

Academic Senate Member Attendance

Please see the Voting Tally Chart after these minutes for individual members' votes and attendance roster notations.

✓ Jason Ball, <i>Part-Time Faculty</i>	✓ Lee Gordon, <i>Business & Computing, Vice President</i>
✓ Carol Barnes, <i>Counseling</i>	✓ Marilyn Kennedy, <i>Lit & Lang, PDI Chair, Secretary</i>
✓ Lauren Becker, <i>Consumer & Health Sciences</i>	✓ Mike Lannom, <i>Curriculum Chair</i>
✓ Allissa Blystone, <i>Math & Sciences</i>	✓ Mickey Laux, <i>at-Large</i>
✓ Tyler Boogar, <i>at-Large, Parliamentarian</i>	✓ Kate McCarroll, <i>at-Large</i>
✓ Eric Budwig, <i>Technology</i>	✓ Irene Naesse, <i>at-Large</i>
✓ Jenny Chaiyakal, <i>at-Large</i>	✓ Leland Paxton, <i>Part-Time Faculty</i>
✓ Jodie Della Marna, <i>Library</i>	✓ Katherine Sheehan, <i>Visual & Performing Arts</i>
✓ Rendell Drew, <i>at-Large, President</i>	✓ Jordan Stanton, <i>Social & Behavioral Sciences</i>
✓ Cyndee Ely, <i>Part-Time Faculty</i>	✓ Ana Huynh, <i>ASOCC Representative</i>
✓ Carly Gonzalez, <i>at-Large</i>	Vacant, <i>at-Large</i>
✓ Joel "Bubba" Gonzalez, <i>Athletics & Kinesiology</i>	Vacant, <i>at-Large</i>

Guests (Optional & Voluntary Sign-In): Rich Pagel, Rick Garcia, Jim Rudy, Heather Dy, Erin Gratz, John Fawcett, Sheri Sterner, Tara Giblin, Cora Volkoff, Laurie Campbell, Vesna Kuo, JohnPaul Nguyen, Melissa Rowden, Anna Butler, Sue Harlan, Curtis Williams, Kayla LaBounty, Rozanna Capoccia, Andreea Serban, Larissa Nazarenko,

1. Preliminary Matters

A. **Call to Order: President Drew** called the meeting to order at 11:30 A.M.

B. **Public Comments:** No public comments

C. Approval of the Minutes

Motion 1: Secretary Kennedy moved to approve the February 17, 2026, amended minutes with minor changes; approved.

D. For the Good of the Order

Senator Paxton announced that the AI Student Forum has been confirmed for April 9, with Board of Trustees President Liz Parker in attendance. They are still arranging a location. He noted that the forum will provide students with an opportunity to voice their concerns and questions about AI.

Senator Kennedy stated that students may not be aware that AI policies have been and are currently being developed in the District Board Policies and Administrative Procedures Committee and the students should be sure they have a student representative there. **President Drew** confirmed via Vice Chancellor Serban indicated there is a student representative on the committee.

Senator Laux thanked **Vice President of Administrative Services Rich Pagel** for taking the time to walk to the Adams parking lot intersection, where his car had previously been hit twice, to observe traffic patterns and consider possible solutions.

2. Consent Agenda

A. ~~Division Senator Election Results:~~

- ~~Library and Learning Support Services: Erin Gratz~~
- ~~Athletics and Kinesiology: Joel “Bubba” Gonzalez~~
- ~~Math and Sciences: Allissa Blystone~~

Motion 2: Parliamentarian Boogard moved to pull this item from Consent and move to New Business; seconded and approved.

3. Officer, Senator, & Committee Reports

A. President and Vice President’s Reports

1. **President Drew** reported that the **ACCJC accreditation visit** has been completed. As part of the campus leadership team, he attended the peer review team’s meet-and-greet breakfast, followed by the open forum session, a listening and information-gathering session. The forum provided the college community with an opportunity for information without managers present, and it was productive and interactive. He also attended the exit report informational session, where the peer review team delivered a brief summary of its observations and stated that OCC met all standards for accreditation. He noted that the team members were very friendly and open throughout the visit and he expressed appreciation to faculty and senators who participated in the accreditation process. **Board Inefficiencies:** He announced that a visit has been scheduled with Board of Trustees President Liz Parker, who will attend an upcoming Academic Senate meeting to address the Senate directly regarding the board efficiencies issues. He noted that the information shared during that session will be gathered and considered by the Transparency Committee. He stated that in February senators expressed concerns about the reduced frequency of board meetings, the potential for negative impacts on transparency, and the reduction of time allotted for public comment. He said Trustee Parker will explain the justification for the new meeting schedule and encouraged senators to come prepared with questions for the discussion.
2. **Vice President Gordon:** No report

