



Chabot-Las Positas Community College District

Chancellor’s Council

Tuesday, February 10, 2026

3:00 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.

CLPCCD Conference Room 1

Attendees:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Owen Letcher (for Ron Gerhard)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Heike Gecox	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aubrie Ross
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mona Abdoun	<input type="checkbox"/> Naomi Mangini	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Chasity Whiteside
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jamal Cooks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ashley Young	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jeanne Wilson
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Thomas Dowrie	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Theresa Pedrosa (Non-voting on Zoom)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dyrell Foster	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Osibisa Roseby	

Guests: Nicole Albrecht, Laura Alacron, Robert Cattolica, Jennifer Druley, Bruce Griffin, Kirti Reddy, Shannon Stanley, Rachael Tupper-Eoff, Jessica Vile

MINUTES

Vice Chancellor Owen Letcher started the meeting at 3:02 p.m.

1. Review and Approval of the February 10, 2026 Agenda

The agenda was approved as presented. **(Young/Ross) All in Favor**

2. Review and Approval of the December 9, 2025 Meeting Minutes

The minutes from the December 9, 2025 meeting were approved with a change to the verbiage on page 6 of 6, “*Faculty are a bit alone in talking about fraudulent enrollments and its implications*” should be “*Faculty are a bit alone in talking about AI and its implications.*” **(Whiteside/Roseby) All in favor.**

3. Information and Discussion Items

3.1. AI Training

Kelly Costello gave a quick update that we are currently still at the beginning stages of rolling out AI training opportunities districtwide. Our partner, Our Media, held a faculty listening session last Friday at the district office. Next steps include having flex day presentations and finalizing the scope of work and schedule for classified professionals too. Mona Abdoun and Ashley Young attended last week’s listening session and were asked if they would like to give an update on how the session went.

AYoung mentioned that it was more of a planning meeting. There was lots of feedback and they discussed things that the faculty would like to see, such as training on how to talk to students about how they are using it, and how to create authentic assessments to evaluate. There was also a suggestion to discuss and produce AI policy during the convocation department meetings.

Aubrie Ross mentioned that during their professional development meeting, the flex day agenda was reviewed. OurMedia is holding a student panel at both colleges and then there will be a debrief session. GenAI proposed two sessions and a debrief, but it was suggested to do one session and a debrief. The training would be hands-on.

Thomas Dowrie understands that there was a faculty listening session and asked when the classified session would take place. AYoung mentioned that the group was focused on students and the student voice and how that interacts with the instructor voice. They would like to see the district publicly acknowledge that it is difficult, especially with all cheating. This is hard for us to figure out and would like some resources and infrastructure to be provided.

Aubrie Ross asked if the classified professionals are still waiting on dates. AYoung asked if the trainings would be different, for example, one for faculty and one for classified professionals.

3.2. Apprenticeship Programs

Julia Dozier gave an overview of what apprenticeship programs are in the district and how they work. A white paper was handed out that was created for senior leadership around how apprenticeship programs in the district affect enrollment.

Apprenticeship programs are earn and learn, which means that from day one, the apprentices are employed, and they also have classroom training to learn their trade. The classroom training part is what we are responsible for, which is called related and supplemental instruction (RSI). This can look like a few different ways, but the traditional trades go to training facilities outside of the campuses and are trained by instructors that are part of the programs themselves. Our job was to receive the curriculum, review it, and make sure it meets our standards. Then we would create a curriculum for the college. It goes through curriculum review, then the State Chancellor's Office and at the same time through the Department of Industrial Relations, and they have a division of apprenticeship standards that oversees all apprenticeship programs in the state.

To become a new apprenticeship program, you must have your standards, which is what you are going to be teaching, what the apprentices are going to learn, how long it is going to take, and what you are going to pay them. That must be submitted to the Division of Apprenticeship Standards, DAS.

Apprenticeship programs can last anywhere from 18 months to 5 years. They must have a minimum of 144 hours of classroom instruction, and a minimum of 2,000 hours of on-the-job training. We collect FTES for work experience, which is the on-the-job training, up to 14 units per apprentice. We also collect RSI from the state for classroom training. Whether the students are on campus, in our classrooms, or being taught offsite, they are still our students. The piece that interests this group is where there is overlap between the college and the programs.

JDozier stated that one of the reasons she is here is because one of her programs is the apprenticeship office for the district. It was reviewed and discussed about 20 years ago, is that it takes a lot of hands-on administrative work to oversee and run an apprenticeship program through a college. It was not effective, and we were not capturing for as many hours because there was not anyone to do it. Then Chancellor Joel Kinnamon gave the job to EDCE. Since then, the department's role has been to be the organizational piece of the programs. Frequently, new apprenticeship programs are referred to us by DAS. They know that we have been doing this for a long time and that we follow the rules, so they refer the latest programs to us. Once the program comes to us, we find out what exactly they want.

