



Academic Senate Council Minutes
 October 3, 2025, 11:30-1:30pm
 San Luis Obispo: 3134; North County: N1128
 Guest Zoom meeting access:
<https://cuesta-edu.zoom.us/j/83108745151>

President	Erich Tucker	Present
Vice-President	Ryan Lowenstein	Present
Curriculum Co-Chair	Steve Leone	Present
Secretary (non-voting)	Vacant	
ASCC (non-voting)	Lucia Landeros	Absent
CCFT President (non-voting)	Greg Baxley	Absent
Child Development, Education, & Ethnic Studies	Michele Gordon Johnson	Present
At Large, Full-Time	Dina Hallmark	Present
At Large, Part-Time	Vacant	
At Large, N.C.C.	Ron Clark	Present
Agriculture	Seth Abugho	Absent
Biology	Devon Bradley	Present
Business	Kerry Bailey	Absent
Skilled Trades & Technology	Jonathan Blackketter	Absent
English	Steve Leone	Present
Fine Arts	Canguo Liu	Present
Movement and Health Sciences	Kate Haisch	Present
Languages & Communication	Vacant	
Learning Resources	Michelle Hopper	Present
Mathematics & Computer Science	Jennifer Sanders-Moreno	Absent
Nursing & Allied Health	Vacant	
Performing Arts	Jennifer Martin	Present
Earth, Engineering, & Physical Sciences	Pat Len	Present
Social Science	Billy Keniston	Present
Student Development & Success	Amy Kayser	Present
Student Services-Counseling	Karen Geida	Absent

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: Kate Haisch

Computer: Canguo Liu

- I. **Approval of Agenda** (3 minutes)
 - Removing #6
 - #7 is changing from approval to feedback and from second read to third read
 - Motion to approve. Consensus
- II. **Approval of Minutes [Academic Senate Council Minutes 9-12-2025](#)** (3 minutes)
 - Motion to approve. 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.
 - None
- IV. **Presidents Report** (9 min)
 - Three letters of gratitude from scholarship recipients
 - Governance 2.0 taskforce – brought forward concerns to leadership
 - Dr. Stearns agreed needs joint taskforce
 - Grateful for collaboration
 - Part time at large position will be opened – one faculty member expressed interest
 - Faculty consultation and engagement taskforce – asked to push forward library, ag, business and health
 - Summit from Sept. 22
 - Shared feedback about bookstore and reminded that it is privately owned
 - Coffee and tea on campus – refer to Dr. Stearns campus note from last Friday
 - Will receive admin support for building agenda
- 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. Joint Senate-Administration Governance 2.0 Taskforce (Approval)
2. BP/AP 4230 Grading and Academic Record Symbols (First Read)
3. BP/AP 5040 Student Records, Directory Information, and Privacy (First Read)
4. BP/AP 4240 Academic Renewal (Second Read)
5. 2025-2028 Student Equity Plan (First Read, Approval)
- ~~6. Instruction CPPR and APPW Language to Connect to CCAP Addenda (First Read)~~
7. CCAP Updates to the Instruction Program Review Documents (~~Second~~ Third Read)
8. Academic Senate Priorities 2025-2026 (Second Read, Approval)

1. **Joint Senate-Administration Governance 2.0 Taskforce** (Erich Tucker, Dr. Todd Hampton, 10 minutes, approval)

Background: On Dec. 5, 2023, the Planning and Budget Committee launched a college-wide participatory governance review and established an initial Governance Review Taskforce that served from Spring 2024-Spring 2025. The result was a Feb. 7th Governance Taskforce Proposal that was presented to the Academic Senate Council for feedback on Mar. 14, 2025, after the proposal had first been presented to the College Council and the Planning and Budget Committee. This proposal recommended "one central council charged with providing oversight, planning, direction, and making recommendations to the Superintendent/President" and a series of standing committees that would report directly to the central committee with recommendations, including "Budget, Accreditation and Policy, Equity and Enrollment Management, and Professional Growth and Wellness." Some of the faculty on that initial Governance Taskforce and some senators on the Academic Senate Council provided feedback and expressed concerns about these recommendations; however, regardless of such feedback, the proposal draft was not modified from the initial Feb. 7th draft to the final Mar. 27th proposal presented to the Superintendent/President for consideration.