B. Reports and Updates on Faculty and Student Engagement and Activities

SCOGG Student Representative Ana Huynh raised concerns about transfer students and miscommunication between departments. She explained that for the Common Application and many Ivy League schools, a transfer report is required. However, students who consulted with counselors were redirected to the Enrollment Center, but after contacting Enrollment, they were told to return to the Transfer Center. She noted that this apparent miscommunication between departments has affected multiple students, including herself, and could jeopardize transfer progress, particularly given that some institutions impose deadlines as short as one week after March 1. She was able to resolve the issue by working with her counselor and learned the documentation would need to be sent to the Transfer Center, but she emphasized that the confusion may negatively impact other students’ application processes. **President Drew:** Thanked her for bringing the matter forward and referenced her previous email on the issue and the possibility of drafting a resolution to address the concern.

C. Curriculum Committee

Curriculum Chair Mike Lannom announced that the Curriculum Committee would have a Tech Review at their next meeting. The primary focus in the upcoming meetings will be updating the Curriculum Handbook and as part of those revisions, the committee will be incorporating language required by Title V related to DEIA. The speaker stated that this language is currently being developed and will be brought forward to the Senate for review in the coming weeks.

D. District Consultation Subcommittee on Budget:

Senator Ely reported that the District Consultation Subcommittee for Budget met on Friday and provided an update on the return of the “summer shift,” which refers to the practice of moving FTES (not units) from one academic year to another—specifically when summer courses begin in June (the prior fiscal year) and end in July (the current fiscal year)—to optimize enrollment funding. This practice was paused during COVID due to

hold harmless provisions and temporary funding guarantees. As of February 19, the district confirmed that the shift was calculated correctly and is once again permissible. The district shifted 2,200 FTES back into the prior year (2024–25), allowing the college to maintain its funding level and qualify for a COLA increase, raising the adjustment from 0.3% to 2.3%.

She stated that at the request of the DCC budget constituents, District budgeting practices have become more detailed and aligned with the Student-Centered Funding Formula (SCFF). Previously, projections were largely based on traditional enrollment assumptions; the district is analyzing all four components of SCFF more closely now. Funding remains approximately 70% based on traditional enrollment, with additional allocations tied to student success metrics. The student success allocation includes the number of students earning associate degrees and credit certificates, transferring to four-year institutions, completing transfer-level math and English within their first year, completing nine or more career education units, and attaining the regional living wage. The District’s budgeting approach is becoming more detailed and indicated that additional updates will follow.

E. District Board Policies and Administrative Procedures Committee (BPAP):

Senator Kennedy made a correction regarding a previous statement she made last week in her BPAP report. She clarified that, contrary to what she stated last week, the **BP 6900 Bookstores** policy had in fact been reviewed last fall, not in 2013 [The updated policy was not posted until this last week on the CCCD website, however.] She intends to request that the policy be brought back for further consideration, as language that was removed may have created issues with students getting books recently.

F. Accreditation Coordinating Committee:

President Drew reported that the OCC Accreditation Coordinating Committee met the previous day; Dr. Sterner hosted the meeting. The committee is responsible for advancing work related to ICER and other accreditation matters. During the meeting, Dr. Sterner and Faculty Online Coordinator Cora Volkoff were asked to present a debriefing on the accreditation process to the Academic Senate. The request will be taken to the Senate E-Board to schedule the presentation, with the intent of closing the loop on the accreditation visit.

4. Unfinished Business

A. AI Policies (See Appendix at end of these meeting minutes for the drafts.):

Senator Kennedy presented the updated language and changes for the two AI policies drafts, stating that the District and college overall had taken a long time and other campuses were ahead of where we are with policies and guidelines. She explained that her revisions were based on faculty feedback and a review of existing AI policies. She added references to the **BP/AP 5500 Student Code of Conduct** to align the document with current procedures. She clarified that in our District as per BP/AP 5500 Student Code of Conduct, misuse of AI—such as plagiarism, fabricated or “fake” research either by the student or with AI-generated hallucinations—falls under the broader category of *academic misconduct*, already defined in the Student Code of Conduct. She incorporated that terminology to ensure consistency with existing policy language.

