



Academic Senate Council MINUTES DRAFT
October 24, 2025, 1:30-3:30pm
San Luis Obispo: 3134; North County: N1128
Guest Zoom meeting access:
<https://cuesta-edu.zoom.us/j/83108745151>

President	Erich Tucker	xPresent/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
Vice-President	Ryan Lowenstein	xPresent/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
Curriculum Co-Chair	Steve Leone	Present/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
Secretary (non-voting)	Vacant	Present/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
ASCC (non-voting)	Yanelly Cardenas	xPresent/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
CCFT President (non-voting)	Greg Baxley	Present/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
Child Development, Education, & Ethnic Studies	Melina Simonds/Michele Gordon Johnson	xPresent/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
At Large, Full-Time	Dina Hallmark	xPresent/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
At Large, Part-Time	Vacant	Present/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
At Large, N.C.C.	Ron Clark	xPresent/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
Agriculture	Seth Abugho	Present/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
Biology	Devon Bradley	Present/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
Business	Kerry Bailey	xPresent/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
Skilled Trades & Technology	Jonathan Blackketter	Present/ Absent / AB 2449 remote

English	Steve Leone	xPresent/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
Fine Arts	Canguo Liu	xPresent/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
Movement and Health Sciences	Kate Haisch	xPresent/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
Languages & Communication	Vacant	Present/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
Learning Resources	Michelle Hopper	xPresent/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
Mathematics & Computer Science	Jennifer Sanders-Moreno	Present/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
Nursing & Allied Health	Michele Redlo	Present/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
Performing Arts	Jennifer Martin	Present/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
Earth, Engineering, & Physical Sciences	Pat Len	xPresent/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
Social Science	Billy Keniston	xPresent/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
Student Development & Success	Amy Kayser	Present/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
Student Services-Counseling	Karen Geida	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: Dina Hallmark

Timekeeper: Kate Haisch

Computer: Canguo Liu

I. Approval of Agenda (3 minutes)

- Question regarding Senate Information, #4; should that be feedback or informational? Clarification it should be for feedback.
- Call to amend the agenda with change to item # 4. Consensus.
- Call to approve the agenda. Consensus.

II. Approval of Minutes [Academic Senate Council Minutes 10-03-2025](#) (3 minutes)

- Request to add meeting Nursing rep attendance to the minutes.
- Call to amend minutes. Consensus.
- Call for approval of minutes. Consensus.

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.

- Jack DePuy introduced new ASCC Rep. Also shared reminder that snacks are available from pantry.

IV. Presidents Report (9 min)

- Review
- Spring flex offerings are being organized, and the president highlights resource priorities for the Senate, including funds for faculty development, a faculty retreat, and a DEI initiative speaker.
- Money awarded to senate for retreat, guest speakers, etc.
- At state level, Nov 6th – 8th. Local senate will review resolutions today so we can share.
- Bill to allow community colleges to pilot programs for BS was vetoed by Governor.
- Reminder regarding AI statement in syllabi. – question regarding the syllabi as to who is responsible to police those who do not include.
Clarification that Senate cannot police.
 - This is currently honor-system and no clear consequence, however may be part of the peer review process in the future.
 - Policy statements do not have consequences for illegal AI use to make it clear to students. There are recommendations in the policy.

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. Educational Master Plan (First Read, Feedback)
2. 2025-2028 Student Equity Plan (SEP) (Second Read, Approval)
3. Regular Substantive Interaction (RSI) for Online Courses Guidelines (Second Read, Approval)

4. Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Fall 2025 Resolutions (Information)

1. **Educational Master Plan (EMP)** (Elizabeth Coria, 20 minutes, First Read)

Background: The purpose of this agenda item is to provide Academic Senate with a First-Read of the EMP Draft. The Educational Master Plan was developed in Spring of 2025. The draft was opened for campus-wide review from September 15 – September 26. Feedback provided from the campus community has been addressed. The draft is being presented for first-read to ASCC, Academic Senate, Planning & Budget, and College Council. The draft will be presented again to these four bodies in November for approval, with any additional feedback from the first read included. The intent is to submit the final document to the December Board of Trustees meeting for approval.

Supporting Documents:

[Educational Master Plan Campus Feedback Sept 15-26](#)

[Cuesta EMP Final Draft v.9.3](#)

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council approves the feedback provided for updates to the Educational Master Plan as presented.