One of the primary Mar. 27th proposal recommendations was "the creation of a new taskforce with the charge of reviewing and assessing current standing committees and providing specific recommendations for either new standing content committees, consolidation or restructuring along with updating the Governance Handbook to align with the changes" for implementation in time for Fall 2026. However, after consultation with faculty leaders on campus and ASCCC publications on this subject, and upon evaluation of the process and outcome of the first Governance Review Taskforce, Senate leadership recommended to our Superintendent/President that we move forward in the spirit of participatory governance with a new joint Senate-Administration taskforce, one with a faculty co-chair and an administrative co-chair. Our rationale is that, under Title 5, our district's committee governance structure is a 10+1 matter, especially due to the involvement and leadership of faculty in participatory governance. Specifically, under our own AP 2510, the goals of this taskforce are within faculty purview as both a Rely Primarily item — "e. District and college governance structures, as related to faculty roles." — and a Mutual Agreement item: "c. Processes for institutional planning and budget development."

After some discussion in Summit, Academic Senate leadership and the administration agreed that the second iteration of the Governance Taskforce would be a joint Senate-Administration Taskforce with a faculty co-chair and an administrative co-chair and that the taskforce membership would endeavor to reach mutual agreement on the recommendations before being presented on future Senate agenda. In the process, under AP 2510, the administration will rely primarily on Senate recommendations regarding the faculty roles on committees and will endeavor to reach mutual agreement with faculty regarding the governance structure of the college — in other words, "the processes for institutional planning and budget development." Once the taskforce membership reaches mutual agreement, a first-read proposal for the governance structure of the college will be placed on a Senate agenda for feedback in late Fall 2025

followed by a second-read draft for approval in early Spring 2026 and completed by Feb. 28, 2026, the deadline recommended on the Mar. 14th Proposal.

Upon approval of the joint Senate-Administration Taskforce, faculty appointments to this taskforce will serve as representatives of the Academic Senate with regular reports to the Council, and one of those faculty members will be elected by the faculty participants on the taskforce to serve as a co-chair in conjunction with an administrative co-chair. Ideally, faculty and administration appointments on the taskforce will reach mutual agreement on a proposal for an update to the governance structure of the college, which would then appear on a future Senate agenda for feedback and approval before moving forward to College Council. The secondary goal of the task force will be to update the Governance Handbook during the Spring 2026 semester to align with the changes, as recommended by the Mar. 14th Proposal.

Supporting Documents:

[Governance Taskforce Recommendation 3-27-25](#)

References: Title 5 §53200, AP 2510, Mar. 27, 2025, Proposal — Governance Review Taskforce Recommendations

Proposal: The Academic Senate approves the formation of a joint Senate-Administration Governance Review Taskforce 2.0 with 5 faculty appointments, one of whom will serve as a faculty co-chair in partnership with an administrative co-chair, and the primary goal of the taskforce will be to draft an improved governance structure as recommended in the Mar. 14th Proposal to be presented on a Senate Council agenda by the end of the Fall 2025 semester for feedback followed by a second-read draft presented for approval on a Senate Council agenda in early Spring 2026.

- Confusion about how taskforce started; will be adding faculty voice
- Question: Was it faculty at large or ASC faculty that offered concerns?
- Answer: At large
- Call for consensus on formation of taskforce. Consensus

2. **BP/AP 4230 Grading and Academic Record Symbols** (Dr. Jason Curtis, 10 minutes, First Read)

Background: BP/AP 4230 Grading and Academic Record Symbols were reviewed by the Policy & Procedure Review Committee (PPRC) on 9/16/2025. BP/AP 4230 are legally required and have been reviewed by the AS/VP, SSSP.

The approval process for BP/AP 4230 will be initiated by Academic Senate Council and is presented for feedback on first read. Following College Council review, BP/AP 4230 will return to Academic Senate Council for second read.

The approval process for BP/AP 4230 Grading and Academic Record Symbols will be initiated by Academic Senate Council and is presented for feedback on first read. Following College Council review, BP/AP 4230 will return to Academic Senate Council for second read.

