

**SADDLEBACK COLLEGE – ACADEMIC SENATE  
REGULAR MEETING  
MINUTES**

**December 03, 2025**

**2:00 PM to 4:00 PM**

**Saddleback College, AGB 106**

8	<b>Senate Officers:</b>	56	Brandee Craig	Present
9	Dan Walsh, President	57	Jennifer Rohles	Present
10	Frank Gonzalez, President-Elect	58		
11	Claire Cesareo, Past President	59	<b>School of Science, Technology Engineering and</b>	
12	Michelle Gustafson, Vice President	60	<b>Math</b>	<b>(7)</b>
13	Michelle Duffy, Ed.D., Recorder	61	David Giordano	Present
14		62	Jim Repka	Present
15	<b>School of Arts, Media, Performance &amp;</b>	63	Michele Rousseau	Present
16	<b>Design</b>	64	Morgan Barrows	Present
17	Maria Mayenzet	65	Nicholas Timmons	Absent
18		66	Sam Abbas	Absent
19	<b>School of Business and Industry</b>	67	Sumaya McCleave	Absent
20	Emily Quinlan	68		
21	Taylor Brooks	69	<b>Associate Faculty</b>	<b>(4)</b>
22	Jane Medling	70	Bruce Gilman	Present
23	Michelle Weckerly	71	E.J. Baldonado-Wilkins	Absent
24		72	EvaMarie Rodriguez-Morris	Absent
25	<b>Division of Counseling Services and Special</b>	73	Wonderful Nancy Allah	Present
26	<b>Programs</b>	74		
27	Casey Eyman	75	<b>Shared Governance Group Representative</b>	
28	Efren Rangel	76	Frank Gonzalez, Faculty Assoc.	Present
29	Kolin Williams	77	Claire Cesareo, Faculty Assoc.	Present
30	Mike Long	78	Georgina Martinez, Classified Senate	Present
31	Sarah Chang	79	Erlynn Ballo, CSEA	Absent
32		80	Adriana Maher, ASG	Absent
33	<b>Division of Extended Learning</b>	81	Juliette Sturgis, ASG	Present
34	Jill Ibbotson	82		
35	Stacy Eldred, Alt	83	<b>Guests</b>	
36		84	Chris McDonald	
37	<b>School of Health &amp; Wellness</b>			
38	Nahid Meshkin			
39				
40	<b>School of Humanities and Social Sciences</b>			<b>(9)</b>
41	Christina Smith			Present
42	Jake Williams			Present
43	Jennifer Hedgecock			Present
44	Mako Tanaka			Present
45	Megan Martin			Present
46	Poly Pantelidou			Present
47	Travis Ames			Present
48				
49	<b>Division of Instructional Support and Teaching</b>			
50	<b>Innovations</b>			<b>(1)</b>
51	Carolyn Seaman			Present
52				
53				
54				
55	<b>Division of Kinesiology &amp; Athletics</b>			<b>(2)</b>

**SADDLEBACK COLLEGE – ACADEMIC SENATE**

**MINUTES**

December 3, 2025  
2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 2:01pm

**2. INTRODUCE AND WELCOME GUESTS & NEW SENATORS**

Dan Walsh, Academic Senate President, asked guests to introduce themselves. There were none.

**3. ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

Morgan Barrows moved to adopt the agenda with the flexibility to move items to accommodate guests. Taylor Brooks seconded. The Academic Senate unanimously approved the adoption of the agenda.

**4. ADOPTION OF MINUTES FROM November 19, 2025.**

Efren Rangel moved to adopt the minutes from the previous meeting. Taylor Brooks seconded. The Academic Senate approved the adoption of the minutes.

**5. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Emily Quinlan shared she will be presenting on the GPT Zero AI detection tool during Flex week on January 8<sup>th</sup> at 2pm. Emily will be presenting during Flex week. Faculty who attend will get a free premium account for a month. She shared copies of the teaching user guide to Senators. If there is faculty buy-in it may be a way to get it institutionally adopted. Dan has used software deluxe version. Nice to share widely.

Nadine Chaaban, Senator at Large from ASG, mentioned initiative regarding including mental health sessions in courses, especially STEM and Nursing classes. Dan will be bringing information back to group.

## **6. PRESIDENT'S REPORT**

Dan Walsh did not have anything to share.