- Presenter shared appreciation to those that assisted to get the document here. highlighting its strategic blueprint and goals for student success, enrollment growth, workforce readiness, and community engagement.
- Already received feedback and questions from College Council and ASCC. Was approve on first read with caveat that there are no substantive changes at senate today.
- Changing from 10 year to 4 year to help guide the work of the college.
- Inclusive planning process with input from stakeholders. Started in Fall 2024. This group decided to move form 10 year to 4 year.
- Presenter reviewed the timeline of the writing process until now.
- Shared goals and objectives, and noted that they would include all student, staff, management, etc.
- Each goal has multiple objectives.
- Challenges and opportunities, some of the themes were shared.
- Implementation and accountability, shared how goals will be timed to measurable objectives. Annual plan, etc.

- Feedback discussion, looks at how EMP aligns with mission, vision and values.
- Opened the floor for additional feedback and comments.
 - Question regarding the timeline. Is there harm in pushing back the review approval to help develop the plan so it doesn't conflict with ISER?
 - Response – yes, because the current one expires 2025.
- Question regarding the grammar etc. some substantive information was incorrect. Noted the corrections on the JotForm. There was a change of some of the notations made, but it doesn't seem that all of the suggested corrections were made. Presenter is looking at notes regarding these updates and requested changes.
 - Question regarding the change to the plan for timeline?
 - Response was it is aligned with other colleges. This also allows us to pivot and meet demands of community. Concern regarding the dates. The planning would be started a year before the current expires.
- Senator noted some what she shared in survey some of the feedback. Asked if there are still opportunities to provide feedback?
 - Response keeping everything broad, and that the sustainability goals
- Senator noted she found it meaningful to participate. Also noted that there was some information for her area that there was information that was incorrect.
- Who or what will implement the EMP? Who then owns and is responsible to the update the EMP.
 - Response, leadership will use metrics and have areas will have goals.
- Senator comments – will there be an update to baccalaureate degrees? Still a goal of the college, so we will still advocate for it. Include information regarding recent events for reference.
 - Presenter agreed.
- Clarification on Distance Education on page 21. Needs to include Hybrid, etc.
- Call for consensus on 5 min. Consensus.
- Page 23, SCC. Plan being developed. At the last board meeting a new center location was designed, so should be updated in EMP.

- Senator noted that 4 years is brief. What other colleges have 4 year plans?
 - Presenter noted list of schools that have 3 years and 5 year plans.
- Question regarding the nimbleness of the plan? Need to fit intuitional wise. All plans should be aligned.
- Follow up, understand in terms that it fits for everyone, but how the annual goals are developed?
 - Broad and general, algin overall broad, then individual departments they are developing their more measurable goals in alignment with overall SSSP goals. Helps meet overall arching goals. This is a framework/guide, so it gives flexibility.
- Call for consensus on 5 more minutes. Consensus.
- Question as to why the process of how goals are moved through the governance process, but the decision making process does go through.
 - Noted there is not much a president for a 4 year, would recommend that a 5 year plan.
 - Ask for senate to approve that on feedback. Presenter noted that all stakeholders were present in the decision making process when 4 years.
- Motion to approve feedback of that a 5 year plan instead of 4 years.
- Guest noted that comment that all stakeholders were at the event is somewhat misleading, as the AS President at the time was not available as it conflicted with plenary.
- Call to approve feedback. Consensus.

2. **2025-2028 Student Equity Plan (SEP)** (Dr. Araceli Espinoza-Wade and Dina Hallmark, 15 minutes, Second Read, Approval)

Background: This agenda item seeks to gather feedback and endorsement on the complete draft of the 2025-2028 Student Equity Plan (SEP). Input was collected through multiple venues: College Council (September 30, 2025), Equity and Student Success Committee (October 2, 2025), Academic Senate (October 3, 2025), Associated Students of Cuesta College (October 8, 2025), and the online feedback form available to the entire college community (September 23 through October 3, 2025). This updated version addresses and incorporated the feedback (see 2025-28 SEP Summary of Feedback Provided document) and has been shared with the College Council. It will also be shared with Associated Students of Cuesta College.

For the 2025-2028 SEP, the Chancellor's Office provided a standardized template, which the draft follows. The Chancellor's Office also prepopulated data for each of the five student success metrics, which are incorporated into the draft.

Supporting Documents:

[2025-28 SEP Summary of Feedback Provided](#)

[2025-28 Student Equity Plan - REDLINE](#)

[2025-28 Student Equity Plan CLEAN](#)

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council approves the 2025 - 2028 Student Equity Plan as presented.

- Presenter reviewed the previous read and feedback schedule.
- Some questions regarding the numbers in the data.
 - The data was prepopulated from the Chancellors office. Our internal version will be more reader friendly.
- Senator noted the document is great, and appreciated how the feedback was incorporated.
- Motion to approve the Student Equity Pan as presented. Consensus.

