Chabot-Las Positas Community College District
Chancellor's Council

Tuesday, September 8, 2026
3:00 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.
ConferZoom

Attendees:

☒ Ron Gerhard	☒ Dyrell Foster	☒ Rajinder Samra
☒ Mona Abdoun	☒ Heike Gecox	☒ Tyson Tieu
☒ Jamal Cooks	☐ Suzanne Kohler	☒ Chasity Whiteside
☒ Thomas Dowrie	☒ Ashley McHale	
☐ Phyllis Essandoh	☒ Osibisa Roseby	

Guests: Jennifer Druley, Brian Goo*, Owen Letcher, Lizzy Mayo*, Dionicia Ramos*, Kirti Reddy*, Jeanne Wilson
**Attended via Zoom.*

MINUTES

Chancellor Ron Gerhard started the meeting at 3:04 p.m.

1. **Introductions**
   - **1.1. 2026-2027 Council Members**
     Introductions took place around the table, as well as guests attending via Zoom.

2. **Review and Approval of the Agenda**
   - **2.1. Review and Approval of the September 8, 2026 Agenda**
     The agenda was approved as presented. **(Samra/Gecox) All in Favor.**

3. **Review and Approval of Minutes**
   - **3.1. Approval of Minutes from the May 12, 2026 Meeting**
     The minutes were approved as presented. **(Foster/Whiteside) All in Favor. McHale abstained.**

4. **Information and Discussion Items**
   - **4.1. 2026-2027 Council Meeting Dates**
     The 2026-2027 Council Meeting dates were reviewed, which follows the pattern of the second Tuesdays of the month. It was discussed that meetings have been rotating via in person versus Zoom from month to month and will resume moving forward. For Council members that cannot attend the in-person meetings, they can attend as guests on Zoom but are unable to vote unless in person.

   - **4.2. Review of IPBM Structure and Council's Charge**
     RGerhard reviewed the policy AP 2510 Participation in District and College Governance, which is the rules of our shared governance structure. The policy states the following with reference to Chancellor's Council:

"The Chancellor's Council coordinates and supervises the district governance system. As the final districtwide policy recommending body, Chancellor's Council solicits, involves, and utilizes the opinions of faculty, classified professionals, students, and administrators, and provides an opportunity for constituent groups to inform and advise each other on policy matters. It shall ensure that districtwide participatory governance committees do not misconceive their purpose or overlap their function, and that any policy recommendation emanating from one group but affecting other groups be reviewed by appropriate committees and constituent groups before reaching final approval and being submitted to the Board.

The composition of the Chancellor's Council shall be as follows: Chancellor, College Presidents, Academic/Faculty Senate Presidents, Classified Senate Presidents, Student Senate Presidents, President of the faculty exclusive representative, and President of the classified exclusive representative, and one representative from the Administrative Association. Changes to this composition must be jointly agreed upon by the Chancellor and the Academic, Classified, and Student Senates."

Council is the final shared governance committee that reviews and makes recommendations on policies and procedures before they go to the Board of Trustees and are finalized and enacted. You will see a consistent theme that pretty much every Chancellor's Council meeting. There will be a bundle of policies and procedures for either a first or second reading. We rely upon you to go back to your constituencies, share the drafts, and solicit any feedback.

We intentionally went through and articulated the roles and the responsibilities that each group has in terms of certain areas of policy development. This is directly out of Title V, and we rely upon everybody, but in particular our faculty and academic senates to help us formulate, design, and recommend to the board policies and procedures on:

- Curriculum, including establishing prerequisites and placing courses within disciplines;
- Degree and certificate requirements;
- Grading policies;
- Educational program development;
- Standards or policies regarding student preparation and success;
- District and college governance structures, as related to faculty roles;
- Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes, including self-study and annual reports;
- Policies for faculty professional development activities;
- Processes for program review;
- Processes for institutional planning and budget development; and
- Other academic and professional matters as are mutually agreed upon between the governing board and the academic senate.

The plus one within the law is the last bullet point here that says other academic professional matters are mutually agreed upon between the Governing Board and the Academic Senate. In our district, that was negotiated decades ago to include facility master planning and facility policy development.

Collegial consultation with classified professionals in our district provides the classified senates the opportunity to actively and effectively participate in the formulation and development of policies and procedures related to the following matters:

- Standards, policies, and procedures regarding student support and success, as related to classified professional roles;
- College and district governance structures, as related to classified professional roles;
- Standards, policies, and procedures regarding implementation and integration of technology systems, as related to classified professional roles;
- Professional development policies and activities;
- Processes for program review, as related to classified professional roles;
- Processes for institutional planning and budget development;
- Classified professional roles and involvement in accreditation processes;
- Classified professional roles and involvement in program planning, development, and staffing;
- Classified professional roles and involvement in facilities planning and development;
- Any other district or college policy, procedure, or related matters that have or will have a significant effect on classified professionals.