## **7. CONSTITUENCY GROUP REPORTS**

### **A. Faculty Association**

Frank Gonzalez, representing the FA, reported:

- 4 MOUs are in the process of being approved: salary schedule placement for faculty who have tenure from previous institutions, prescription plan for retirees will now have to pay Medicare part D - which is about \$75-80/month, but vision care will now be included and is about same cost as compensation, practicum loading, and clinical pay for nursing contract.
- There was a long discussion on entering sick time and PNL. A day equals 7.2 hours as load. Overload is different and hourly. Reach out to FA exec or school rep if you have questions. Claire added that FA is working on getting a document from district to help explain since Banner has made the communication harder because of hours instead of days. PT has not changed.
- Claire added that we continue to have payroll issues. Some faculty received only one paycheck combined instead of two. Apparently, this was not the district's doing, but SchoolsFirst. Summer Saver may have been taken out of one paycheck instead of two for this round. Many things still need clarification. District was not aware as Banner still shows two paystubs in the system.

### **B. Student Government**

None.

### **C. Classified Senate/Association**

Georgina Martinez shared they are meeting with Chancellor next week about the President's search. There will be a Caring Campus event on the 11<sup>th</sup> and they are still hashing out details. Classified Senate wanted to thank Senate for the input on what to present for Banner survey concerns.

### **D. California School Employees Association**

There is a meeting on December 8<sup>th</sup> regarding the tentative agreement of the contract.

**8. ADOPTION OF CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS**

**A. Curriculum**

Taylor Brooks motioned to adopt the Consent Calendar items. Morgan Barrows seconded. The Academic Senate voted unanimously to adopt the Consent Calendar items.

**9. OLD BUSINESS**

**A. Approval of Faculty to Serve on Committees**

Taylor Brooks motioned to approve the Faculty to Serve on Committees. Jim Repka seconded. The Academic Senate voted unanimously to approve the Faculty to Serve on Committees.

**B. Board Policy and Administrative Regulation Advisory Council (BPARC) Update  
BP/AR 4300 Field Trips, Excursions, and Field Study Courses**

Dan Walsh shared:

Field Trips, Excursions, and Field Study Courses: lawyers confirmed that we can't use general fund money for travel for athletics and competitions. We used language from other surrounding colleges that didn't end up being completely correct, so we are stuck with this language for now. Trying to encourage colleges to use other funds.

Group to discuss other BP/ARs. Dan pulled two for the January meeting:

4230 Grade Symbols: They wanted to add symbolizing for Credit for Prior Learning that seems confusing and BP itself does not spell out what the symbols mean.

Chris McDonald explained the following for the different symbols: M=military, P=portfolio, C=industry, E=credit by exam.

Discussion and questions from the group included:

- Maybe there should be a designation of "CPL" or "CP" before the specific symbols.
- Can we make sure Articulation and Curriculum be brought into this conversation because it might impact students who are looking to transfer? VPSS should be in

meeting, hopefully they can help with the conversation, but faculty who help students with articulation/transfer questions need to be included.

- CPL is not put in GPA calculations. It depends on what transfer institutions take, some don't even take CPL.
- Counselors need to be involved because students ask us if they should include or use CPL credits/courses when transferring. It needs to be explicit on transcripts which types of CPL are not part of GPA.
- C and P letters are already used in regular grades, might be confusing on transcripts.
- What is considered passing needs to be clarified (C or better, D or better) as students mistakenly think that is a D or better is considered a passing grade.

5031 Instructional and Course Materials Fee: changes to language are to clarify that the faculty choose instructional materials and clarifies that it is the district that is ensuring students have access on the first day of classes. Differentiates who is responsible for what in terms of faculty vs. district.

Discussion and questions from the group included:

- Some of the wording chosen seems strange. Strengthen is a weird word.
- How are they going to ensure first-day access? Who is going to ensure first-day access? What about students who are not part of programs such as Promise?
- This is to try to move the district to the Burden-Free initiative for students, felt like it was the BP most appropriate?

Michelle Gustafson asked to look at 4040 Library Materials BP and asked why they were adding language regarding staff when the policy is about faculty selection of materials. Some felt they should create a different policy about following procedures, processes and operations, not add into faculty's responsibility for the selection of materials.

### **C. Curriculum Update**

A message from Michelle Duffy was read to remind faculty of the following:

- CCN Phase III templates are being completed. Once they are released, they will be built in META and faculty discipline chairs will be notified. CCN Phase III courses are scheduled to be implemented in fall 2027.
- New courses approved to move forward must be built in META by this Friday, December 5<sup>th</sup>. In addition, any programs approved to move forward must have their paperwork (narratives, program master, LMI/analysis if needed etc...) submitted by December 5<sup>th</sup>.
- The next window for new courses proposals and new program initiation forms closes January 23, 2026.
- The Curriculum Team is working through some recent Title 5 changes to the COR including adding course disciplines and incorporating DEIA. Stay tuned for more information in early Spring.