3. **Regular Substantive Interaction (RSI) for Online Courses Guidelines** (Cynthia Wilshusen, Melina Simonds, Colleen Harmon, 15 minutes, First Read, Approval)

Background: This proposal relates to ongoing discussions at the state and local levels around online education growth and course quality. At Cuesta College, it is essential that our distance education offerings maintain the same high standards and academic integrity as our in-person classes. To achieve this, courses must align with state, federal and accreditation requirements that distinguish distance education from correspondence education, most notably, the requirement for Regular and Substantive Interaction (RSI) between instructors and students.

Federal regulations established by the U.S. Department of Education and reinforced by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC), mandate that distance education courses include consistent, meaningful, and instructor-initiated engagement to support student learning. In 2022, California's Title 5 regulations were updated to align with this federal language, replacing the previous terminology of regular effective contact with a clearer definition of RSI and its required components.

During the pandemic, Cuesta College's Academic Senate Council approved Minimum Standards for Teaching Online to guide faculty in the rapid shift to remote instruction. While those standards were helpful during the emergency response, they provided limited detail regarding RSI requirements and did not fully reflect updated regulatory expectations.

To address this gap and ensure long-term compliance and instructional quality, the Online Education Committee has developed the Regular and Substantive Interaction (RSI) Guidelines. These guidelines provide faculty with:

- A clear definition of RSI aligned with federal and state requirements
- Specific examples of what constitutes regular and substantive interaction
- Best practices for incorporating RSI into online courses
- Guidance on documenting RSI within the Learning Management System (LMS)

The Regular and Substantive Interaction (RSI) Guidelines will:

- Ensure all distance education courses meet updated regulatory and accreditation standards
- Expand upon the existing Minimum Standards for Teaching Online with actionable, up-to-date guidance
- Support faculty in delivering high-quality, engaging, and compliant online instruction
- Protect institutional eligibility for federal financial aid by meeting federal RSI expectations

The Online Education Committee plans to integrate these guidelines into faculty training, online course development, and review processes, with continued support from the Online Education team.

This proposal has been shared with the Online Education Committee, and will be shared with Academic Senate, College Council and Accreditation Steering Committee.

We have incorporated feedback from the first read, as well as specific feedback from CCFT. Additionally, we have included visuals and background information that provides clarity to meet the needs of all users.

Supporting Documents:

[Draft Regular and Substantive Interaction ASC Feedback V2 REDLINE](#)

[Draft Regular and Substantive Interaction ASC Feedback V2 CLEAN](#)

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council approves the Regular Substantive Interaction (RSI) for Online Courses Guidelines as presented.

- Presenter reviewed how the previous feedback was incorporated. Tried to make it clear about the different levels of readers, and how each will look at the document. There was an appendix and other specific parts from Title V that were added, and some technical pieces.
- Question figured out of Pronto could be included?
 - Yes, found out that we can now request RSI reporting.
- Senator shared their Division asked about ACCJC list for RSI, and is the committee going to look at list, and those are just samples as to how it can be incorporated.
 - Those are the most common. Not referencing Pronto because it is a paid service and not all have access. Not an inclusive list, just a sampling.
- Senator appreciated the updates. Wondering if there will a training that will roll out, and how to verify compliance? How do we make sure it is rolling forward?
 - Concerns regarding off-cycle reviews. The committee is brainstorming how best to facilitate that. This policy is needed all the time, not just within accreditation reviews. Need to reach the faculty not doing it. Need to be proactive within division to get the word out there.
- Question regarding how to get the data from Pronto? Does it also include feedback regarding the video engagement?
 - Report will say text or video. Doesn't give detail, but does count.
- Senator noted the document is great. Particularly the charge, on page 4, is fantastic. One of the constituents wanted to ask what the next steps might

be? How will it be implemented and union involvement and negotiate, or will it part of peer evaluation forms?

- Presenter noted that communication is already part of the peer review, and need to learn to use the tool and include it in the peer feedback. There will need to be training, and the faculty and divisions will each do it differently.
- Question regarding the report, is it available at the end of the semester or can it be viewed earlier.
 - Presenter noted it can be requested at any time.
- Presenter noted it is substantive feedback, not just 'good work'. On a regular reoccurring basis. You define in syllabus "this is how I interact with you". Up to instructor to determine what/when feedback happens.
- Call to approve. Consensus.

4. **Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Fall 2025 Resolutions** (Erich Tucker, 10 minutes, Informational)

Background: The ASCCC uses formal resolutions as its primary mechanism to define positions, set priorities, and guide action across the California Community Colleges system. According to its Resolutions Handbook, resolutions "identify and record the will of the academic senates of the California community colleges" and drive the work of the ASCCC, its Executive Committee, and committees.

