District Services Classified Senate

Thursday, October 08, 2026
12:00-1:00 p.m. Online - Zoom

DRAFT MINUTES

Governing Council Attendance:

☒ Chasity Whiteside, President	☒ Joy Iwashimizu, Payroll & Human Resources
☒ Roseann "Ro" Renzullo, Vice President	☐ Dawn Neideffer, Accounting & Purchasing
☒ Rachel Ugale, Treasurer	☒ Peter MacDonnell, Educational Services, EDCE & TVCC
☐ Vacant, Activities Coordinator	☒ Kelly Costello, Chancellor's Office, PRMG & ITS

Members Present: Cathy Gould, Michael McClung, Helen Henneman

1. Review and Approval of Agenda

The meeting was called to order by Chasity at approximately 12:02 PM. Chasity noted that Program Review Check-In had been added to the agenda after the initial meeting announcement email. The October 8, 2026 agenda was reviewed, and members were invited to provide edits. Peter motioned to approve the agenda, and Kelly seconded. With no discussion, objections, or abstentions stated, the October 8, 2026 agenda was approved by consensus.

2. Review and Approval of Minutes

2.1 Approval of Minutes - September 10, 2026 Meeting

Draft minutes from the September 10, 2026 meeting were reviewed. Chasity summarized the major items from the meeting, including review of the July 9 minutes, the first draft of the Senate Constitution and Bylaws, Board Policy and Administrative Procedure review items, the working draft of BP 3775 Responsible Use of Artificial Intelligence, the Program Review timeline, Professional Development Day feedback and expenditures, workplace safety follow-up information, the professional development framework for funding allocation and requests, committee report-outs, SEIU, future agenda items, and adjournment.

Members were invited to provide corrections or edits. No corrections were stated. Kelly motioned to approve the September 10 minutes, and Ro seconded. With no objections or abstentions stated, the September 10, 2026 minutes were approved by consensus. Chasity stated that the minutes would be finalized and posted.

3. Discussion / Decision Items

3.1 (ai) Senate Constitution and Bylaws: Second Draft for Review

3.1.1 Proposed Addition of Facilities, Bond, M&O as a Senate Representative Area

Chasity reviewed the second draft of the Senate Constitution and Bylaws and specifically highlighted the proposed addition of Facilities, Bond, Maintenance and Operations as a Senate representative area. She noted that this is a major change because adding that representative area would increase the Governing Council from four Senators to five Senators and would provide direct representation for an area that accounts for a significant portion of Senate membership.

Chasity explained that most of the second draft remained the same as the version reviewed at the prior meeting, with the main update being simplified Terms of Office language. The revised language would allow the President, Vice President, Treasurer, Activities Coordinator, and Senators to serve more than two consecutive terms if nominated and elected through the regular election process. Discussion noted that this change keeps the one-year term structure in place while reducing the likelihood of vacancies caused by a strict two-term limit.

Chasity also reviewed updates clarifying that Senate membership includes permanent classified professionals assigned to District Services, including confidential and supervisory personnel, and does not include temporary, hourly, short-term, student, professional expert, or other non-permanent employees. She noted that the draft incorporates AP 2510 shared governance language, clarifies

amendment and ratification procedures, adds voting procedures, and creates sections for Senate committees and workgroups, professional development and Senate activities, parliamentary procedure, and periodic review of the Constitution and Bylaws.

Ro stated that she supported the simplified Terms of Office language. Ro also suggested revising references to Educational Services, Economic Development and Contract Education, and TVCC because Tri-Valley Career Center is part of Economic Development and Contract Education. Kelly suggested using language that distinguishes Educational Services and Student Success from Economic Development and Contract Education. Chasity stated that she would review the document and update the references consistently.

Ro asked about the history of Maintenance and Operations representation and why the area may not have been called out in the original document. Chasity and Kelly discussed that the Facilities area and District Services structure have changed over time and that the area may have previously been included under a different heading, even if Maintenance and Operations was not named specifically. Chasity stated that the draft would return at a future meeting with the discussed changes incorporated.