#### **D. Banner**

Dan Walsh opened the floor for comments/concerns. Dan reminded everyone to continue to report issues to deans and Chris McDonald and Sandy Pope.

Questions from the group included:

- Have things been changed regarding add codes? Can we give add codes or wait until first day of classes? Chris McDonald answered that students shouldn't have to wait any longer.
- Are they still working on progress reports through Banner? Chris McDonald answered that the early alert component is on the list to work on, but building out dashboards first.
- Student was accidentally dropped from a class, but A&R has a form instructors can fill out to get them reinstated. A&R says this is a very common problem.

#### **E. Banner Survey Results Update**

Senators have requested to put forward a motion demanding release of all responses.

-----

The Academic Senate demands the release of all the responses to the Banner Surveys conducted in November 2025.

Comments that in no way were offensive or unprofessional were excluded from the released results.

Those in charge of the implementation of Banner should not be the gatekeeper of what is appropriate to release. It is a conflict of interest.

Employees were told that all the responses would be released prior to the survey starting.

-----

The Academic Senate condemns the statement that Banner implementation is “beyond basic survival to a state of incremental improvement and slow but growing confidence in the system” in a Banner Status Report sent to employees on November 24th. It is not “beyond basic survival” in student services and the “growing confidence” is clearly not supported by the survey results. District should not gaslight employees by calling to “celebrate how far we have come”.

Discussion and questions on releasing all data from the group included:

- The data already reflected sentiments of how negative the results were, so why did they cut out open-ended answers. Chris McDonald answered that some were removed because of privacy concerns or being considered unprofessional.
- Why was the email language celebrating how far we have come when many are still in crisis mode? Chris McDonald answered that district has a dilemma in that classified professionals have broken their backs to get Banner to work, so when do we celebrate their work? He hears Senate’s point but wants to be able to recognize effort of everyone trying to fix the system.
- The email was about survey results which are exactly opposite of what the email language is describing. That is the ultimate form of gaslighting.
- Results are bad, is there a system that is more stable to go back to? Can we call this a failed experiment yet? Dan answered that there is nothing to go back to. The cost to recreate what we had would be too much.

- There is a way to acknowledge the work that has been done to make it better without whitewashing the struggle we are still going through.
- Students who were here before Banner would feel very different about how things are working after Banner than students who started with Banner implemented.
- Having all survey results should be fully disclosed to help us get changes enacted quickly by Banner team. We can make it public which would be a nightmare for Banner.
- Coast is being sold a bill of goods because Banner is telling them everything is great now. Banner is downplaying bigger issues that survey results could help warn other districts.
- How many employees do we have? Why didn't more of the employees respond to the survey? Claire answered that the percentage that responded is greater than any other survey we have deployed. Clearly, there was a need for people to say something. Chris McDonald answered that we have over 3,000 employees district-wide.
- In history of surveys, we have never seen the survey not release all the results, even with identifying results. Concern with not releasing all responses is that it seems more underhanded than necessary. Why put out the survey if not releasing the data and release data to everyone? Whether it's true or not, perception is out there that it was underhanded. Everyone across the board should have the data. They didn't even explain why certain comments were chosen or kept. Release is lacking transparency. These surveys and townhalls are a little too late.
- Many people took time out of their busy schedule by responding and adding comments. We should honor that time.
- Chris McDonald stated that the district exec team has full survey results and has shared surveys with Ellucian.
- Dan reiterated that this discussion is about whether the Senate wants all data released or not. We are trying to take a position on releasing all of the data and comments. For both surveys, students and employees.



Morgan Barrows motioned to request the data from the Student Banner Survey be divided by those whose 1<sup>st</sup> semester was Fall 2025 and those who were returning students. Taylor Brooks seconded. Michele Rousseau abstained. The Academic Senate voted to request the data from Student Banner Survey be divided by those whose 1<sup>st</sup> semester was Fall 2025 and those who were returning students.

Mike Long motioned to demand release of all responses to the Banner Surveys conducted in November 2025, both the Student Banner Survey and the Employee Banner survey, with redacting names. Casey Eyman seconded. Discussion: Frank Gonzalez shared that he wasn't initially in agreement with releasing all comments, but that Claire made a good point that all previous surveys have released all results and not a good precedent to set by choosing not to release all responses for this survey. Wonderful Nancy Allah abstained. The Academic Senate voted to demand the release of all the responses to the Banner Surveys conducted in November 2025, both the Student Banner Survey and the Employee Banner survey, with redacting names.