Employers are realizing that this is a way to recruit and retain employees. When programs come to us to create a program, we send it off to the DAS. Then when approved, we then go to the VPAS at the college, and present to them that a program is interested in being an apprenticeship program with us. The vice president assigns a dean to be the liaison for that program. The dean then works with EDCE directly; they then choose a faculty member to lead the curriculum for that program. There are different models of curriculum. Some want to create their own 100%. Some want to use a similar program to adopt. If that is the case, the faculty member works directly with the program itself, decides how many lecture hours, how many lab hours are assigned, and walks it through curriculum review. Then they help to create a certificate of achievement, as well as a pathway to a degree.

Another model is to use current courses on campus. For instance, the Alameda County Courts looked at Chabot's paralegal program, and they liked that and wanted to use those classes. The faculty member will meet with them and walk them through the courses that are available. The student apprentices will be in those classes as regular students and then also have work experience. There is also a hybrid model of using some of Chabot's courses and some of their own. Not all apprenticeship programs are restrained to our service area. We have programs up and down the state.

How we get funded is through many ways. The work experience hours are counted as FTES. The classroom hours are counted as RSI hours. It is reported to the state on a different form by Business Services, and that is an hourly rate that we get per apprentice, per hour of training.

We keep 15% of the RSI hours. 85% goes to those programs for the apprentices. EDCE is self-funded. Any revenue that goes beyond our cost goes back to the district at the end of the year.

Now that we have more small non-traditional apprenticeship programs that are going to the campus and using faculty, we have just been paying the fees and having the students enter classes that are open. Ideally, we have tens of thousands of apprentices and what we would like to do is be able to buy out a class. This is a new thing for us.

Another revenue source that we have is grants. There is something called California Apprenticeship Initiative Dollars that goes towards programs that are brand new. Those dollars pay for creating curriculum, equipment, facilities, etc. When we bring on a new program, a faculty member is assigned to us, and they get paid F-Hour. We pay for that and a portion of the benefits.

Mona Abdoun mentioned that the reason this was asked to be added to the agenda is because there have been a lot of serious concerns at Chabot regarding the role of faculty in this process. Faculty are asked to enter these course outlines of records, but they are not necessarily connected to the discipline or subject matter. Sometimes the faculty are tapped to enter those course outlines of records and is not really part of the appropriate discipline or subject. There is little faculty oversight of the development of new apprenticeship programs, so no input from faculty on what is needed professionally, or what kinds of classes we already have that could help. Sometimes faculty gets emails that we want to develop a course for an apprenticeship program and are asked to just mirror one of the courses that is already on schedule. It does not seem to be the most appropriate way of doing it. As a faculty member, there is not a way to evaluate those apprenticeship courses. Are they upholding Title V standards? Are they doing their SLOs and PLOs? Is the work experience paperwork being filed?

JDozier mentioned that as far as new programs are concerned, EDCE brings them forward to the college. It is understood that curriculum is faculty purview, and it gets brought to the college, then a dean assigns it to a faculty member. EDCE does not have any control over anything where classes are concerned. When there are apprentices attending regular on schedule classes, the faculty member who is creating the program mirrors the course so that it has an apprenticeship code because we track those separately. The students should be taught the same way as everyone else since they are our students. The thing that is different is that it does require different tracking. Regarding evaluating the courses, these are our district's, and they are created and approved by curriculum review and then again, every 5 years. The SLOs are incorporated into them.

Work experience is a little bit different for apprentices because under California Labor Law, there are some exceptions for what is required for apprentices. They do not need to have the same oversight on campus because they are having oversight in the program itself. For instance, for sprinkler fitters, there is a program coordinator at the sprinkler fitters' program that checks all the hours, works directly with the employer, and then those hours are then given to the district.

As far as lack of communication is concerned, the challenge has come up as we have evolved into these new models of hybrid or 100% scheduled classes. The trades are cleaner and easier to track. The instructor is part of the apprenticeship program and must meet the minimum qualifications. Otherwise, as far as communication is concerned, we do not know what is going on internally at the colleges as far as communication with the courses.

EDCE is overseeing the coordination and the organization making sure that the apprentices are enrolled; hours are tracked and working with the colleges to make sure that the curriculum has what they need and that it is going through the process. One challenge that the district has is once it is submitted to the state chancellors' office; occasionally things get dropped. There was a particular situation where something was submitted to the state, the faculty member who oversaw it left the district, and we did not find out until much later that nothing had happened. We do what we can to inform and serve as the liaison between the program sponsor and the campuses, especially with A&R.

MAboun asked if there could be any faculty with the county that do not meet our minimum qualifications that are teaching classes. JDozier mentioned that they have to be a credentialed faculty. We do not want people who are unqualified to be teaching the classes.