Supporting Documents:

[CCLC BP 4230 Grading and Academic Record Symbols](#)

[BP 4230 Grading and Academic Record Symbols Redline](#)

[BP 4230 Grading and Academic Record Symbols Clean](#)

[CCLC AP 4230 Grading and Academic Record Symbols](#)

[AP 4230 Grading and Academic Record Symbols Redline](#)

[AP 4230 Grading and Academic Record Symbols Clean](#)

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council approves the feedback provided on BP/AP 4230 Grading and Academic Record Symbols.

- Dr. Curtis: BP is a useful summary of the AP. Each grade now has more explanation. Two symbols will be added – FW and a CPL designation for the transcript
 - FW indicates that faculty have not seen student; presumably withdrew; grade is below passing
 - Financial Aid will follow up with FW to determine if F was earned or if they withdrew
 - Related to Title IV

Questions from senators with answers from presenter:

- Q: Put last date student seen?
- A: Just the FW
- Q: Is EW new?
- A: No, students can apply for it themselves, not awarded by faculty
- Q: Were faculty involved in decision?
- A: Faculty are on PPRC.
- Clarification later in discussion from faculty member who previously served on PPRC. Noted that members don't edit BP and AP so wants to make sure faculty were truly involved in the revision
- Q: Something similar to FW has come before ASC before and failed. This one blurs the lines. Is there precedent at other colleges?
- A: Isn't sure of the number, but yes. Santa Monica College has a good explainer on the matter.
- Q: Was there any discussion about the FW being a non-evaluative symbol?
- Follow up Q from presenter: Should faculty award the F and then Financial Aid enquires and switches it to an FW.
- Questioner's response: Yes, would solve the problem that they don't want to assign a grade based on attendance.
- A: Will incorporate idea of FW being non-evaluative in the feedback.
- Call for more time – 10 extra minutes.

Discussion:

- D+ is missing
- Letter grade descriptions are not applicable to all courses. It's 10+1 for explaining grades on syllabus
- Remembers instance where FW would have been appreciated – got no response when reaching out to student.

- Change to “up to a year”
- Recall from 2020 that it would be a top down decision because of Title 4 compliance
- “Verifiable documentation” from student. Difficult to get EW approved. Would like to strike verifiable documentation and only include language in Title 5
- Can only award grade for work done, not attendance
- Not an actual redline; are the definitions new? Yes, replacing table.
- Unfulfilled and incomplete converts to F. Suggest if unfulfilled, the grade the student would have earned anyway
- Week 12 or update for 16-week calendar?
- For CPL section – CPL awards are for a grade but could have the CPL notation
- Will be able to award CPL for 100-level courses; not just baccalaureate
- Agree with comment that grade explanations take away faculty’s ability to determine what grade means for their courses
- Call for more time – 5 minutes
- NC grading indicators – do get credit for a pass
- In P section, recommend indicating that it’s 2.0
- NC grading is for non credit courses so it’s correct
- Make it clear if referring to credit or non credit courses. So it doesn’t look like it means not awarding any credit for a credit course
- Call for consensus on feedback. Consensus

3. **BP/AP 5040 Student Records, Directory Information, and Privacy** (Dr. Jason Curtis, 10 minutes, First Read)

Background: BP/AP 5040 Student Records, Directory Information, and Privacy were reviewed by the Policy & Procedure Review Committee (PPRC) on 9/16/2025. BP/AP 5040 are legally required and have been reviewed by the AS/VP, SSSP. BP/AP 5040 were presented to College Council on 9/23/2025 for first read. The PPRC recommends the following revisions for College Council/Academic Senate Council consideration:

- AP - Changing the section title *Name and Gender Changes to Former Student Records* (page 7-clean, page 8-redline) to *Name, Gender Identity, and Gender Changes to Student Records* to align with the section title used in the CCLC template.
- The BP/AP refers to the district and the college. Recommend consistency throughout, using district as suggested in the CCLC templates.

BP/AP 5040 Student Records, Directory Information, and Privacy are presented for feedback or approval on first read.