She stated she received repeated faculty objection to the original terms of “intentional” and “unintentional” violations in the draft of AP 3903 which covers all District employees as well as students. She proposed removing those specific words/distinctions for employees and students while still focusing on compliance and non-compliance, as that is the larger issue. Student non-compliance would follow the established Student Code of Conduct process as well as any legal and ethical issues. Employee non-compliance would focus on legal and ethical standards or violations of job requirements. Academic freedom would still be in force for faculty, as individual faculty retain authority over how AI is addressed in their classrooms, typically through syllabus language. In the AP 4910 proposed policy, she kept in the multiple assessment recommendation but removed a specific list of items, as those may vary with disciplines and with time.

Senator Paxton asked about the timeline for District approval, noting that the policy has been in

development for an extended period. **Senator Kennedy** noted that this has been going on for a year-and-half, and the goal is the end of April or sooner, and with the addition of the AP 4910 from LBCC as another option, that has settled the concerns of most faculty, as it allows academic freedom and instructor purview over their classroom policies. **Senator Paxton** was concerned with some dated references in the LBCC policy draft and recommended removing the term “generative” from the proposed AP 4910 policy and replacing it with updated technical language such as *agentic AI*, etc. He expressed concern whether faculty would be allowed to use agentic AI for their RSI for students. **Senator Kennedy** clarified that BP 3903 allows faculty use for those things if not in violation of privacy or ethics policies and not disallowed by supervisors. She stated she would bring his terminology concerns to the BPAP Committee and clarified that two separate policies are under consideration—one addressing general employee and student use of AI and another focused specifically on academic integrity and classrooms—and stated she would take the feedback back to BPAP for further review before returning the policy to the Senate.

5. New Business

A. Division Senator Election Results:

- Library and Learning Support Services: Erin Gratz
- Athletics and Kinesiology: Joel “Bubba” Gonzalez
- Math and Sciences: Allissa Blystone

Parliamentarian Boogar clarified that division senators are elected within their divisions and are not subject to Senate approval; placing them on the consent agenda could imply that the Senate has authority to approve or reject them, which is not the case. He emphasized that division representatives are elected by their peers and automatically serve on the Senate.

He reminded everyone that Technology and CHS still need to submit confirmation of their division senator elections. Deans were asked to ensure a formal call-out is conducted in case additional candidates wish to run and to email the results once finalized.

Senator Paxton asked whether at-large and part-time senator nominations must wait until all division elections are complete. **Parliamentarian Boogar** stated that a call-out for both at-large and part-time senators would open soon, likely the following week, in accordance with the established timeline previously shared.

B. OSHA Regulations on Indoor Temperature and Parking Lot Item:

Vice President of Administrative Services Rich Pagel provided an update regarding the too-cold conditions in the Chemistry Building following a four-day weekend. He explained that two boilers in the building went into distress/alarm mode, which disrupted the building’s control systems. Because the Chemistry Building is the newest on campus and designed under strict Title 24 regulations—governing indoor air quality and energy efficiency, it draws 100% of its air from outside sources. On that day, outside temperatures dropped to approximately 41 degrees, resulting in indoor temperatures in the 50s. A work order was submitted, and Maintenance & Operations (M&O) responded promptly to restore the system. He noted that there are no HVAC technicians on weekends, except for critical facilities such as the pool, which has an alarm system for pH imbalances.

He introduced **Rick Garcia**, who oversees HVAC operations campus-wide. They explained that Title 24 regulations are very strict and are updated every three years. Unlike older buildings—such as those built in 1954, where occupants can manually control thermostats—newer facilities operate with CO₂ sensors and automated systems. Individual control of temperature or lighting is not permitted under state code due to energy efficiency compliance requirements. Buildings constructed in different eras operate under different codes and regulations.

He also addressed prior concerns about locking systems at MBCC, noting that coordination issues between custodial staff and daytime crews, including Public Safety (referenced by Jim Rudy), have been resolved.

