Chabot-Las Positas Community College District
Chancellor's Council
Tuesday, November 11, 2025
3:00 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.
District Office, Conference Room 1

Attendees:

☒ Ron Gerhard	☒ Heike Gecox	☒ Aubrie Ross (via Zoom)
☒ Mona Abdoun	☒ Naomi Mangini	☒ Chasity Whiteside
☒ Jamal Cooks	☒ Ashley Young	☒ Jeanne Wilson
☒ Thomas Dowrie	☒ Theresa Pedrosa	
☒ Dyrell Foster	☒ Osibisa Roseby	

Guests: Jamal Cooks, Jennifer Druley, Bruce Griffin, Jonah Nicholas
Via Zoom: Christy Davis, Owen Letcher, Kirti Reddy, Michael Thompson

MINUTES

Chancellor Ron Gerhard started the meeting at 3:01 p.m.

1. **Review and Approval of the November 11, 2025 Agenda**
   The agenda was approved as presented. **(Pedrosa/Dowrie) All in Favor**

2. **Review and Approval of the October 14, 2025 Meeting Minutes**
   The minutes from the October 14, 2025 meeting were approved as presented.
   (Foster/Pedrosa)

3. **Information and Discussion Items**

   3.1. AI Training
   RGerhard stated that most everyone in the room has had a chance to attend the AI training that we have been rolling out. Feedback was solicited.

   Jeanne Wilson mentioned that she enjoyed the training and will be doing a part two with the Student Services administrators and assistants.

   Mona Abdoun mentioned that the training was more in depth than other trainings that she has been to but is still trying to figure out how to use it for her classes. From a faculty perspective, the trainers were really good about giving instructions. There will need to be some thought engineering training for faculty.

   RGerhard mentioned that we have offered the 3-hour AI professional development experience, starting with the Senior Leadership Team, then the broader management group, and the more recently, the executive assistants, senior administrative assistants, and administrative assistants across the district. Some faculty and classified leadership also participated in the training as well.

The next step is looking at setting up similar type sessions on the campuses between now and the middle of next spring. Related to students and faculty, we have also conducted focus groups. Students were asked if they were able to participate. The feedback from students that did attend was that it was great and there is a lot of interest. An AI Club is currently pending activation and another one just came to talk to the Student Senate.

We are gearing up towards doing something for spring flex day at both colleges related to a panel of both faculty and students. It is important to get a clear understanding and open dialogue of how students are using AI. Getting us, as an institution, to have dialogue between faculty and students ultimately leads to similar type sessions with faculty geared towards hands on learning. This pathway leads to a point in the future where we will all be on the same level of understanding where we can have constructive conversations about devising together a district policy on AI.

Ashley Young mentioned that the first 20-30 minutes of the 3-hour training went into a lot of the basics that everyone should know. That was very helpful. And the concept that AI is really just taking that to a deeper level as we go forward, people can relate to that. It was suggested that maybe the training be tapered down to 1-hour. This would help the people that are dead set against AI to be able to get a better, basic understanding of it. Unless they get a basic understanding, they are never going to accept it, no matter what.

RGerhard mentioned that a few gave feedback that the presenters presented it in a way that there are different levels of functioning. Even though there may be a knowledge of the benefits of AI in the workplace and how it can be used personally, the 3-hour training is not needed for all parties that will not use it in that manner. Though, it is an informative and helpful exercise for us as an educational institution to know what the expectations are of our students who leave us and go into the workplace.

MAbdoun mentioned that a question that came up in a division meeting was what if a student able to then use AI to log in to Canvas and complete their module work with that. Naomi Mangini mentioned that there is a sense in the classroom of students who do use AI are competing against students that do not use it. KCostello mentioned that it is also an equity issue because it is what the person using it puts into it. If you are more capable than the next person in regards to what prompts you use, your output is going to be better than theirs.

