Academic Senate Council Agenda
November 14, 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	Present/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
Vice-President	Ryan Lowenstein	Present/ 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	Present/ 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	Present/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
At Large, Full-Time	Dina Hallmark	Present/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
At Large, Part-Time	Vacant	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	Kerry Bailey	Present/ Absent / AB 2449 remote
Skilled Trades & Technology	Jonathan Blackketter	Present/ Absent / AB 2449 remote

English	Steve Leone	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	Michele Redlo	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	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: Kate Haisch
Timekeeper: Devon Bradley
Computer: Melina Simonds

I. **Approval of Agenda** (3 minutes)
- Open for comments or questions on Agenda.
- Request to add to agenda – Governance 2.0 Taskforce to reports at the end, under the standing reports section.

- Question about resolutions at the last meeting, and if he could provide the feedback from his division now. AS president asked senator to report at Public Comment section.
- Call for Consensus. Consensus.

II. **Approval of Minutes** [Academic Senate Council MINUTES DRAFT 10-24-2025](#) (3 minutes)
- 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.
- Cynthia Wilshusen shared that "The Attic" is now open. It is a shared space for faculty to use, and there is a recording studio. Provided flyers with info. Asked that reservations are made for the recording studio. She is also there and available for assistance and questions. It is in 3219, upstairs in the library room.
- Senator asked inquired the outcome of the resolution regarding online proctoring that was discussed at the last meeting, and asked for an update the outcome at Plenary?
  - AS President noted that there were three items resolved in that resolution. The first was voted down, but passed parts two and three.

IV. **Presidents Report** (9 min)
- Asked for assistance to help plan Academic Senate leadership retreat. It is open to all faculty to apply.
  - Senator asked that a taskforce to help with planning.
  - AS President, noted that is why he is asking for volunteers that are interested, so he can invite them to taskforce meeting. More details will be discussed at next meeting.
- The 'League', to come visit help find a resolution on some 10+1 issues. They will interview faculty and administration, write a report to share. They will mainly focus on 10+1 and governance process. There times there is overstepping with these two processes, so this visit should help find a resolution for those types of issues. More information will be reported at a later senate meeting.

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 (Second Read, Approval)
2. AP 5012 – International Students (First Read, Feedback)
3. Formation of a Task Force on Annual CCAP Course Evaluation Process and Corresponding Paperwork (First Read, Approval)
4. Establishment of OER/ZTC Task Force (First Read, Approval)
5. Review the Recommendations for Embedded Peer Tutoring at Cuesta College (First Read, Feedback)
6. Spring 2026 Academic Senate Council Meeting Dates (First Read, Approval)

1. **Educational Master Plan (EMP)** (Dr. Elizabeth Coria, 15 minutes, Second Read)

   Background: The purpose of this agenda item is to request a second read of the EMP Draft from the Academic Senate, with feedback from the first-read in October included. 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 by the campus community has been addressed. The draft has been approved by the College Council and Planning & Budget. Approval is requested from the Academic Senate and will be requested from ASCC at their November 19 meeting. The intent is to submit the final document to the December Board of Trustees meeting for approval.

   Supporting Documents:
   Educational Master Plan Campus Feedback V2
   Cuesta EMP Final Draft Redline
   Cuesta EMP Final Draft Clean

   Proposal: The Academic Senate Council approves the Educational Master Plan as presented.
   - Presenter noted that there attached to the agenda is the most updated feedback sheet that has any edits and responses to the comments that were received from Senate, and also all of the other comments that were received.