Senator Becker asked whether the college conducts assessments of buildings operating under different systems, as there are inconsistent temperatures on the second floor of CS&D. **VP Pagel** responded that

evaluations typically occur in response to submitted work orders, which prompt technicians to calibrate and assess systems. He reiterated that MBCC is a complex building designed to meet the requirements in place at the time of construction. **Senator Naesse** expressed her continued concern about persistent temperature and humidity issues in the LLSS building. Repeated work orders often result in technical data reports indicating systems are calibrated correctly, despite faculty and students experiencing physical discomfort. She described physiological impacts—such as elevated heart rate and blood pressure—and said faculty feel dismissed when told systems are functioning properly. She noted that some instructors have stopped submitting work orders because they feel nothing changes. She suggested that portable air conditioning units, fans, or heaters be available in order for instruction to continue effectively in rooms that are excessively hot or cold. **VP Pagel** requested that faculty continue submitting work orders, emphasizing that they are essential for tracking and accountability. He acknowledged that LLSS has presented ongoing challenges and referenced prior town halls that were held to address those concerns. Temporary solutions, including portable units, have been used in some cases and stated that while conditions have improved, they may not be perfect, but facilities staff are committed to addressing issues and are not dismissing concerns. **Senator Laux** asked about the Chemistry Building, as it draws 100% outside air continuously for ventilation, which can contribute to cold conditions. Additionally, lights remain on unnecessarily. **VP Pagel** indicated that lighting controls would be reviewed. **Senator Laux** noted that work orders do not provide real-time solutions during instruction, such as during exams in overheated rooms, and expressed frustration that state regulations prevent local control of temperature systems.

Motion 3: to extend this discussion by two minutes; approved.

Senator Carly Gonzalez asked whether there is an escalation process when repeated work orders do not resolve issues. **VP Pagel and Rick Garcia** emphasized the importance of involving deans, who can elevate concerns to administration. They noted that facilities staff can sometimes remotely access systems via laptops or phones when notified, even outside regular hours, though the system does not allow full 24/7 live monitoring. **Senator Becker** suggested the possibility of placing small temperature and humidity gauges in classrooms to provide real-time data. She suggested that such tools could help align facilities data with lived classroom experiences.

C. Adult Education and Adult Education Consortium:

Program Director for Adult Education Sarah Martinez presented an overview of the Adult Education program at OCC. She began by describing the diverse population served—students ranging in age from 18 to 70—and she explained the historical roots of adult education in California. She noted key milestones, including the formal authorization of adult schools in 1919, the expansion of ESL and workforce programs in the 1960s, the establishment of noncredit instruction in community colleges in the 1980s, funding cuts during the 2008 recession, and the launch of AB86 in 2013, which created regional consortia between K–12 districts and community colleges. Today, the California Adult Education Program (CAEP) focuses on workforce pathways, noncredit career education, and transitions to college and employment.

Program Director Martinez explained that OCC participates in a regional consortium with K–12 districts, the Orange County Department of Education, Coastline ROP, and the other district colleges to coordinate planning, budgeting, and service delivery based on regional need. Program outcomes include increasing literacy, supporting high school diploma and GED completion (primarily through K–12 adult schools), facilitating transition to community college, helping students to complete certificates or degrees, and supporting job placement and wage advancement.

She outlined allowable instructional areas under CAEP, including adult secondary education, ESL, short-term career training with stackable credentials, services for adults with disabilities, workforce reentry, and programs supporting parents in K–12 engagement. She clarified in response to a question that GED and high school diploma programs are primarily offered through K–12 adult schools, though Golden West College also offers GED preparation.

ORANGE COAST COLLEGE

AEP – Allowable Instructional Areas

<p>Adult Secondary Education</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Foundational academic skills including reading, writing, basic mathematics, and learning/study skills 	<p>Adults with Disabilities</p> <p>Workforce Entry/Re-entry</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Populations with systemic barriers to economic success who enroll in career programs
<p>English as a Second Language</p>	<p>Adults/K12 Success</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Education/training to adults, typically parents and/or community members to help school-aged children succeed in school
<p>Short-Term Career Training</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Education/training that prepares adult learners to enter workforce in one year or less 	

She stated that the Adult Education Office structure, co-reports to Instruction and District Educational Services and Technology. The team includes a director, outreach specialist, program specialist, part-time counselor, and part-time professional experts. Services focus heavily on transition support—helping adult learners navigate parking, applications, enrollment, registration, and

connection to campus resources. She emphasized that many adult learners feel intimidated by college, and the office provides personalized guidance to build confidence and belonging.