Supporting Documents:

[CCLC BP 5040 Student Records Directory Info Privacy](#)
[BP 5040 Student Records Directory Info Privacy Redline](#)
[BP 5040 Student Records Directory Info Privacy Clean](#)

[CCLC AP 5040 Student Records Directory Info Privacy](#)
[AP 5040 Student Records Directory Info Privacy Redline](#)
[AP 5040 Student Records Directory Info Privacy Clean](#)

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council approves the feedback provided on BP/AP 5040 Student Records, Directory Information, and Privacy as presented.

- Dr. Curtis: clean-up work primarily; toward the bottom of AP, section added about name and gender; PPRC and CC agreed to the header change. Can reflect correct name and gender identification
- No feedback
- Call for consensus on feedback. Consensus

4. **BP/AP 4240 Academic Renewal** (Dr. Alex Kahane and Dina Hallmark, 5 minutes, Second Read)

Background: BP/AP 4240 Academic Renewal were reviewed by the Policy & Procedure Review Committee (PPRC) on 5/6/2025. BP/AP 4240 are legally required. There are no recommended changes to BP 4240, but it will go through governance with the AP before being presented to the Board of Trustees for review and approval to keep them on the same review cycle.

BP/AP 4240 were presented to Academic Senate Council for first read on 8/22/2025. College Council reviewed and approved BP/AP 4240 on first read on 9/9/2025. The College Council had no recommended changes or feedback.

BP/AP 4240 Academic Renewal are presented to Academic Senate Council for second read and final approval.

Supporting Documents:

[CCLC BP 4240 Academic Renewal](#)
[BP 4240 Academic Renewal](#)

[CCLC AP 4240 Academic Renewal](#)
[AP 4240 Academic Renewal Redline](#)
[AP 4240 Academic Renewal Clean](#)

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council approves the feedback provided BP/AP 4240 Academic Renewal.

- Alex Kahane: came to first meeting of the year; wording change made; went to College Council and approved on one read
 - Title 5 changes have been proposed and they are in 45-day comment period. If new language is approved, will need to revise in a year from now. College Council recommends moving this through for students now.
 - Senator noted that this will be meaningful for students. Has several students who will receive their degrees because of this.
- Call for approval by acclamation. Acclamation.

5. **2025-2028 Student Equity Plan** (Dr. Araceli Espinoza-Wade and Dina Hallmark, 15 minutes, First Read, Approval)

Background: This agenda item seeks to gather feedback on the complete draft of the 2025-2028 Student Equity Plan (SEP). In May 2025, a preliminary draft, which focused solely on the metrics, was presented to both the Academic Senate and College Council for review and input.

This full draft has been shared with College Council and will also be shared with Associated Students of Cuesta College. In addition, a request for feedback has been circulated to the entire college community.

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 Student Equity Plan DRAFT](#)

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council approves the feedback provided for the updates to the 2025-2028 Student Equity Plan.

- Araceli Espinoza-Wade: full draft for feedback; based on a template from the Chancellor's Office and limited to layout and word count.
- Went to College Council for feedback. Going to ASCCC next week. Campus announcements sent out and deadline is Oct. 3.

Questions

- Q: 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 – previously there was consultation with English and math faculty. Who worked on these strategies? If approved, is it prescriptive for English and math?
- A: They put a call out to faculty and had one instructional (English) and two service faculty for that section. No math rep. Won't be prescriptive. Welcome feedback now through the form. None meant to be set in stone.
- Q: Senator's faculty felt it resonated with division. How do ESL students factor in to equity plan? Was there a focus group or feedback?
- A: Dr. Espinoza-Wade works with ASCCC to get that feedback.

Discussion:

- Presenter asked team members to give feedback based on work with their students
- Suggestions for 3.2.2 strategies – greater support for embedded tutors but also support for writing center and math lab and student success centers. Would like faculty consultation to enhance those services.
- Presenter asked for specificity with action strategies, such as “greater support for ...”