RGerhard stated that we are going to have conversations indefinitely into the future in terms of how students are using AI. AYoung stated that maybe we have a shorter overview of the basics of AI at a Town Meeting, etc. There is value in getting the information out there. RGerhard stated that the value of the three hours is the fact that it is interactive and does not want that to get lost. It puts a touch and feel to the conversation on AI instead of being theoretical. AYoung mentioned that the specific training did not seem to fit what she would use it for. KCostello mentioned that maybe the problem was that the training was geared towards assistants. She also mentioned that when the Senior Leadership Team had their training, it did not pertain to her necessarily and she got much more out of the assistant training. The trainers target their audience.

3.2. Enrollment Update

RGerhard gave a quick update. The final apportionment report was submitted and was phenomenal. Essentially, what that means is Chabot is about 10,140 or so FTES, which is about 1,051 FTES above what we though in July. LPC is also up year over year by probably about 10%. The final enrollment reports were even higher than what we had thought. That coupled with the fact that last week, our state's MIS file was submitted on student financial aid recipients within the district.

This is important because two of the data pieces submitted for fiscal year 2024-25, was the number of students who had received a Promise Grant as well as a Pell Grant. It is important because those two items are now direct inputs within our funding model. When we submitted the year before, we had a 30% increase, in the number of students getting a Pell Grant. We had about a 22% increase in the number of students getting a State Promise Grant. When the numbers were submitted last Monday for 2024-25, we had about a 30.5% increase in the number of students getting Pell Grants, so that is 30% year-over-year, 2 years in a row. We had about a 5% increase (rounded up) in the number of students getting a State Promise Grant.

RGerhard gave huge accolades to everyone in the room that helped and especially in terms of enrollment. It was a heavy lift for everybody. What this means, according to Jonah Nicholas's simulations that he unveiled on Friday at DEMC, is that we are out of Hold Harmless as a district, beginning the current fiscal year, 2025-26. This is not by a lot, roughly about a half a million dollars. To put that half million into perspective, our total unrestricted general fund budget is about $140 million, but the good news is we are out of hold harmless.

MAbdoun mentioned that she thought we were off of hold harmless. JNicholas explained that the hold harmless revenue up to this particular fiscal year has always been our Apportionment revenue plus any COLAs. The reason for the hold harmless is because that figure, dollar amount, is greater than what we would have achieved if we were just purely doing the Student-Centered Funding Formula calculation. The hold harmless this year does not include the COLA, so it is flat from 2024-25 into this 2025-26 year. Based upon the figures that we are reporting now to the state, that $140 million that we have on hold harmless, our SCFF number is now about a half million dollars above that, which is important for subsequent years because then we are going to be getting the full COLAs from that point forward through other mechanisms that are not available while on hold harmless.

AYoung asked if this includes proposed numbers for the winter intersession and spring or is it based upon 2024-25 numbers. JNicholas mentioned that the supplemental that the chancellor discussed, the Pell and the Promise Grant, those numbers are from 2024-25, but we get paid for them in 2025-26. For the 3-year FTES average for the current fiscal year, the way the simulator worked was JNicholas took exactly what we would be funded at according to the State Chancellor's Office. Anything above that is what is considered unfunded FTES. So, the simulation says what exactly the sate would fund us

at and what revenue would that generate. The number on that is a little over 17,000 FTES. So, basically what we achieved in 2024-25 is based upon the new recalculation numbers. So, the 2025-26 FTES that is being assumed for this current fiscal year is basically flat from what was assumed or what was achieved in 2025.

RGerhard stated that just because we are out of hold harmless, which is good news, does not mean that we, as a district, are going to get the COLA that the state has put out of 2.3%. So, in 2025-26, the state has funded COLA at 2.3% and growth at 2.35%. This does not mean we are getting that 4.65% new money. JNicholas stated that the amount that we are getting, that we are exceeding our hold harmless revenue, is about half a million dollars. That half a million dollars is the incremental amount that we get in 2025-26, which is the equivalent of .35%.

3.3. Winter Intersession Update
RGerhard stated that today is the first day of registration for our winter intersession as well as spring 2026. Within the first two hours, we have had almost 250 student registered for winter intersession, which came from priority registration. Things are looking optimistic.

3.4. Compressed Calendar Update
Bruce Griffin mentioned that next year's schedule has been rolled over, so it is now with the scheduling departments making the changes that they need to make.