She highlighted College Discovery Day for adult school students, case management support for United Domestic Workers union members whose tuition is funded through a state partnership, noncredit ESL testing and measurable skill gains reporting, and an annual noncredit student recognition ceremony. She also described the Adult Education Dual Enrollment Program (SB 554), which allows students enrolled in high school diploma or GED programs to take up to 11 units of college credit at no cost, accelerating time to completion. Additionally, she noted grant funding through the English Learner Opportunity (ELO) Healthcare Pathways program, which supported development of a pharmacy technician program and may expand into additional healthcare pathways.

Due to time constraints, Martinez concluded her presentation and offered to return with additional information at a future meeting.

6. Adjournment

Minutes: Approved on March 10, 2026

MINUTES: First draft written by Senate Support, Misha Wang. Revision of first draft and Senate-approved drafts written by Senate Secretary, Marilyn Kennedy, who also distributes the final Senate-approved version to the Chancellor, Board of Trustees members and secretary, union presidents, GWC and Coastline Academic Senate presidents, OCC College President, and faculty as per OCC Senate bylaws.

	Motion 1: Approval of Feb. 17, 2026, minutes	Motion 2: Pull Division Senator Election Results from Consent and Move to New Business	Motion 3: Extend Discussion on OSHA Regulations
Senators & Voting Tally Chart			
Ball, Jason: Part-Time Senator (2025-2026)	Absent	Absent	Absent
Barnes, Carol: Counseling Senator (2024-2027)	✓	✓	✓
Becker, Lauren: Consumer & Health Sciences Senator (2023-2026)	✓	✓	✓
Blystone, Allissa: Math & Sciences Senator (2023-2026)	✓	✓	✓
Boogar, Tyler: Senator-at-Large; Parliamentarian (2023-2026)	✓	✓	✓
Budwig, Eric: Technology Senator (2023-2026)	✓	✓	✓
Chaiyakal, Jenny: Senator-at-Large (2025-2028)	✓	✓	✓
Della Marna, Jodi: Library & Learning Support Senator (2023-2026)	✓	✓	✓
Drew, Rendell: Senator-at-Large; President (2023-2026)	✓	✓	✓
Ely, Cyndee: Part-Time Senator (2025-2026)	✓	✓	✓
Gonzalez, Carly: Senator-at-Large (2024-2027)	✓	✓	✓
Gonzalez, Joel "Bubba": Athletics & Kinesiology Senator (2023-2026)	✓	✓	✓
Gordon, Lee: Business & Computing Senator; Vice President (2025-2028)	✓	✓	✓
Kennedy, Marilyn: Literature & Languages Senator; Secretary (2025-2028)	✓	✓	✓
Lannom, Michael: Curriculum Chair; Non-Voting E-Board (2024-2027)			
Laux, Mickey: Math & Sciences Senator-at-Large (2025-2028)	✓	✓	✓
McCarroll, Kate: Senator-at-Large (2024-2027)	✓	✓	✓
Naesse, Irene: Senator-at-Large (2023-2026)	✓	✓	✓
Paxton, Leland: Part-Time Senator (2025-2026)	✓	✓	✓
Sheehan, Katherine: Visual & Performing Arts Senator (2024-2027)	✓	✓	✓
Stanton, Jordan: Social & Behavioral Sciences Senator (2025-2028)	✓	✓	✓
Huynh, Anna: ASOCC Representative; Non-Voting (Fall 2025)			
Vacant: Senator-at-Large (2023-2026)			
Vacant: Senator-at-Large (2024-2027)			

Appendix

AP 3903 Safe, Responsible, and Ethical Use of Artificial Intelligence

References:

[California Consumer Privacy Act \(CCPA\);](#)

[Education Code Sections 76240–76246;](#)

[California Confidentiality of Medical Information Act;](#)

[California Assembly Bill 1008;](#)

[Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act;](#)

11 [HIPAA Security and Data Rules](#)

12 BP 3901 and AP 3901 Electronic Information Security

13 [AP 4910 Generative Artificial Intelligence in Academics](#)

14 [AP/BP 5500 Student Code of Conduct](#)

15 This Procedure establishes specific guidelines, processes, and responsibilities for implementing the
16 Board Policy on the safe and ethical use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools. It ensures compliance with
17 federal and state laws, protects data security, mitigates risks of bias and misinformation, and upholds
18 academic freedom and professional integrity. This Procedure applies to all District employees and
19 students.