- A senator asked the presenter if the feedback received from the campus-wide survey and AS were brought back to the EMP taskforce for the group to decide whether to incorporate feedback given. The presenter responded, "No, why would we. The taskforce finished their work."
- Last sentence removed from draft where finding south county site was noted, as the board has already voted to move forward on a site.
- Senator noted that they are still getting feedback from constituents. Multiple constituents have concern over the EMP and approving it. Strong concerns over it being a 4 year plan, specifically implementation of EMP plans, and then having to plan the next one.
- Senator posed questioned regarding the plan being 4-years, and how that decision came about. Also, if the feedback from the previous meeting expressing concern for the plan only being 4 years.
  - Presenter noted that there was a planning retreat with stakeholders and that is where the decision was made. It was decided that a 4-year plan would move forward. There was a robust discussion and the decision was made to move it to a 4-year plan.
  - Noted that in 3 years when the new plan will begin work, it can be reassessed there and change the timeline of the plan to something other than 4 year plan.
  - Another senator noted that his constituents too have issues regarding moving forward with a 4 year plan.
  - Senator noted that the college operates in a participatory governance structure, and decisions are made using that structure, and that this was never brought through participatory governments. Retreats are not places where we make decisions. Senator also raised the concern that even at that this stage of the game, had it gone through and gotten approved at a four year plan, it would have been expected the plan to actually be like our previous one. So that that concern still remains.
- Question regarding other feedback and inaccuracies on program data. One concern expressed, was regarding Distance Education. Also, conditions regarding colleges pursuit of baccalaureate.
  - Data has been cleaned up with each draft.
  - Decided to leave in plan because if Governor or legislation changes, we want to have it in there.
- Comment from guest, noted that there is seeing a pattern that there are concerns only at the end when it goes through the governance process.

There were many opportunities to provide feedback, and be involved in the process. Constituents had opportunity to bring their concerns to those representing them on the taskforce. Not sure if it is a communication challenge, but felt strongly they needed to verbalize their observation of this issue. It is not a good use of time if a taskforce and working group is going to work on certain issues and constituents' concerns are not addressed prior to the governance process. We shouldn't be at this point raising concerns.

- o Senator agrees with Guest's statement, that it shouldnt be like this but noted that there are different with this particular process as there were not as many opportunities, (that last EMP was brought through the governance process multiple times during development, not just at the end). Although communication was good, the EMP was not brought through governance until now when it is done. The April forum which was supposed to present the EMP draft was cancelled. There was not enough opportunity to provide feedback while the plan was being developed.
- o Presenter noted that there were weekly updates, and information about the data getting collected. The link was open for two weeks for feedback to be provided. There was very little feedback.
- o Senator noted that there is still a trend that feedback is not incorporated, and
- o Additional time for 5 minutes. Consensus.
- Senator noted that has feelings of agreement on both sides. However, believes that adding year, to make it a 5 year plan, would allow for 3 years of data.
- Senator read feedback from constituents. Specifically, how goals for departments/divisions are set in relation to division, cluster, and college goals.
- The issues in the EMP that are too vague to flush out the structural areas as a plan are not necessarily easy in the monitoring and accountability section. This could be much more specific. The goal setting is too big. Senator noted, for example, not sure how every department is able to set their own goals. If department goals were required to align with division goals, and division goals was to align with cluster goals. Cluster goals must align with the college's executive goals. It seems like the goals set at the highest level dictate the rest of the goals for college. If that's the case, how

will the annual college goals be determined and how they go through governance. An additional year to prepare would be helpful.

- Call for consensus.
  - 1 orange, 2 red cards. Open for additional comments.
    - Senator noted that constituents feel that this is rushed through and not enough feedback and collaboration has been done.
    - Another senator noted their card is due to similar concerns from constituents.
    - Third senator noted they did orange card, to not block but to make their constituents concerns heard and noted. For one, there was no suggestion to get rid of the baccalaureate, but rather to have the legislation be reported, and then some of the other information has been addressed. Understand that this is a document that's gone through a great deal of draft work, and there's a lot of really interesting data, but I think this is an opportunity for us to really reset and think about what the Ed Master Plans function is, as specified, really in ACC standards, 1.3 and 1.4.
- A question regarding the timeline. What happens if this is not approved today?
  - It would go to Dr. Stearns to review and decide to push forward without approval, as College Council and Planning and budget have approved.
- Revote. 3 orange cards. The proposal passes without consensus.