Discussion and questions condemning language used in email about Banner implementation included:

- The statement seems just to be an editorial and not really necessary.
- Basic survival is not just for student services, but also in all administration offices. Where will this statement go out? Dan answered it would be emailed and possibly read to the Board if Senate approves as resolution.
- Complaining about the positivity of language doesn't make us look great and we would want the positive reasons of email.
- Can we just express that they are undermining our concerns?
- Claire proposes we don't send out as a resolution, but just express concerns.

Since consensus from group did not express support for this particular resolution, Senate did not go through with vote.

#### **F. BS in Medical Laboratory Technologist**

Hencelyn Chu presented on the Baccalaureate MLT program being proposed. The Baccalaureate Governance Review Group recommends submission of program proposal to the CCCCCO for approval.

Presentation of program included the description of program, hybrid format, 4-year degree, which also includes 52 weeks of clinical experience. It will be an extension of current MLT program at Saddleback, but the difference is the Technologist is BA, Technician is AA and scope of practice is different.

Major workforce is needed and current pathways don't provide enough graduates. 80% of jobs in industry need BA. Salary range is about 50% higher than for employees with AA. There are no direct matches in non-duplicate analysis. Employer surveys and student surveys show high interest. Group is collecting employers' letters of support and on track for getting support and all required documents.

Discussion and questions from group included:

- Why are other schools not graduating enough students? Hencelyn answered their criteria for admissions are stringent and students difficult to place at clinical sites. What we have is that our students would already have preparation, already have experience, easier to train, and it takes more effort for other colleges to give them that training. Other schools' students come in without any experience and it is harder to train those students.
- Why MLT students not transferring? Hencelyn answered that other schools require high GPA and many other criteria and their programs are high expense.
- What are the general ed areas that are being proposed? Hencelyn and Frank answered they are technical writing, philosophy, and a sociology course. Would like to create courses general enough for subsequent BA programs that will be able to be used. BA programs have to have at least 9 upper division units of courses that are not MLT.
- Will these upper division be more specialized toward medical? Hencelyn answered that they want to make them more general.
- Will other departments be able to help out and be part of discussions? A BA program came through that needed a geography course without consulting geography dept.
- If we have philosophy why not foreign languages? For us to have a BA program, CSUs and UCs cannot provide them. We can only offer programs that 4-year institutions don't already offer. CSU Dominguez's program is different because

theirs is not inclusive of the units we already offer. Nursing is the only one that is still going back and forth as to whether we can offer the BA. The State has already vetoed for a 2<sup>nd</sup> time in AB 1400.

- Cal States are graduating students that allow for students to be technologists but it isn't the same degree as our proposed program. Private schools have similar programs, but we don't have to worry about private institutions.

Application needs to be submitted by 1/15/2026. Proposed Senate meeting for 12/17 or 1/14 to approve before application submitted. Dec. meeting would be a shortened meeting only for this agenda item.

Discussion on additional date to vote on program: Morgan proposed 12/17 @ 2-3pm. Senate approved. Questions or concerns can be directed to Hencelyn, Frank, or Tram.

## **10. NEW BUSINESS**

### **A. SOCCCD AI Use Guidelines**

Senate review and support of district employee AI guidelines Mike Sauter, Alan Foote, Kim d'Arcy

Alan presented guidelines document and language. Alan explained that more will come down the line, but we need basics to start with approved by the colleges and district. Group is trying to get approval from groups at IVC and district. Not meant to be a BP or AR as far as using AI in the district. Need to approve basic guidelines first.

Discussion and questions included:

- Confused by what guidelines the guidelines are referencing. Language seems circular. Alan answered that CCLC is coming down with guidelines for BP/ARs that this document will be referencing.
- Faculty only have to abide by BP/ARs and it wouldn't be good to approve something we haven't seen yet. Others appreciated the comment. Faculty feels the document is too directive.
- Maybe use something like "take into consideration" in language. Faculty have academic freedom concerns because of language in the guidelines.