20

21 1. Safeguarding Privacy and Data Security

22

23 1.1 Prohibited Data Types

24 Users must not enter sensitive or restricted data into AI tools. Prohibited data types include
25 but are not limited to:

- 26 • Personally Identifiable Information (PII) as defined by the California Consumer Privacy Act
27 (“CCPA”) and FERPA.
- 28 • Protected Health Information (PHI) as governed by HIPAA.
- 29 • Financial information, proprietary business information, or confidential District data.

30

31 1.2 Secure Use of AI Tools

- 32 • Public AI tools (e.g., ChatGPT, Google Bard) may only be used for non-sensitive, general-
33 purpose.
- 34 • District-approved AI tools with integrated security and compliance features may be used for
35 District or College operations.

36

37 1.3 Training and Awareness

- 38 • Faculty will have oversight and purview on faculty AI educational and training materials.
- 39 • District IT will develop and distribute guidelines on recognizing restricted data and securely
40 using AI tools.
- 41 • Students and faculty will have access to educational materials on AI compliance through the
42 District’s learning management system (LMS), College orientations, and workshops.

43

44 2. Mitigating Misinformation

45

46 2.1 Verification of AI Outputs

- 47 • Users should validate AI-generated outputs against credible sources before using them in:
 - 48 ○ Coursework, research, publications, or presentations.
 - 49 ○ Official District or College communications or documentation.

50

51 3. Addressing Bias in AI Output

52

53 3.1 Reviewing AI Content for Bias

- 54 • Users are encouraged to critically review AI-generated content for bias, stereotypes, or
55 discriminatory language before use.
56 • Employees and students will have access to training resources on identifying and mitigating AI
57 bias.

58
59 **3.2 District-wide Collaboration**

- 60 • The Colleges and District Office will collaborate to create consistent AI guidelines and share
61 best practices.

62
63 **4. Upholding Copyright and Academic Integrity**

64
65 **4.1 Copyright and Fair Use**

- 66 • Users are encouraged to review AI-generated content for copyright compliance and ensure
67 that they do not infringe upon intellectual property rights.

68
69 **4.2 Avoiding Plagiarism and Academic Misconduct in Classrooms**

- 70 • The applicable plagiarism and academic misconduct Board Policies and Administrative
71 Procedures apply to AI-generated content, and students and faculty must ensure that all
72 submissions, including AI-assisted work, are original or appropriately properly cited to the best
73 of their ability.

74 **4.3 Faculty Recommendations**

- 75 • Faculty should provide clear instructions on acceptable and unacceptable AI use in
76 coursework in their class syllabi. The Academic Senates will develop and provide to faculty of
77 the respective College guidelines related to appropriate syllabus statements.
78 • When applicable, faculty should define AI tool restrictions for assignments, exams, and
79 research projects, including whether AI-generated work is permitted and how it must be cited.

80
81 **5. Compliance and Institutional Support**

82
83 **5.1 Promoting Compliance through Education**

- 84 • The Colleges and the District Office will develop training programs, resources, and guidelines
85 for AI compliance.
86 • Employees and students will be encouraged to participate in workshops, webinars, and
87 educational sessions on the ethical and responsible use of AI tools.

88
89 **5.2 Addressing Non-Compliance**

90 ~~Unintentional~~ non-compliance will focus on education and corrective action rather than
91 punitive measures.

92 Faculty and staff who inadvertently misuse AI tools will receive guidance or coaching to
93 ensure compliance.

94 Students may be referred to ~~The Dean of Students office for appropriate recommendations as~~
95 ~~per AP/BP 5500 Student Code of Conduct academic support services to better understand~~
96 ~~the appropriate use of AI tools.~~

97 ~~Intentional or~~ persistent violations will be addressed through existing Board Policies and
98 Administrative Procedures.

99

100 5.3 Continuous Improvement

- 101 • The District will periodically update its AI guidelines to align with new technologies, evolving
102 ethical considerations, and regulatory changes.

103

104

105 **AP 4910 Generative Artificial Intelligence in Academics**

106

~~AP 3775 Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence Tools~~

107

~~AP 4035 Academic Honesty~~

108

AP 3903, Safe, Responsible, Ethical Use of Artificial Intelligence

109

BP 4030 Academic Freedom

110

BP/AP Student Code of Conduct 5500

111

Responsibilities

112

A. The Vice President of Academic Affairs is responsible for administering this procedure.

113

B. Faculty are encouraged to state expectations around the appropriate use of generative AI in
114 their class syllabus and adhere to district policies and procedures related to generative AI.