Laura Alarcon introduced herself and mentioned that she teaches classes for the apprenticeship. She has her regular class and then she has the students from the apprenticeship in her regular class. She does not have a class that is being bought out by the apprenticeship. It is confusing and it takes a lot of time. The other thing that is confusing is how we name the apprenticeship classes, if it is only for tracking purposes that we mirror some of our classes. If for example, I teach a class for PSCN2, and add a little X next to it, then we could know it was for apprenticeship. When the whole name of the class is changed, it is confusing and it does not help the students. I hope this can be worked on. This needs to be done with faculty that work within these disciplines.

JDozier clarified regarding the separate courses; we do not buy out classes unless we have a full class of apprentices. We are hoping to get there, but we are not there yet. As far as the name of the class, that would be an internal academic services or admissions and records conversation. Apprenticeship programs are closed, in that you must be admitted into the program before you take the apprenticeship class, so there should not be any confusion as far as open enrollment with regular students.

LAlarcon asked that the fact that we are offering classes to apprenticeship students, that does not mean that we need to have the name apprenticeship. Is that correct? JDozier believes that it does have to have the name of apprenticeship so that it can be tracked separately. LAlarcon asked if it could have any other word. JDozier stated that it is an internal campus decision and out of her purview.

ARoss asked if the classes are not cross listed? MAbdoun mentioned that she had her summer classes, and it turned out that one of the sections had a cap that was 10 students lower, and there was an extra roster of 10 students. Because it was an extra roster, it was extra work.

Robert Cattolica introduced himself as the curriculum chair at Chabot and mentioned there are a lot of concerns that faculty have about different apprenticeship programs and courses. There has been a change in the apprenticeship world. Historically there were

things like roofing and sprinkler fitter, and those were terminal programs where you finished the program and moved onto a career. Now there seems to be more pressure to give transferable credit for apprenticeship courses and to create apprenticeship programs that move seamlessly into bachelor's programs. That seems to be where conflict is arising. Faculty and disciplines that are historically associated with bachelor's degree or higher are protective over the quality of their programs. They see apprenticeship programs coming in and are not certain or not fully educated on the boundaries. There may need to be a slightly different process, as the older process might not be serving us the way we need it to. We need to make sure we are keeping the quality where we want it to be and that the appropriate stakeholders have a chance to look at the curriculum to chime in. For example, if we are doing a course on substance use counseling, then perhaps the counseling or psychology faculty should have had a chance to say hey, we already teach that class, or that overlaps with this other class we teach. There is thought that we need some slightly different processes.

JDozier mentioned that one of the things that we need to keep in mind is that apprenticeship programs are employer-led. They come to us and say that this is what I need my employees to do. If we have classes that are already on schedule the apprentices can attend, it means fewer steps for us to have to go through. Career Technical education is employer-led and workforce-led. Rather than us trying to fit our courses into the employer, the employer should be working with us on what they need for the job.

Shannon Stanley introduced herself and mentioned she does see the value of apprenticeships and is heartened to hear that folks are open to a new process. Coming from my experience, transfer of courses and programs, and associate degrees for transfers, we need to be mindful of our districts and state's dedication to guided pathways, stackable certificates, and degree programs. There are tremendous opportunities for apprenticeship to collaborate with us so that those students that are going through apprenticeships and want to advance in their fields and go for bachelor's degrees and beyond, they can do that in the most efficient way possible. Collaboration early on would really be a benefit to the apprenticeships and for our students.

LAlarcon mentioned that some of her classes' prefixes have been changed to APHC, and that is not something we would like to continue doing. As a person who has been working closely with the students, apprenticeships are especially important. It is important to work with the people who are offering apprenticeships, so they know what we are offering here. We already have a lot of classes that might be beneficial to these employees. It is important to know that the curriculum committee is not a vessel to just throw these classes for approval. We are professionals in our field, and it needs to be more collaborative between the people offering apprenticeships, what they want, and what we already offer. It was also asked how much money the apprenticeships bring to the district and if that information could be forwarded to the Faculty Senate. It is understood that there is a breakdown of percentages but should be discussed in the Senate.

JDozier will go back and share the information with the director of apprenticeship programs and also speak with the two colleges.

3.3. Enrollment Update / Winter Intersession Update

OLetcher gave a quick update regarding the Winter Intersession. It did exactly as the district had hoped. Las Positas had 136 FTES across 25 sections with a fill rate of around 95%. Chabot had about 110 FTES across 25 sections with fill rates in the low 90%. Districtwide, that totals about 146 FTES generated from December 20 through January 17. This shows strong productivity and our most cost-efficient enrollment in history, or at least in our recent history.

The takeaway is that student demand was there for the sections that we offer, given the fill rates. Winter intersession is a viable enrollment option for students, and it provides meaningful support in our SCFF strategy.