2. **AP 5012 International Students** (Jennifer Burchett, 5 minutes, First Read, Feedback)

Background: AP 5012 International Students reviewed by the Policy & Procedure Review Committee (PPRC) on 10/21/2025. AP 5012 has been reviewed by AS/VP SSSP, SSSP Deans, and Director of Admissions, Student Records, and Registration.

AP 5012 is legally required if a district admits non-citizen students. Districts should include provisions for adherence to federal requirements regarding immigration documentation.

The PPRC requests that the Academic Senate Council and College Council review the language of AP 5012 to ensure it is student friendly. The PPRC recommends adding an introductory statement such as: "Cuesta College welcomes international students from all countries to attend and learn within our community."

The approval process for AP 5012 International Students will begin in Academic Senate Council and is presented for feedback on first read. Upon review/approval by College Council, AP 5012 will return to Academic Senate Council for second read.

Supporting Documents:

CCLC AP 5012
AP 5012 Redline
AP 5012 Clean

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council approves feedback on AP 5012 - International Students as presented.

- Presenter reviewed the process. This is legally required for the district in adherence to federal regulations. There is a redline and clean version. The approval process will begin here, with feedback, and then will return for a 2nd read.
- Question if it has been to student senate yet?
  - No, it has only gone to PPRC, but this is the first stop for feedback.
- Senator noted this policy is much clearer, and easy to follow than previously. Also noted please the way that the redline was done made it difficult to follow the redline. Asked that the entire document was crossed out and then added some changes.
- Senator asked if language could be added to support students that need language assistance.
- Include some welcoming language, will that be added at the top? It does not currently show.
  - It was already recommended by previous feedback from PPRC. But asked that feedback be given again today so it can be incorporated in the next draft.
- Another senator offered support.

- Senator offered edits, 7 – must enroll in a degree or certificate program, should be fixed. Student is misspelled in some areas.
- Senator asked if for readability, if headers for each section would be easier for students to read and find information they need.
- 3rd paragraph, part of 12 units – does that also include hybrid? Could that be included?
    - Need to check regulation, but hybrid should work and could be added.
- Call for consensus on feedback. Consensus.

3. **Formation of a Task Force on Annual CCAP Course Evaluation Process and Corresponding Paperwork** (Dr. Mario Espinoza-Kulick, Kristina Vastine, 10 minutes, Approval)

Background: This proposal stems from the California Community Colleges Vision 2030, which identifies dual enrollment as a key strategy for expanding equitable access to higher education, and Education Code §76004 authorizes colleges to partner with high schools to offer these opportunities. Cuesta College has made ongoing commitments to maintain and improve the quality of dual enrollment instruction, including but not limited to approval of a CCAP/Dual Enrollment Faculty Coordinator, and a previous Dual Enrollment Task Force.

It will be shared with Human Resources, the Cuesta College Federation of Teachers, and the Institutional Program and Planning Review committee for review and input.

The purpose of this agenda item is to introduce a Taskforce to propose revisions to the annual review process for high school led dual enrollment courses.

Background information includes Cuesta College, it offers the majority of our dual enrollment courses (85%) by overseeing qualified high school Dual Enrollment Teachers. High school partners complete a Curriculum Review with a discipline-specific Faculty Designee to establish a high-school-teacher-led CCAP course. Once a Curriculum Review is approved, the High School Dual Enrollment Teacher then goes through an annual CCAP course evaluation with a discipline-specific Cuesta Faculty Designee. This task force will review the annual CCAP course evaluation process and associated forms to ensure that Cuesta College

faculty are consistently evaluating the course content and curriculum for dual enrollment courses.