115

Faculty are encouraged to reiterate their expectations in class announcements and assignment
116 instructions. Faculty are also encouraged to reference ~~BP/AP 5500 Student Code of Conduct AP~~
117 ~~4035 Academic Honesty and AP 4910 Generative Artificial Intelligence in Academics~~ in their
118 syllabi.

119

C. In the case that generative AI is permitted in coursework, students are responsible for using
120 generative AI according to the expectations defined by the course instructor. Inappropriate use
121 of generative AI, which results in academic dishonesty, cheating, and plagiarism, is not
122 tolerated. All members of the academic community shall refer to ~~AP/BP 5500 Student Code of~~
123 ~~Conduct AP 4035 Academic Honesty~~ for procedures for further guidance.

124

Definitions

125

A. Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI): “Traditional AI systems are primarily used to analyze data
126 and make predictions. Generative AI, however, expands on these capabilities by creating new
127 data similar to its training data. This advancement enables the generation of various forms of
128 new content, including audio, code, images, text, simulations, and videos. Generative AI refers
129 to any machine learning model capable of dynamically creating output after it has been trained.
130 Importantly, the scope of generative AI extends far beyond content generation. The potential
131 applications of generative AI models are vast, ranging from music composition and video
132 generation to molecular modeling in drug discovery and medical diagnostics. As the technology
133

134 continues to evolve, its applications are poised to extend into new domains” (*Generative AI.*
135 World Intellectual Property Organization, 2024).

136 B. Appropriate use of Generative AI: In the case that the use of generative AI is allowed in the
137 expectations of the course, appropriate use of generative AI is when the use adheres to district
138 policies and procedures, adheres to faculty expectations as defined in syllabi, does not qualify
139 as ~~plagiarism~~ **academic misconduct, does not qualify as disruption of the educational process as**
140 ~~defined in AP4035 Academic Honesty~~, and does not supplant the acquisition of skills students
141 are expected to attain in the course.

142 **Course-Specific Expectations**

143 A. Instructors have the right to set their own expectations regulating the use of Generative AI tools
144 in each of their individual courses. This includes whether to allow or disallow some or all uses of
145 generative AI tools. Instructors should set expectations in their course syllabus and clearly
146 communicate these expectations to students in the course. Students who are unsure of course-
147 specific policies regarding the use of Generative AI tools should ask each instructor for
148 clarification (ASCCC Academic Integrity Policies in an AI World, 2025).

149 B. Based on the expectations detailed in the course syllabus, students should be fully informed as
150 to the specifics around the use of generative AI, including but not limited to the following:

151 a. Whether the use of generative AI is permitted or not permitted;

152 b. If permitted, the extent to which it is allowed to complete assignments.

153 c. If permitted, which specific generative AI tools or platforms are allowed to be used.

154 d. The extent to which students are required to disclose and/or cite their use of generative AI
155 outputs, models, and platforms.

156 f. The consequences of inappropriate use of generative AI tools.

157 **Equitable Use & Access**

158 A. Allowing the use of generative AI in class should be designed to ensure equitable and inclusive
159 learning environments are accessible to all students. Allowing the use of generative AI in class
160 should be an opportunity that reduces existing inequalities among students of varying
161 backgrounds, rather than a perpetuation of inequities, including access to said technologies and
162 digital literacy (Faculty Association of California Community Colleges, n.d.).
163

164 **Determining Appropriate Use**

- 165 A. Faculty are encouraged to use their disciplinary expertise, familiarity with student performance,
166 and a holistic review process when determining if generative AI was used appropriately.
- 167 B. Faculty members should use multiple methods of assessment to ascertain that the students'
168 work meets **academic integrity standards** and the course expectations.
- 169 C. ~~Examples of multiple methods of assessment might include, but are not limited to, comparing~~
170 ~~the submission to the student's previous work, engaging the student in a follow-up~~
171 ~~conversation or requesting a written explanation.~~

172 Also see

173 AP 3903, Safe, Responsible, Ethical Use of Artificial Intelligence

174 BP 4030 Academic Freedom

175 BP/AP Student Code of Conduct 5500

176 ~~BP 4910 Generative Artificial Intelligence in Academics, AP 4035 Academic Honesty, AP 4030~~
177 ~~Academic Freedom, and AP 3775 Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence Tools.~~

178 -----

179