/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
Languages & Communication	Vacant	Present/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
Learning Resources	Michelle Hopper	Present/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
Mathematics & Computer Science	Jennifer Sanders-Moreno	Present/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
Nursing & Allied Health	Vacant	Present/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
Performing Arts	Jennifer Martin	Present/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
Earth, Engineering, & Physical Sciences	Pat Len	Present/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
Social Science	Billy Keniston	Present/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
Student Development & Success	Amy Kayser	Present/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
Student Services-Counseling	Vacant	Present/ Absent / AB 2449 remote

Land Acknowledgment: We collectively acknowledge that Cuesta College occupies the ancestral, traditional, and contemporary lands of both the Salinan and the Northern Chumash who are the original, current, and future caretakers of the land upon which we, as guests, work, teach, and learn.

Cards:

Timekeeper:

Computer:

- I. Approval of Agenda** (3 minutes)
- II. Approval of Minutes** [Minutes-DRAFT 10-09-2026](#) (3 minutes)
- III. Public Comment** (9 minutes): All public comments will be limited to three minutes in length for each speaker. Interest in speaking during Public Comment must be expressed at the beginning of Public Comment.
- IV. Presidents Report** (9 min)
- V. Business Agenda**
Be sure to discuss these items with your division faculty so that you can adequately represent your division in reaching consensus on these items.

Contents:

- 1. New Program Proposal: UAS/Drone Technology Program, Five Certificates of Specialization and One Certificate of Achievement (First Read, Feedback)**

2. **2026 ISER Draft 1st Read (First Read, Feedback)**
 3. **Call for Feedback – Participatory Governance Handbook, Section 1: Introductory Material (First Read, Feedback)**
 4. **Call for Feedback – Participatory Governance Handbook, Section 3: Decision Making (First Read, Feedback)**
 5. **Modification of the Committee Description for the Student Success Center Committee (Second Read, Approval)**
 6. **Approval of Off-Cycle Regular Senate Council Meeting ((First Read, Approval)**
 7. **2027 Spring Academic Council Meeting Dates (First Read, Approval)**
1. **New Program Proposal: UAS/Drone Technology Program, Five Certificates of Specialization and One Certificate of Achievement (Ron Overacker and Kyle Neesen 15 minutes, First Read, Feedback)**

Background: This proposal stems from regional workforce demand for trained commercial drone operators and from the college's New Program Approval Process. Industry advisory input from PG&E Aerial Field Operations, the Governor's Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES), and SLO County Public Works identified a shortage of trained UAS operators and the need for a local training pipeline. Members of the March 11, 2026, the Agriculture Advisory Committee identified drone technology, and the ability to integrate drone data into operational decisions, as a priority for modern agriculture. The proposal completed Stage I Preliminary Concept Consultation with Dr. Priest, Amy Stapp and Agriculture Division representatives, Lexie Bell regarding funding, and other college personnel. College Council provided Stage II feedback on May 12, 2026, and the Planning and Budget Committee endorsed the proposal at Stage III on September 29, 2026. The proposal now comes to the Academic Senate Council for Stage IV for feedback and endorsement in accordance with BP 2510, before returning to College Council for Stage V approval. Course outlines of record will move through the Curriculum Committee, which may approve the curriculum once Stage V is complete.

The purpose of this agenda item is to present the proposed UAS/Drone Technology Program to the Academic Senate Council for feedback and endorsement as an educational program development matter under BP 2510 and Title 5 §53200. Following College Council review, program leads continued meetings with advisory partners and consolidated the program structure. Utility partners, including PG&E, clarified that detailed thermal inspection is performed from crewed aircraft, and that what they need from drone operators is the ability to plan missions, work within FAA requirements, and operate inside an organizational safety management system. The number of new AERO courses

was reduced from eight to four: AERO 151: Advanced Drone Regulations and Safety Management, AERO 161: Drone Applications in Geospatial Technology, AERO 162: Drone Applications in Precision Agriculture, and AERO 163: Drone Applications in Public Safety. The program now consists of five Certificates of Specialization (UAS Mapping, Enterprise UAS Operations, UAS Public Safety, UAS Agriculture - Crop Monitoring, and UAS Media Production) and a Certificate of Achievement in UAS Technology (16.0 to 17.0 units), all built on AERO 100: Basic UAV Operator, which is already approved.