For Fall 2025, the ASCCC has published a packet of proposed resolutions ahead of its Fall Plenary Session (to be held November 6-8, 2025)

The process invites local academic senates to engage in the review of those proposed resolutions, generate their own possible resolutions or amendments, and participate in area meetings and the plenary debate.

In short: as your local academic senate, it is essential to review the ASCCC's Fall 2025 resolutions packet because it is a key moment to contribute to statewide faculty governance, anticipate system-wide changes that will impact your college, align local work with emerging priorities (such as open educational resources, burden-free instructional materials, curriculum review, equitable student access), and ensure your faculty voice is represented in deliberations. A thoughtful review will allow your senate to prepare a recommendation to faculty, reach consensus

on positions, decide whether to support or propose amendments, and plan for the operational and governance implications once resolutions are adopted.

- What is the intent of the resolution?
- What issue(s) is it trying to address?
- Is this within the purview of the ASCCC?
- Is the request feasible?
- What are possible unintended consequences?
- Given the resolved as written, what are some actions that the ASCCC can undertake?
- Are the resolved statements clear?
- Does the resolution have statewide relevancy and impact or is it attempting to address one college's local issue?

Please provide input to your senate president or delegate about how your college should vote during debate.

Supporting Documents:

[Plenary Resolutions Packet](#)

- Senator asked AS President to highlight what he found important.
- AS President noted that is difficult, so would just ask for feedback from those that have reviewed the information.
- 101.02-
- 102.05 and 102.06 – streamline CALGETSI approval
- Most of the 102's
- Question if to approve all 102's? Senator noted that she has no stake in 103, but yes should approve 102.
- 103.1 opposing the use of online test proctoring and don't agree with tech. Senator can agree with why it is negative, but don't think it is correct to say that faculty can do that themselves. It is a student success center and college question to create tech solutions to do it.
- There needs to be a mechanism on how people can take the test. Appreciate the idea behind it, but doesn't agree with the line that 'Faculty should develop'. Faculty can't be responsible to do on their own.
- Senator asked if AS President attended area meeting?

- Answer, no. There is still opportunity to address the comment, and ask them to address the language.
- If approved as is, it will cause an equity issue. If they don't make drastic revisions, this should be declined.
- Call for 10 minutes. Consensus.
- On heels of previous comments, that a revision would be a benefit of a version, but it definitely needs to be revised.
- Specifically, "discourage online proctoring". Will see a drop FTES because it is an obstacle for some students. Just need to find a better solution.
- President asked if should be tabled?
 - Senator noted that we can request to strike the language.
- Not just encourage faculty state wide, but collaborate on a solution.
- Guest noted that online proctoring does create an equity issue, and then with respect that it is more in the sense to design more authentic assessments. We should be thinking about that as students have changed the way they learn. Having and not having both bring on equity issues.
- 110.1 do appreciate that it can accelerate protocols for faculty experiencing threats and/or violence.
- 105.02; Flexible Attendance – needs clarification. Not sure where it is going and not ready to move forward. Needs more work and needs to be clear on what it seems to be saying.
- Strongly advocate and support 106.1 in dual enrollment. There is room for improvement.
- 111.03 and 111.04 – talk about avoiding using these types of materials.
- Call to add 10 minutes. Consensus.
- Deserves more discussion for 111.03 and 111.04.
- It is a language issue. The auto bill issues the college has and figure out another way to do it. The intent is to provide materials to provide no-cost and not just temporary access. Find a way to make materials burden free.
- Senator questions the clarity of the resolution on flexible attendance and suggests more work is needed.
- If there is more feedback, send directly to AS President.
- Call to approve feedback. Consensus.

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

- No requests

VII. Standing Reports:

1. ASCC – Yanelly Cardenas – recently elected new VP. Overall reviewing club budget proposals, and starting club meetings.
 2. CCFT – Greg Baxley – in standing reports, but wanted to highlight.
 - i. CCFT movie night.
 - ii. New meeting required for “Pre-post” meeting for evaluation process.
 - iii. Mid October flex will be gone next year due to change to 16 week calendar.
 3. Curriculum – Steve Leone –
 4. Equity and Student Success – TBA
 5. Faculty Professional Development – Matthew Davis – over 200 attendees at Oct. Flex.
 6. Online Educational Resources – Carina Love
 7. CMC – Sabrina Rock
 8. Online Education Committee – Cynthia Wilshusen – welcome letters, more than 50% received as you are assigned courses. Get in ASAP. Faculty survey coming out. Shared with other committees. \$100 gift card and two \$50.
 9. Student Learning Outcomes Assessment – Kelli Gottlieb
- +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: November 14, 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:

Pres. 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