Student Senates are also provided the opportunity to actively and effectively participate in the formulation and development of policies and procedures related to the following matters:

- Grading policies;
- Codes of student conduct;
- Academic disciplinary policies;
- Curriculum development;
- Courses or programs which should be initiated or discontinued;
- Processes for institutional planning and budget development;
- Standards and policies regarding student preparation and success;
- Student services planning and development;
- Student fees within the authority of the district to adopt; and
- Any other district and college policy, procedure, or related matter that the district governing board determines will have a significant effect on students.

4.3. IPBM Survey Results

RGerhard presented the IPBM survey results. This survey is sent out every year and is designed to solicit feedback from members of the IPBM committees, which include

Chancellor's Council, PBC, Facilities Committee, and the Technology Coordinating Committee. The survey asks questions such as: How are we doing overall? Is our committee structure working well? Are the committees doing what they are intended to do? Is there active engagement? Are there things that could be done better?

There are two reasons why this is done. The first is that we want to continue to improve, so it is important to know what can be done better. The second is that this is a critical document for our accreditation reports, so the Commission can see that we are having these types of conversations about participatory governance.

Overall, the feedback indicates that the committees are working well. One item that continues to come up is a new committee member orientation. If new members join during the academic year, committee chairs provide a one-on-one orientation.

The other item that came up was that the Board Policy states that committees, including Chancellor's Council, are supposed to submit an annual summary or report to Council. This is something that is included in the policy but has never been done. The question is whether this would be a worthwhile endeavor or if the policy should be revised to remove that requirement.

Rajinder Samra mentioned that Institutional Research has found that changing the response option from "neutral" to "neither agree nor disagree" affected the survey results and suggested changing it.

Mona Abdoun mentioned that she believes it would be helpful to have an end-of-year summary of what each committee has been doing, including recommendations they have made, goals, policies, etc. However, this may create additional work for each committee. RGerhard stated that they will revisit this when reviewing the policy and procedure, as the work would likely fall upon the tri-chairs.

The survey is normally sent out to respondents in May, so it was suggested that it be added to the April agenda to review the questions before it goes out. Kelly Costello mentioned that it might be best to bring it back in March for review and approve it at the April meeting.

5. Information and Discussion Item

5.1. First Reading of Board Policies

RGerhard stated that first readings of board policies and procedures will typically come to Council with track changes so that any changes can be seen. Council is then asked to take these back to their constituents for review and bring feedback to Council for a second reading.

The district pays an annual subscription to the Community College League, and many of these changes come from their recommendations.

5.1.1. BP 2365 Recording

5.1.2. BP 2710 Conflict of Interest

5.2. First Reading of Administrative Procedures

5.2.1. AP 2325 teleconferenced meetings

5.2.2. AP 2710 Conflict of Interest

5.2.3. AP 6600 Capital Construction

5.3.Working Draft BP 3775 Responsible Use of Artificial Intelligence

RGerhard introduced draft BP 3775, Responsible Use of Artificial Intelligence. He provided some background on the work the district has been doing over the past year to help employees better understand what AI is, what it is not, and how it may impact us in the classroom and operationally. The district has been offering three-hour, hands-on professional development training sessions to give employees the opportunity to work directly with AI and better understand its tools, functions, and potential benefits. To date, more than 300 full-time and part-time employees have participated in the training.

RGerhard explained that the goal was to establish a common foundational knowledge of AI before beginning conversations about District policy and governance. He also mentioned that employers in the community are increasingly asking how colleges are preparing students to use AI in the workplace. Employers are now asking students about their knowledge, training, and experience with AI during interviews, and there is concern that graduates are not developing the skills employers expect.

RGerhard mentioned that the draft policy was developed by reviewing policies from other colleges and universities and incorporating elements that he felt would fit the district's structure, size, and culture. He emphasized that this is not a first reading, but rather the beginning of a conversation to gather feedback and develop a policy that will serve the needs of the colleges and district.

He also clarified that a Board Policy is intended to provide high-level governance and philosophical direction from the Board of Trustees. It is not intended to address how things will be implemented or which AI platforms will be used. Those details will be addressed in the Administrative Procedure (AP). He asked that suggestions related to implementation be set aside for consideration when the AP is developed.