The certificates intentionally draw on existing courses in Geography, Geology, Agriculture, Art, Criminal Justice, and Film, Television, and Electronic Media. These courses count toward both the UAS certificates and their home programs, so no new curriculum is required in partner departments, and enrollment flows in both directions. Instruction is aligned with FAA 14 CFR Part 107, the proposed FAA Part 108 rule for beyond visual line of sight operations, the FAA safety management system framework in 14 CFR Part 5, 14 CFR Part 137 for agricultural spray operations, NIST sUAS standard test methods, and NFPA 2400.

The program uses a phased rollout. It is delivered through an adjunct faculty model with no new full-time faculty hire anticipated at launch, and \$80,000 in Strong Workforce Program (Round 10) funding is secured for Year 1. Equipment estimates assume every aircraft is purchased outright, and the program will seek donated equipment, educational pricing, and loaner aircraft from drone manufacturers based in San Luis Obispo County. The program directly advances Goal 1 (Strengthen Student Outcomes) and Goal 2 (Refine and Expand Educational Pathways) of the Cuesta College Educational Master Plan 2026-2030, including Objective 2.1 on career education pathways and Objective 2.3 on dual enrollment.

Supporting Documents:

[Aero UAS New Program Proposal Form](#)

Proposal: The Academic Senate provides feedback on the UAS/Drone Technology Program, Five Certificates of Specialization and one Certificate of Achievement as proposed.

2. 2026 ISER Draft 1st Read (Jason Curtis, 15 minutes, First Read, Feedback)

Background: This proposal stems from the Accreditation Steering Committee as they oversee the work being done this Fall on the 2026 Institutional Self-Evaluation Report (ISER) and sharing that work through the participatory governance

process. As with the development of past ISERs, the Accreditation Steering Committee approved the development of a Writing Team. Their work followed the timeline developed and approved by the committee at the start of the process. That work and the feedback provided as standard drafts went through the participatory governance has culminated into the draft of the full report being presented today. The purpose of this agenda item is for the Academic Senate to have its chance to read and provide feedback on the first draft of the 2026 ISER.

The Accreditation Steering Committee reviewed and provided feedback at their meeting on 10/19/26. The draft will be shared at the 10/27/26 Planning and Budget meeting, and College Council will see it on 11/3/26. The proposed outcome for the Academic Senate to provide feedback will be the same for those committees.

Please provide feedback on content only; style and formatting will be edited later. All feedback will be discussed at the next Accreditation Steering Committee meeting.

Supporting Documents:

[ISER Cuesta College](#)

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council approves the final version of Cuesta College's Institutional Self-Evaluation Report as presented.

3. Call for Feedback – Participatory Governance Handbook, Section 1: Introductory Material (Kelli Gottlieb, 15 minutes, First Read, Feedback)

Background: The Governance 2.0 taskforce, or “Governance 2.0”, was charged with evaluating and then providing recommendations related to the participatory governance structure at the college. To align with the governance structure approved during the Spring 2026 semester, Governance 2.0 has prepared recommendations for revisions to the SLOCCCD Participatory Governance Handbook (PGH).

The PGH will be brought through participatory governance in a similar manner to the ISER. Four separate sections of the PGH draft will be presented around campus at different committee meetings to gather first read feedback. Stakeholders will also be able to provide feedback on the PGH through an anonymous feedback form that will be sent via email. The task force will consider and address all feedback, then the assembled PGH will be presented for a final read at these committees.

The next section being presented for feedback is the “Introductory Materials” section. This section includes the college’s mission, vision, and values, the

Introduction to the PGH, and a section on the best practices, values, and principles of effective participatory governance.

Supporting Documents:

[Governance PGH Section 1 - 1st read](#)

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council provides feedback on Section 3 of the Participatory Governance Handbook as presented.

4. Call for Feedback – Participatory Governance Handbook, Section 3: Decision Making (Kelli Gottlieb, 15 minutes, First Read, Feedback)

Background: The Governance 2.0 taskforce, or “Governance 2.0”, was charged with evaluating and then providing recommendations related to the participatory governance structure at the college. To align with the governance structure approved during the Spring 2026 semester, Governance 2.0 has prepared recommendations for revisions to the SLOCCCD Participatory Governance Handbook (PGH).

The PGH will be brought through participatory governance in a similar manner to the ISER. Four separate sections of the PGH draft will be presented around campus at different committee meetings to gather first read feedback. Stakeholders will also be able to provide feedback on the PGH through an anonymous feedback form that will be sent via email. The task force will consider and address all feedback, then the assembled PGH will be presented for a final read at these committees.