Details on the current 2025-2026 CCAP Course Evaluation process can be found [here.](#)

The proposal recommends approving a task force to propose edits to the Faculty Designee Annual Course Evaluation process for high-school–led dual enrollment courses. This process currently includes an annual in-person site visit, evaluation forms, and student survey tools. Task force members will include faculty designees with at least one semester of experience and administrators and/or classified staff who directly interface with dual enrollment course review processes. Appointments will be made by the Academic Senate President in consultation with the Dual Enrollment Faculty Coordinator. Recommendations will be reviewed with Human Resources, the Cuesta College Federation of Teachers, and the Institutional Program and Planning Review committee. The Task Force will develop their recommendations to be presented to Academic Senate Council in Spring 2026 to implement changes for the 2026-2027 academic year.

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council approves the formation of a Task Force on Annual CCAP Course Evaluation Process and Corresponding Paperwork as presented.

- Presenter reviewed information provided above. Read background information noted above. Opened the floor for questions and comments.
- Question regarding time commitment, and would there be a stipend for PT faculty.
    - Response is, possibly. Dual Enrollment does have some funding available and he would discuss with Assoc. Director Kristina Vastine.
    - The time commitment would be about 10 hours for the semester.
- Senator noted that they would like to see if evaluations could be done every other year for those that have been teaching the for a significant length of time. Only if nothing has changed.
    - Presenter agreed. Noted that will part of the work of the taskforce. The forms need to be updated, and that can be considered. The process is to evaluate the course and not the instructor.

- Presenter replied, would be on a timeline to update and complete work by end of Spring, but changes would not be implemented until next year.
- Presenter also noted volunteers should have at least 1-semester of Dual Enrollment Designee.
- Call for consensus. Consensus.

4. **Establishment of OER/ZTC Task Force and background** (Carina Love, 10 minutes, Approval)

Background: As the Cuesta OER/ZTC Coordinator and Statewide Academic Senate OERI coordinator, I became aware of several issues around OER/ZTC which would benefit from a broader faculty perspective. The first item is an upcoming directive from the Chancellors office to commit to providing burden free access to instructional materials. This includes a BP/AP that must be in place by January 26. While we have been given placeholder language to meet the tight deadline, we must begin to plan how to sustainably provide affordable resources for our students even when our OER/ZTC grants run out.

The recent Senate Plenary presented a webinar with possible language that could replace the placeholder language and come from a Senate group so we would have a place to start. I attended this today and the slides will be released next week.

The attached memo from the Chancellor's office describes the expectation for local districts to begin to reduce costs for students:

"The new regulation requires that district governing boards adopt policies guaranteeing student access to textbooks and supplemental materials on the first day of class. Practices that meet this requirement include adopting and adapting open educational resources (OER) or providing initial textbook chapters in accordance with copyright allowances. In addition to first-day access, governing boards must also adopt policies that strengthen student access to all other instructional materials before they are required in any course."

"The regulation defines instructional materials as all required items for a course — including textbooks, supplemental materials, and supplies. "Textbooks" are identified as the educational resources listed in a course syllabus, while "supplemental materials" include a broad range of additional learning supports

such as lab manuals, workbooks, required software, journal articles, interactive websites, and readers."

Supporting Documents:

[Chancellor Memo](#)

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council approves the formation of a Task Force for OER/ZTC as presented.

- Presenter shared her background work as the OER Coordinator. Also went over the background and proposal. Taskforce is needed to have faculty to work with to improve and implement chancellor's office directives.
- Question regarding 'first day' and if that is a move to all textbooks and materials to be zero cost?
  - Response, is not all.
- What is the work anticipated for the taskforce, just the BP/AP work?
  - Not just BP/AP, but also sustainability, and best practices, equity documents, and ongoing projects.
  - Has some sample language for BP/AP work.
- Senator ask that presenter consider need to have a longstanding committee, and the taskforce can help move forward ideas and needs of the program. A working group of faculty would be helpful to move the program forward and catch up to where the college should be.
  - Presenter would like to have the...
- Senator from Nursing noted that she would be interested and was part of the work of OER and ZTC at another college. Agreed with other senator that there should be an ongoing committee to do work to move program forward.
  - Presenter agreed.
- Senator asked if the proposal could be amended to change from taskforce to workgroup?
  - Presenter asked for AS President for clarification on the difference between the two.
    - AS President shared the definition of both.
- Call for additional 5 minutes. Consensus.
- Guest noted that the work of the taskforce/workgroup could align and report to Online Education Committee.