Heike Gecox stated that this policy is much needed. MAbdoun agreed that this is a good start and definitely needed.

RGerhard shared concerns about students entering higher-level math courses without the foundational skills needed to be successful. He mentioned discussions occurring at the

CSU level regarding students' math preparation and the potential implications for transfer coursework.

Ashley McHale mentioned that there is always a concern for the impact on the environment.

RGerhard acknowledged the concern and mentioned that a Trustee had raised a similar question. There was also discussion about the potential impact of AI on the workforce, including job displacement.

A question was raised about whether the work being done through IEPI this academic year would help inform the policy. RGerhard confirmed that policy and procedure development are part of that work and will also help inform the district's train-the-trainer model.

There was additional discussion about academic freedom and ensuring that faculty are not required to use AI as part of their work. RGerhard explained that these types of issues may be more appropriate for the AP. He mentioned that the district plans to establish an advisory or steering committee with representation from various constituency groups to help develop the AP and address matters related to academic freedom, collective bargaining, technology, data security, and the use of AI platforms. He emphasized the importance of ensuring that confidential student and district information is not entered into AI platforms that have not been reviewed for security.

RGerhard asked Council members to share the draft BP with their constituencies and bring back feedback for further discussion at the October Chancellor's Council meeting. He also offered to attend constituency meetings if additional discussion would be helpful. He reiterated that the draft is being presented for discussion purposes only and is not a formal first reading.

6. District and College Resolutions / Report Outs

6.1. Report out from the Senates and Unions

Ashley McHale, LPC Academic Senate President: Reported that LPC has identified five Academic Senate goals for the year, including supporting the ethical and appropriate use of AI in the classroom, ensuring accreditation standards, researching the feasibility of first-year experience cohorts, encouraging collaboration between counseling and academic pathways, and supporting DEIAB practices. Task forces will be formed to work on these goals.

She also mentioned three possible resolutions, two of which are related to AB 1705. The first addresses revisiting default placement rules for math, and the second focuses on clarifying math expectations for transfer students. The third resolution, which is still being developed, focuses on fiscal support for proctoring centers at college campuses.

This follows ASCCC Resolution 105.01, which supports systemwide academic integrity and infrastructure for distance education in the age of agentic AI. She explained that colleges need funding not only for proctoring center facilities but also for staffing. LPC currently has space available for proctoring but does not have the classified staff needed to fully support it. There was also discussion about the possibility of establishing proctoring centers across the state so students taking online courses could complete in-person exams at their nearest community college.

Mona Abdoun, Chabot Faculty Senate President: Reported that Chabot's first Faculty Senate meeting will take place on Thursday. Over the summer, she and the Faculty Senate Vice President have been working on matters related to SSB 9, including discussions with VP Tracey Coleman, Bruce Griffin, Robin Tornay, and others about how to better support instructors.

This semester, they have put together additional resources for instructors, including direct links to information, a video, and five office hours to provide guidance and answer questions related to SSB 9. She also developed draft guidelines for instructors and students regarding academic integrity and the responsible use of AI. These guidelines align with the draft AI Board Policy being discussed at Council and will be reviewed by the Faculty Senate. She mentioned reviewing best practices from CSUs, Stanford, and UC Berkeley, and noted that many departments have their own policies and websites outlining best practices. She suggested that developing similar resources at the colleges would be helpful.

Heike Gecox, Faculty Association President: Reported that the Faculty Association has been busy developing training materials for faculty evaluations under the new contract. The focus has been on ensuring that faculty and administrators understand the changes and have the resources needed to complete evaluations. She encouraged those who have not completed the training to do so and asked that deans continue to remind faculty about the available training. She mentioned that the training is available through Canvas and that they are continuing to work through the transition to the new evaluation process.

RGerhard provided one last update on the district's AI professional development grant through IEPI. He mentioned that the district received approximately $250,000 in grant funding, which has primarily supported the AI training sessions attended by more than 300 employees.

As part of the grant commitment, the district is also developing an AI plan that includes the Board Policy, Administrative Procedure, and a train-the-trainer program. He explained that the IEPI team has already visited the district twice to review its work and provide feedback. A third and final visit is scheduled for December 9, when the team will review the district's progress and provide additional peer feedback and recommendations. He mentioned that Council members who have been involved in the

process may be asked to participate, and additional information will be shared as the date approaches.

7. Future Agenda Items

- Draft BP 3775 Responsible Use of Artificial Intelligence

8. Adjourn the September 8, 2026 Meeting

The meeting was adjourned at 4:18 p.m.

The next meeting is on October 13, 2026.