- Alan brought up other proposed language. People didn't feel it was better, seems more problematic with "shall govern" language. Faculty are only required to follow board policy.
- These are only recommendations correct? So we don't need guidelines to follow, just have district recommend, is that correct? Alan answered that AI Taskforce has been asked to create guidelines for faculty to follow, not restricted by it. This is in response to getting questions from faculty about what to use or how to use as a faculty member.
- If district pays for something, maybe. But board can't tell us not to use AI yet. This is a non-starter for Senate right now. Senate should have been brought in earlier to this conversation. We should have opportunity to discuss and send back with questions and recommendations.
- Chris McDonald and Technology Leadership Team doesn't think the language added is a burden. District is trying to get AI tools in place and they need to have guidelines in place to do this. District wants to turn on Gemini, but need guidelines and legal dept. has to have guideline documents in place. Legal wants faculty and departments to have options. There is no teeth to any of the guidelines, but language must be put in place.
- There is a problem with the language of "don't use personal AI accounts." Are we going to have access to a variety of AI tools so we can choose what we want? We should be able to use any tools we deem more effective than others and not be inhibited by what the district gives us. All our work is institutional work, teaching included.
- The language regarding FERPA and HIPAA is already being complied with. Chris McDonald answered that when writing the actual BP, they will include actual language that states what can be used due to HIPPA and FERPA constraints.
- These guidelines should be vague enough to speak to everyone. Instructors creating presentations and coders. These guidelines should encompass everyone who works in the district.
- Are we supposed to conform to what the state wants? We are free to do what we want to do at this point.

- Is this about best practices vs. guidelines? Is that just semantics? Maybe use recommendation?
- When it becomes a BP, it has to be debated. The wording is a little slippery with language of “follow guidelines.” Consult and consider might be better descriptors.
- Too many people will read what the guidelines mean is what we are supposed to do.
- Consensus is that we are not comfortable with the language. Have group rewrite and bring back to Academic Senate.
- Efren asked if it should be a small group work to bring back to larger group. Group agreed that would be a good idea.

Taylor Brooks motioned to table the SOCCCD AI Use Guidelines in order to review and revise the original document Alan presented prior to action. Michele Rousseau seconded. The Academic Senate voted unanimously to table the SOCCCD AI Use Guidelines.

Volunteers to work on AI Guidelines: Claire, Bruce, Dan, and Wonderful Nancy. Claire will be point person for workgroup.

## **11. COMMITTEE REPORTS**

### **A. Executive**

None.

### **B. College/Senate Committees**

Calendar Committee: meeting with IVC to discuss discrepancies in college calendars.

Faculty Development Funding: PT faculty can ask for funding from both schools but if they are using Saddleback funds, they are asked to represent Saddleback at the event. Wonderful Nancy asked if they had to declare as IVC or Saddleback. Dan answered that you can choose as long as not using the district’s funds and representing another college.

## 12. REPRESENTATIONAL AREA/ATEP/PT FACULTY REPORTS

Part Time Faculty: Bruce reported that the PT Faculty are preparing a newsletter for the beginning of next semester. Their first order of business is to bring forward a bylaw amendment to propose that there is a PT rep for every area of the school. They would like to move elections to each division/area instead of voting college-wide for 4 PT reps. They will bring this up for the Jan. 21<sup>st</sup> meeting. Please talk to your faculty during PD week during your division meetings.

Question: Do you mean all areas like areas including kinesiology, because we are not a school? Bruce answered yes.

## 13. ADJOURNMENT –

Meet two weeks from now for special meeting: December 17<sup>th</sup> @ 2pm.

Dan Walsh adjourned the meeting at 3:56pm

## [HANDOUTS DISTRIBUTED WITH AGENDA &/OR AVAILABLE ON THE SENATE SHAREPOINT WEBSITE](#)

AS Agenda - 03Dec2025

Agenda Item 4 - Minutes Draft from November 19, 2025

### CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS

#### Curriculum:

Agenda Item 8A.1 - Spring 2026 Curriculum Calendar

Agenda Item 8A.2 - Proposed course revisions and deletions for academic year 2026-27

Agenda Item 8A.3 - Proposed program revisions for academic year 2026-27

Agenda Item 8A.4 - Proposed new credit course justification for academic year 2026-27 (Spring)

Agenda Item 8A.5 - Proposed new credit course justifications for academic year 2027-28

Agenda Item 8A.6 - Proposed new credit program justifications for academic year 2027-28

Agenda Item 9A. - Approval of Faculty to Sit on Committees

Agenda Item 9B - Board Policy and Administrative Regulation Advisory Council (BPARC) Update  
BP/AR 4300 Field Trips, Excursions, and Field Study Courses

Agenda Item 9E - Banner Survey Results Update; Discussion/Action on survey results with edited written responses. Senators have requested to put forward a motion demanding release of all responses

Agenda Item 9F - BS in Medical Laboratory Technologist – Baccalaureate Governance Review  
Group recommends submission of program proposal to the CCCCCO for approval

Agenda Item 10A - SOCCCD AI Use Guidelines

**KEYWORDS: Banner Complaint, Survey Results, Banner Feedback, MLT, AI Guidelines**