- o Senator noted that would be a good move, and shared previous experience.
- Call for consensus to amend the proposal to be 'Workgroup' instead of 'Taskforce'. Consensus.
- Call for approval of formation of workgroup. Consensus.
- Cynthia Wilshusen, Michele Redlo , Michelle Hopper and Alex Kahane have volunteered.

5. **Review the Recommendations for Embedded Peer Tutoring at Cuesta College** (Dr. Amelia Marini and Matthew Fleming, 15 minutes, Feedback)

Background: This proposal stems from the formation of the Embedded Peer Tutoring Committee, a subcommittee of the Academic Senate, formed to review relevant research related to embedded peer tutors, to consider the current Embedded Peer Tutoring Program, and to make data-driven recommendations regarding the efficacy and structure of the program. It will also be shared with the Vice-President of Instruction and the Academic Deans for review and input. The proposal recommends the Academic Senate Council approve the feedback provided to update the Embedded Peer Tutoring Proposal.

Supporting Documents:
[Recommendations for Embedded Peer Tutoring at Cuesta College](#)

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council approves the feedback and recommendations of the Embedded Peer Tutoring Group at Cuesta College as presented.

- Presenter shared background on proposal. This will proposal will go to Deans/VP meeting to present as well. The spirit of the workgroup was interdisciplinary, and included SSC and Dual Enrollment, and the process was truly collaborative. This is a feedback item, to help improve or refine document before it goes to leaderships.
- AS President thanked the presenters and the workgroup for the work that has been completed so far. Asked if there were any issues that senate should be aware of.

- o Presenter noted that this was very rewarding as the goal is to get students engaged and overall was a great experience, and hopes it moves forward to really help students.
  - o Other presenter agreed, and says the data really confirms it.
- Senator has several thoughts, 1 – have a section the compares embedded tutors to other tutors. The issues is comparing embedded tutors to teaching assistance. For example, why can't they see the grades? What can they do in the classroom? The training that they receive, and how to teach the material. You have highlighted the cumbersome process for the tutor, and the faculty. The community of practice is a great idea.
  - o Presenters agreed that it maybe an idea to have a coordinator position to help manage the embedded tutors.
  - o Presenter noted that have more faculty input in the future to make it better for both tutors and faculty who participate.
  - o In terms of TA vs Embedded Tutor, if they can't see grades, reinforce the teaching they need to be able to relay. There is a difference in the context of this campus. It is different at a university.
    - ▪ Senator said they would like to have information regarding the difference between TA and embedded tutor so faculty can be informed and make an informed decision as to what would be appropriate.
- Senator asked what, besides coordinator position, will be emphasized to leadership when presented?
  - o The coordinator position is really the next step, because issues that moving forward would be alleviated by have a coordinator to manage the position.
  - o College Success Studies are really eager
- Guest appreciated the case, but doesn't have an idea of what the current structure is and how the ideas and possible changes differ. These types of programs, want to give instructors some autonomy, but uniformity and best practices, actually makes it easier, and smoother, to have high impact. Example would bi-weekly check-in meetings be helpful? The recommendations you have now, would be to provide more clarity on what the current structure is and how this could be better moving forward.