The district will continue to monitor the success and completion, but early indicators are that it was an encouraging winter intersession for all. Students will enroll if courses are targeted for classes they need. This validates that winter is a repeatable enrollment strategy for next year, and not just a one-time, one-off deal.

Items to continue monitoring are guardrails, student load, and student success, making sure there are caps in place for their load as well. Equity impacts are evaluating who is accessing and completing those courses.

AYoung asked if it would be possible in the future to look at not giving priority registration for that session because the ideal would be getting students outside of our college to register and not cannibalizing our students who could be taking classes in the spring. Bruce Griffin mentioned that we are not allowed to not offer priority registration. Heike Gecox stated that there are state guidelines regarding when those priority registration dates must happen.

Aubrie stated that students were able to enroll in more than one class and does not know how they were able to successfully complete that many hours. It was also asked if there is discussion about funding since it will not be funded by the district next year. HGecox mentioned that DEMC is discussing that right now.

Thomas Dowrie asked if there are any analytics on the students that have taken two courses. OLetcher stated that he does not believe that we have run that analytic yet on success and completion. HGecox stated that productivity was high, which means the failure rate was pretty low. OLetcher also mentioned that if the student were entered as a failure in the class, it would show a negative in our productivity. It subtracts from our productivity value, which means at 90ish percent in both cases, that means most of those students enrolled, completed, and achieved a successful passing grade.

Dyrell Foster stated that our success rates were high and most of the current students took advantage of it.

ARoss asked if we know when the budget will be available based on how much money we got versus how much we paid out to faculty salaries? This is important given the district paid the expenses this year, but that will change next year. Daniela Ballif stated that if you are looking into the budget for next year, it has not been started. OLetcher stated that it is being asked what the expense versus revenue for this year. Chasity Whiteside also mentioned that we should include classified staff that were scheduled to work as well.

3.4. Compressed Calendar Update

OLetcher stated that this is just a standing item, but there is no update at this time.

4. Board Policies and Administrative Procedures

4.1. First Reading of Board Policies

The following board policies are brought forward for a first reading.

4.1.1. BP 7310 Nepotism

4.2. First Reading of Administrative Procedures

The following administrative procedures are brought forward to council for a first reading.

4.2.1. AP 3415 Immigration Enforcement Activities

KCostello stated that the biggest change in this procedure is an addition to the notification requirement in accordance with state law.

4.2.2. AP 7310 Nepotism

4.2.3. AP 7500 Volunteers

4.3. Second Reading of Board Policies

The following board policies are brought forward for a second reading.

4.3.1. BP 7342 Holidays

4.3.2. BP 7345 Catastrophic Leave Program for Unrepresented Employees

4.3.3. BP 7346 Employees Called to Military Duty

4.3.4. BP 7347 Family Medical Leave

4.3.5. BP 7350 Resignations

4.3.6. BP 7370 Political Activity – Employees

4.3.7. BP 7381 Health and Welfare Benefits

4.3.8. BP 7385 Salary Deductions

4.3.9. BP 7510 Domestic Partners

4.3.10. BP 7800 Faculty, Managers, Trustees, and Staff Emeriti

There was a motion to approve the board policies for second readings. **(Young/Dowrie)**
All in favor.

4.4. Second Reading of Administrative Procedures

4.4.1. AP 7343 Industrial Accident and Illness Leave

4.4.2. AP 7345 Catastrophic Leave Program for Unrepresented Employees

4.4.3. AP 7346 Employees Called to Military Duty

4.4.4. AP 7370 Political Activity – Employees

4.4.5. AP 7371 Personal Use of Public Resources

4.4.6. AP 7510 Domestic Partners

There was a motion to approve the administrative procedures for second readings.
(Foster/Gecox) All in favor.

5. District and College Resolutions / Report Outs

Ashley Young, Las Positas College Academic Senate President, gave an update that the senate is looking into the retirement investment fund. It was asked who controls what it is invested in. Oletcher stated that there is a Retirement Board of Authority, which is a separate entity and includes an outside advisory. Our RBOA is specific to our college, but other colleges use the same advisor, Futuris. There are quarterly meetings at the district office.

Mona Abdoun, Chabot College Faculty Senate President, mentioned holding AI faculty forums. These are an opportunity to get together, but not necessarily to vent, and discuss AI in the classroom. It is a way for folks to learn from one another. A forum will be held later this month, and an email should go out this week.

The Senate is also considering a resolution from our online learning committee regarding plug and play courses that were created by our State Chancellor's Office. Our director of online learning found that there are flaws with these types of classes. They do not meet all our standards.

6. Future Agenda Items

- AI Training

7. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 4:19 p.m.

The next meeting is scheduled for March 10, 2026 via Zoom.