The next section being presented for feedback is the “Decision-Making” section. This section details the process for district-wide recommendations, starting from proposal initiation and ending with a recommendation to the Superintendent/President and/or Board of Trustees. This section also includes information about the roles and authority of different constituent groups in SLOCCCD.

Supporting Documents:

[PGH Section 3 - Decision-Making](#)

[PGH Section 3 - Decision Making Graphic](#)

[APPROVED Governance 2.0 Flowchart Page 1](#)

[APPROVED Governance 2.0 Flowchart Page 2](#)

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council provides feedback on Section 3 of the Participatory Governance Handbook as presented.

5. **Modification of the Committee Description for the Student Success Center Committee** (Sean Boling, Matt Fleming, Stacy Kimmey, Steve Leone, 10 minutes, Second Read, Approval)

Background: Approved by the Academic Senate Council (ASC) on May 12, 2023, the Student Success Centers Committee was created and presented as a subcommittee of the Academic Senate Council in response to the 2021 ASCCC white paper titled “The Role of Faculty in Tutoring and Learning Centers in the Community College,” which advocates that Student Tutorial Centers “function as intentional spaces of collaboration between departments and programs and among tutoring and learning center faculty and teaching faculty with the goal of extending the classroom and improving student learning.”

The mission of this subcommittee has been for faculty representatives of the Senate to provide pedagogical support, input, and recommendations to the managers of our Student Success Centers to, in part, address equity gaps with tutorial services and encourage equity-minded practices in the recruitment, hiring, mentoring, and training of online, embedded, and face-to-face peer tutors. In addition, the Student Success Centers Committee is tasked with use of the 2021 ASCCC white paper, “The Role of Faculty in Tutoring and Learning Centers in the Community College,” to collaborate with those Student Support Services and Programs (3SP) managers and staff who are involved in the planning and management of the peer tutor programs that support our students across the disciplines.

However, while this faculty consultant group has provided recommendations, including a well-researched Embedded Peer Tutor (EPT) Report that was approved at the ASC on Nov. 14th, 2025, this input has arguably not been utilized in the planning, scheduling, and decision-making process regarding online tutoring and online embedded peer tutoring services for our students. Also, even though state apportionment funding as defined under AB 1187 (Irwin, 2022) is provided for supervised tutoring, which includes in person and virtual tutoring, instructional deans are being asked to pay for embedded tutors out of their limited budgets and recently, funding for embedded tutors has been limited to the AB 1705 fund, which is the sole budget currently being used to fund embedded tutors for only two disciplines: English and Math. Instructional deans have approved funding out of their limited budgets for embedded peer tutors for other disciplines, but it is not clear how sustainable this practice may be or how all of this may affect apportionment under AB 1187.

Part of the issue why interdisciplinary online tutoring and online embedded tutoring has not been supported as recommended and requested may be due, in part, to a misunderstanding of the term “supervised tutoring,” which is defined as follows by Title 5 § 58168: a “method of instruction that involves a student tutor

who provides supplemental instruction in a subject or skill” [that] “must be coordinated through a designated learning center and may be conducted either in person or virtually” [and] “must be supervised by faculty members who meet the minimum qualifications” [and] “shall include collegial consultation as an academic and professional matter pursuant to § 53200, subdivision (c).”

Supervised tutoring does not entail constant, continual, or line-of sight supervision, which has sometimes been the rationale for not honoring faculty recommendations regarding the scheduling of online tutors, the use of online or in-person embedded tutors, and the Student Success Center tutor events.

As Title 5 § 58168 indicates, all decision-making regarding supervised tutoring “shall include collegial consultation” with the faculty. On that note, the intent of this proposal is to magnify the role of the faculty under Ed Code, Title 5, and BP/AP 2510 as mutual agreement participants in the standards, practices, and budget development for all modalities of tutoring, including but not limited to online and online embedded tutoring. To ensure that authentic faculty consultation occurs and that mutual agreement regarding “processes for institutional planning and budget development” for supplemental instruction is satisfied, this proposal argues for a modification of the description of Academic Senate’s Student Success Centers Committee as presented in the attached file.

This second-read draft contains some minor changes based on feedback from the faculty members of the Student Success Center Committee.