- Senator provided feedback on CSS 168, to see more opportunity for area specific instruction/training. STEM has some ideas that would work for them, and more individualized by area of study.
- Call for 5 more minutes. Consensus.
- Senator noted that 768 and 168 are both courses. Disaggregated student data is helpful, but not always time in the course to do that. Growth mindset. Experienced tutor training. Asked about the comment, and asked for clarification.
    - Presented noted that after the students begin work, the faculty that trained them do not get feedback if that work was helpful and used. Want to close communication gaps.
    - Presenter noted that the silo comment is more that it refers to they feel separate.
    - Opportunity for more context as to what students are expecting.
- Guest noted, what is a that considering the difference between disciplines, but and consistent base. Can there be some crossover foundation structure of standard practices? There needs to be training for both tutors and faculty.
- Question to regarding the meetings with tutors. There is no compensation, as they are currently only compensated for 2 hours a month. Tutors and faculty are not compensated at all for additional meetings.
- Senator has issue with the requirements that tutors must pass the exact class they are going to tutor in. In some cases that is not necessary and used history classes as an example. This could help with recruitment and retention.
- Call for consensus on feedback and recommendations. Consensus.

6. **Spring 2026 Academic Senate Council Meeting Dates** (Erich Tucker, Ryan Lowenstein, 5 minutes, First Read, Approval)

Background: The Academic Senate Council meets on the second and fourth Friday of the month. To be inclusive of our faculty that work at the North County Campus, we'd like to set the primary meeting location for one meeting (3/20) to be at the NCC (secondary location would be SLO campus).

We would like to propose the following Academic Senate Council meeting dates: 1/23 (Reg), 2/6 (Off-Cycle), 2/20 (Reg), 3/13 (Reg), 3/20 (Off-Cycle - NCC), 4/10 (Reg), 4/24 (Reg), 5/8 (Reg)

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council approves the Spring 2026 meeting dates and locations.

- Any comments or question on proposed dates.
- Call to approve proposed meetings dates. 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?
- Last summit was to be this week, but was cancelled due to no discussion items.
- Senator asked if summit could discuss funding for AI detection tools. Some faculty are paying out of pocket.
- Computer lab or testing center that could be used where access to AI could be turned off where they just type, to not use bluebooks.

VII. **Standing Reports:**
1. ASCC – Yanelly Cardenas – *Leadership conference coming up. Committee to help plan more events. Spring semester to start.*
2. CCFT – Greg Baxley – Movie night coming up. *Started negotiations regarding 16-week. Once change agreed is lowering flex hours required. Director of student engagement hiring committee volunteer needed. Dr. S asked for opinion on ways to help use AI appropriately. Looking for ideas. Guest speaker, faculty and student panel.*
3. Curriculum – Steve Leone – Busy month. *Approved 17 new courses, and 4 new degrees. Articulation Officer asked to share, pre-req enforcement. Some are not enforced because it could cause issues with enrollment. Messaging will go out soon to all faculty to open discussion. CPOS there might be courses in students do not get FA for. These are usually support and co-req courses. Chemistry, 201BX, not required but beneficial and students have to pay out of pocket for them. Want to plant a seed to support students. Pre-req not enforced, need to figure out how to enforce. The obstacle is that A/R had a labor issue to not enforce. Need more conversation. Limitations of enrollment, like auditions, want to ask if*

individual faculty interviewing student into class, not supported by Title V, but have another process that maybe includes a panel to get around problem. Develop a panel to have research assistant's process. More sound and valid if more than one faculty.

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 – *Come see her in Attic. Thank you to group for approving substantive changes. Faculty doing the work will make good changes. Canguo Liu shared AdobePodcast, free through college's AdobeSuite, can be used for cleaning up videos and removing background sound, etc. Cynthia will take note.*
9. Student Learning Outcomes Assessment – Kelli Gottlieb
10. Dual Enrollment – Mario Espinoza-Kulick

   +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)

- *Governance 2.0 - include several faculty, and authentically reviewing ACCJC standards and concerns regarding EMP and cancelling Strategic Planning Committee. May have received an email regarding all faculty serving on committee to come up with a list of activities. Use information to see any overlap and use that to recommend committee structures. Feb 2026.*
- *JEDI – wanted to share they will be accepting applications for next cohort. This week facilitators met with Dr. Stearns. Did proposal for admin and financial support, and will have an update of what that will turn into. Committee may reach out to collect some data. There are 15 spots in next co-hort.*
-

Next Meeting: November 21, 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