4. Board Policies and Administrative Procedures
Kelly Costello gave a quick update on the California Community College League's update that just came out for fall 2025. The district receives updates for policies and procedures twice per year, once in the spring and once in the fall. These updates are largely based in changes in law. Once received, the vice chancellors' and chancellor's offices will review their respective area's policies and procedures. If there are needed changes to an existing BP or AP, the revision will go through the normal review process and end up on a future agenda for Chancellor's Council.

4.1. First Reading of Board Policies
The following board policies are brought forward for a first reading.

4.1.1. <u>**BP 7140 Collective Bargaining**</u>
Jennifer Druley stated that the change for BP 7140 is where it says classified staff or employees, it now says classified professionals. It was also mentioned that the other policies moving through have no changes, but are being brought forward for the normal 10-year cycle review.

4.1.2. <u>**BP 7232 Classification and Classification Review**</u>

4.1.3. <u>**BP 7245 Confidential and Supervisory Employee Complaints**</u>

4.1.4. <u>**BP 7265 Management Personnel Complaints**</u>

4.1.5. BP 7270 Student Workers

4.1.6. BP 7335 Health Examinations

4.1.7. BP 7337 Fingerprinting

4.1.8. BP 7341 Professional Development Leave (Administrative)

4.2. First Reading of Administrative Procedures
The following administrative procedures are brought forward to council for a first reading.

4.2.1. AP 7125 Verification of Eligibility for Employment

4.2.2. AP 7215 Academic Employees: Probationary Contract Faculty
JDruley mentioned that there is a line item missing for the second-year contract that should have been included.

4.2.3. AP 7233 Claims for Work Out of Classification

4.2.4. AP 7270 Student Workers
JDruley said this was created to address a missing procedure. The procedure contains info on what Human Resources already distributes and also includes what the colleges use for financial aid processing.

4.2.5. AP 7330 Communicable Disease

4.2.6. AP 7336 Certification of Freedom from Tuberculosis

4.2.7. AP 7337 Fingerprinting
The outdated language was updated and language was added to clarify that we do not use fingerprints directly with the DOJ or FBI.

4.2.8. AP 7341 Professional Development Leave (Administrative)

4.3. Second Reading of Board Policies
There are three board policies up for a second reading.

4.3.1. BP 6307 Debt Issuance and Management

4.3.2. BP 7216 Academic Employees: Grievance Procedure for Contract Decisions

4.3.3. BP 7700 Whistleblower Protection

There was a motion to approve the board policy second readings. **(Pedrosa/Young) All in favor.**

4.4. Second Reading of Administrative Procedures

    4.4.1. <u>**AP 3501 Campus Security and Access**</u>

    4.4.2. <u>**AP 3516 Registered Sex Offender Information**</u>

    4.4.3. <u>**AP 3540 Sexual and Other Assaults on Campus**</u>

    4.4.4. <u>**AP 3560 Alcoholic Beverages**</u>

    4.4.5. <u>**AP 3600 Auxiliary Organizations**</u>

    4.4.6. <u>**AP 6150 Designation of Authorized Signatures**</u>

    4.4.7. <u>**AP 6200 Budget Preparation**</u>

    4.4.8. <u>**AP 6250 Budget Management**</u>

    4.4.9. <u>**AP 6307 Debt Issuance and Management**</u>

    4.4.10. <u>**AP 6370 Contracts - Personal Services**</u>

    4.4.11. <u>**AP 6540 Insurance**</u>

    4.4.12. <u>**AP 7216 Academic Employees: Grievance Procedure for Contract Decisions**</u>

    4.4.13. <u>**AP 7344 Notify District of Illness**</u>

    4.4.14. <u>**AP 7700 Whistleblower Protection**</u>

    There was a motion to approve the board policy second readings. **(Mangini/Pedrosa)**
    All in favor.

5. **District and College Resolutions / Report Outs**

    Student Senate of Chabot College
    Theresa Pedrosa mentioned that she will work with the Las Positas College Student
    Government to review the policy of smoking on campus.

6. **Future Agenda Items**
    No future agenda items were noted.

7. **Adjourn**
    The meeting was adjourned at 3:52 p.m.

The next meeting is scheduled for December 9, 2025 via Zoom.