- Suggested replacing or adding to JEDI academy training reference – “other alternative DEIA trainings around the state” so it’s not narrowed down to our own program
- Presenter noted that JEDI is not institutionalized but see the benefits so want to keep it in so that it can be pointed to and continued
- Senator can’t get embedded tutor every semester – would like to raise awareness and expand online tutoring
- Thinking about first-generation student; one strategy could be about how to support students going from noncredit to credit
- Call for consensus on feedback. Consensus

~~6. **Instruction CPPR and APPW Language to Connect to CCAP Addenda** (Kelli Gottlieb, 10 minutes, First Read)~~

~~**Background:** If the Academic Senate approves the CCAP IPPR addenda, the main instructional program review documents will need a minor update to direct users to the addenda. In addition, the comprehensive review includes a question for programs that do not offer CCAP, allowing them to explain why.~~

~~**Supporting Documents:**~~

~~CPPR and APPW Main Document Language~~

~~**Proposal:** The Academic Senate Council provides feedback on the CCAP language to be added to the CPPR and APPW instruction documents.~~

7. CCAP Updates to the Instruction Program Review Documents

(Kelli Gottlieb, Kristina Vastine and Mario Espinoza-Kulick, 10 minutes, Second Read)

Background: The CCAP Addenda for the Instruction CPPR and APPW have been revised to incorporate feedback provided by the Academic Senate at the 9/12 meeting. The changes include:

- Eliminated temporary data analysis section
 - It is the intention of the faculty coordinator and the associate director to work with CCAP faculty (in a taskforce) to develop robust, relevant data analysis sections over the course of this year and to return with an updated version of the CPPR and APPW addenda that contains the data component.
- Separated High School Instructor-led and Cuesta Instructor-led into separate sections of the comprehensive review (CPPR) and incorporated requested prompt.
- Shortened the annual review (APPW) to just updates and prompts to prepare future comprehensive reviews (CPPR)
- Consolidated redundant prompts
- Clarified focus on the high school dual enrollment (Cuesta-led and HS-led) with an alternate area where other dual enrollment (like enrichment and innovation) can be discussed.
- Formalized informal language

Supporting Documents:

[CCAP APPW Addendum Redline](#)

[CCAP APPW Addendum clean](#)

[CCAP CPPR Addendum Redline](#)

[CCAP CPPR Addendum Clean](#)

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council provides feedback on the CCAP addenda for the CPPR and the APPW.

- Kelli Gottlieb: wanted to receive more feedback and continue work. Thank you for changing from approval to feedback
- Espinoza-Kulick – excited to hear views and improve
- Comments:
- #3 on CPPR addendum – issue if there's only one faculty member in department for discussion component.
 - Presenter suggested removing “department”
- Thank you for the changes. Seems more doable.
- Q: Why not approve it today?
- A: Received feedback last week that a senator that would be against unless compensated. That senator not present today.
- Presenter: compensation questions could be added to APPW to CPPR
- Senator recommended approving and the other issues can be handled through the union – this body should not consider compensation
- Vote on moving from approval to feedback
- Call for consensus on feedback. Consensus

8. **Academic Senate Priorities 2025-2026** (Erich Tucker, Ryan Lowenstein, 10 minutes, Approval)

Background: We are not obligated to set committee initiatives, but identifying priorities helps us advocate more effectively for support in these areas. Last year's priorities have been reviewed, and the following have been identified as the initiatives for this year. We invite the Academic Senate to consider these and provide additional suggestions for new priorities.

The Academic Senate proposes the following priorities in 2025-2026:

1. **Support Curriculum Implementation**

Continue implementation of curriculum mandates, including Common Course Numbering and the transition to CalGETC.

2. **Address AB 1705**

Collaborate with faculty and administration to develop strategies that support students under the full implementation of AB 1705, with attention to longitudinal data and discipline-specific needs.

3. **Transition to a 16-Week Calendar**

Partner with faculty to identify and support the instructional, scheduling, and student-success impacts of the 16-week calendar shift.

4. **Preserve and Protect Academic Freedom**

Affirm and advocate for academic freedom within Senate purview, while collaborating with bargaining units on contractual protections to ensure faculty rights are safeguarded.

5. **Strengthen Shared Governance and Campus Communication**

Foster trust, transparency, and mutual accountability through co-developed processes that advance collegial consultation, improve campus communication, and align with institutional health priorities.

6. **Embrace Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Education**

Revisit and expand the Senate's work on AI, evaluating existing policies, identifying new implications, and supporting faculty innovation and professional development in this area.