Supporting Documents:

[Student Success Centers Committee Description - Modified \(Second-Read\) -- Red-line](#)

[Student Success Centers Committee Description - Modified \(Second-Read\) -- Clean](#)

[FINAL - Embedded Peer Tutoring \(EPT\) Proposal](#)

[“The Role of Faculty in Tutoring and Learning Centers in the Community College” \(ASCCC/Fall 2021\)](#)

[BP 2510](#)

[Ed Code § 53200, subdivision \(c\)](#)

[Ed Code § 58168](#)

[AB 1187 \(Irwin, 2022\)](#)

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council (ASC) approves the second-read draft of the committee description for the Student Success Center Committee as proposed and requests that this committee description be implemented immediately.

6. **Approval of Off-Cycle Regular Senate Council Meeting** (Erich Tucker and Ryan Lowenstein, 10 minutes) (First Read, Approval)

Background: Discussions have taken place regarding the Academic Senate's review and approval of the complete Institutional Self-Evaluation Report (ISER) prior to its submission to the Board of Trustees. To accommodate this process, a special, off-cycle Academic Senate meeting would need to be scheduled before the November 4 Board meeting. Thus, the next available meeting date and time is 10/30/2026, at 1:30PM. To call for a regular meeting, the bylaws state:

"A) Regular meetings of the Academic Senate Council will occur on the 2nd and 4th Friday of the month unless otherwise specified by the Academic Senate President with approval from the Academic Senate Council.

B) A quorum of the Academic Senate Council shall consist of a simple majority of 50% plus one of the membership being present.

C) Special meetings of the Academic Senate Council or of the faculty shall be announced at least five working days in advance of the meeting."

The meeting time will be Friday, 10/30/26 at 1:30 pm.

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council approves an Off-Cycle Regular Senate Council Meeting for Friday, 10/30/2026 at 1:30 pm.

7. **2027 Spring Academic Council Meeting Dates** (Erich Tucker and Ryan Lowenstein, 5 minutes, First Read, Approval)

Background: The Academic Senate Council currently meets on the second and fourth Friday of the month. However, the College Council approved a revised schedule last spring 2026 that was overlooked for this Fall 2026 based on even numbered weeks of instruction. Both proposals are attached to determine Spring 2027 meeting dates.

We would like to propose two options for Academic Senate Council meeting dates for Spring 2027:

Former Schedule: 1/22, 2/26, 3/12, 3/26, 4/9, 4/23

College-adopted Schedule: 1/29, 2/26, 3/12, 4/2, 4/16, 4/30

Supporting Documents:

[Senate meetings - Spring 2027](#)

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council approves the Spring 2027 meeting dates.

VI. Summit Items: Are there any items, campus issues, and/or divisional concerns/issues that anyone wants to go to Summit for answers/clarification?

VII. Standing Reports:

1. ASCC – Yanelly Cardenas
 2. CCFT – Greg Baxley
 3. Curriculum – Matt Knudsen
 4. Equity and Student Success – TBA
 5. Faculty Professional Development – Matthew Davis
 6. Online Educational Resources – Carina Love
 7. CMC – Sabrina Rock
 8. Online Education Committee – Cynthia Wilshusen
 9. Student Learning Outcomes Assessment – Kelli Gottlieb
 10. Legislative Liaison – Alex Kahne
- +1 Other (if you are interested in presenting any report from your committee, please send a report to Erich Tucker before noon on the day of the ASC meeting)

Next Meeting: October 30, 1:30-3:30 pm
Find Minutes and the Agendas on the ASC Website



VIII. 10+1

Title 5 § 53200 (b): Academic Senate means an organization whose primary function is to make recommendations with respect to academic and professional matters. In Sections 53200 (c), "Academic and professional matters" mean the following policy development and implementation matters

1. Curriculum including establishing prerequisites and placing courses within disciplines
2. Degree and certificate requirements
3. Grading policies
4. Educational program development
5. Standards or policies regarding student preparation and success
6. District and college governance structures, as related to faculty roles
7. Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes, including self-study and annual reports
8. Policies for faculty professional development activities

9. Processes for program review
10. Processes for institutional planning and budget development
- +
11. Other academic and professional matters as are mutually agreed upon between the governing board and the academic senate.

Contact:

President Erich Tucker
erich_tucker@cuesta.edu

V.P. Ryan Lowenstein
(805) 592-9580
ryan_lowenstein@cuesta.edu

Curriculum Co-chair Steve Leone
(805) 592-9334
sleone@cuesta.edu

Curriculum Co-chair Matt Knudsen
(805) 592-9783
mknudsen@cuesta.edu