Proposal: The Academic Senate approves the committee proposals provided on the Academic Senate Priorities for 2025-2026.

- Senator will block title currently on Priority 6 (Embrace Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Education). Significant number of faculty don't want it AI all
- Reminder that there are three tiers of suggested language around AI
- Senator noted that neither of the AI and academic honesty taskforces are about "embracing"
- In addition to what faculty adopt in their classroom, other work needs to be done.
- Recommends taking out headings – too confusing – the blocks make sense
- For 6 – rewrite (not revisit and expand)
- FT faculty in history – one is only face to face, two online are going to hybrid to give tests in person; would like support for seeing if hybrid will work; friend at another college puts everyone in a room without computers or internet; want to support faculty who don't want to use AI
- Support faculty for the solution that works for their courses; ASC has supported the three statements; his field also has many changes related to AI; helps students with what to do and what not to do; need to address it
- The sentence still feels like faculty are onboard moving forward when really they are questioning, concerned, etc. Wants the statement to reflect diverse perspectives.
- Dr. Curtis encourages faculty to not just think about classroom implications. We will be bombarded with AI opportunities at the college. Would like faculty to think that way, too. What jobs are vulnerable? Would like faculty to take an interest in those jobs as well. When asked for an example -- software will be able to do a lot of what a dean does
- Senator agreed there's potential for jobs to be slashed
- Would like to keep #6 because taskforces are still going
- Group agreed on the following: *Evaluate existing and develop new AI policies as needed, identify new implications, and support faculty innovation and professional development to address the challenges and benefits of generative AI in higher education*
- Erich Tucker would like senators to send feedback so he can edit

- Senator asked to get rid of headings, reword #6 as above
- Some headings are too broad
- Erich Tucker asked if 1, 2, 4 and 5 are OK – just remove headings?
- Senator noted that when you block internet you cannot block AI; have to block electronic devices – could still run ChatGPT
- Call for consensus on AS priorities as amended. 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?

- Any summit items to bring forward on Oct. 8?
- Senator asked to express gratitude to Dr. Stearns, VPAA, VPSS and VPAS for supporting 2.0 (see above)
- When collaboration taskforce gets together – will probably give to Erich Tucker to share with Summit first before Academic Senate

VII. Standing Reports:

1. ASCC – Lucia Landeros
2. CCFT – Greg Baxley
3. Curriculum – Steve Leone
 - Progress report on Common Course Numbering. Reviewing seven Phase IIA courses in Curriculum Committee by the end of the year. Phase IIB courses (15) will be implemented for Fall 2027. Faculty surveys for Phase III courses were sent out for 47 courses. Implementation date TBD. Be friendly toward Curriculum reps; they may be reaching out for help with revisions. Compensation for faculty leads and team members
 - Senator shared that curriculum submission process is streamlined and appreciated.
 - Question about learning what has changed in the COR. Steve Leone can go through process individually. Can access CORs through Curriqunet and faculty are evaluated on teaching to the COR.
4. Equity and Student Success – TBA
5. Faculty Professional Development – Matthew Davis (filed report)
 - The Committee has finalized the schedule for October flex and it is currently in the hands of Marketing to be turned into our brochure; we hope to have the brochure sent out campus wide by the end of next week.
 - The committee is pleased to offer three full days of programming, including an all-day CPR/First Aid Certification course on Friday, October 10, 2025 from 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM in 5401 on the SLO Campus (with lunch provided by the Office of Instruction). Registration will be required for those wishing to participate, with registration instructions included in the October Flex Brochure.
 - Two additional sessions--one on the SLO campus and one at the NCCC--will be led by the National Conflict Resolution Center on the "ART of Communication" will also require advance registration and are limited to 35 participants each; registration information will be included in the brochure. Interested participants are encouraged to register early.

- The window for submission of Faculty Professional Development funding requests has opened and will remain open until December 1, 2025 or until we have exhausted half of our funds, whichever comes first. Application information is available on our website under the first drop-down menu.
- 6. Online Educational Resources – Carina Love
- 7. CMC – Sabrina Rock
 - Kate Haisch on behalf of Sabrina, who plans to come next month
- 8. Online Education Committee – Cynthia Wilshusen
- 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: October 17, 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