3.2 Board Policy and Administrative Procedures Review

3.2.1 Working Draft BP 3775: Responsible use of Artificial Intelligence

Chasity introduced the working draft of BP 3775 Responsible Use of Artificial Intelligence and asked Peter to speak to the item. Peter explained that the draft Board Policy is broad and intended to describe the district's overall approach to artificial intelligence rather than specific role-based use cases. He summarized key themes in the draft, including keeping humans involved in decision-making, fairness, privacy, security, transparency, and access to professional development related to artificial intelligence.

Peter shared feedback from his area that the policy is necessarily broad because it applies to multiple groups, including students, faculty, classified professionals, and the district. He raised a concern that the equity and accessibility language could read as though the district is currently providing artificial intelligence tools to students. Cathy clarified that the district does not currently provide artificial intelligence tools to students, but students could potentially have access through Google Workspace and Gemini because of ZoneMail accounts. Cathy noted that those tools have not been enabled for students pending policy and faculty discussion, and that details are more likely to appear in an Administrative Procedure.

Kelly added that current ChatGPT access for staff and faculty was connected to training and may not be the platform used going forward. She explained that broader discussions, including faculty, classified staff, and student government, will occur as the Administrative Procedure is developed. Peter stated that the Board Policy appears appropriate for its intended purpose, but that many employees are especially interested in seeing the Administrative Procedure because it will provide more direct guidance.

Rachel asked whether the policy or future procedure will address systems that already use artificial intelligence or machine learning, including fraud detection systems for applications and financial aid and automated license plate readers. She raised concern about potential bias, decision-making, and human review when AI-powered systems are used. Peter agreed that bias should be more specifically highlighted. Cathy also suggested that employees should be using district-vetted AI tools and questioned whether that point belongs in the Board Policy or Administrative Procedure.

Chasity noted that additional feedback should address AI embedded in software, software purchases, upgrades, or district technology systems. Members discussed the need to vet tools for bias, security, data privacy, and decision-making impacts before tools are implemented or relied upon. Discussion also included the difference between ChatGPT access and Microsoft Copilot or other tools embedded in existing district systems, with Cathy noting that Microsoft tools are covered under the district's existing contract.

Chasity stated that she would bring the Senate feedback to Chancellor's Council on October 13. Feedback to be shared includes the need to address AI embedded in software and technology systems, bias and human review in AI-supported decisions, the role of district-vetted tools, where technical feedback from the Chief Technology Officer, Information Technology Services, or the Technology Coordinating Committee will be gathered, and the timeline for finalizing the Board Policy and beginning the Administrative Procedure. Members were encouraged to attend Chancellor's Council by Zoom if they wanted to hear the broader feedback from constituent groups.

3.3 Program Review Check-In

Chasity asked whether members had heard about Program Review in their areas or had participated in related discussions. Ro shared that she was not clear on how Program Review discussions occur within TVCC or EDCE, who leads that work, or how classified professionals are notified or included. Kelly clarified that District Executive Staff complete the District Services Program Reviews and should also communicate with their teams. Kelly noted that first drafts are due to her by the end of October.

Peter shared that he was aware of some conversation between program directors and the EDCE director. Kelly explained that program review conversations may happen differently in each department and may be incorporated into regular department discussions rather than handled through a separate Program Review meeting. Chasity noted that her experience has varied by area and supervisor, and that one Senate goal is to make District Services planning documents and planning decisions more transparent, so classified professionals have an opportunity to provide input.

Chasity explained that draft Program Reviews are expected to be posted online after the District Executive Staff meeting at the end of October, and that areas are expected to provide brief Program Review presentations during the November District Services monthly meeting. Members were encouraged to ask their managers about the Program Review timeline and how staff will be included in the discussion. Chasity also noted that if members do not have the opportunity to provide feedback within their area, the Senate may provide feedback to the Chancellor after reviewing the posted drafts.

Kelly stated that she would send the link to the District Services Program Review webpage once the drafts are posted. Discussion also noted that recent years have brought more transparency to the District Services Program Review process, and that District Services may also present Program Review information through the Planning and Budget Committee.

3.4 Professional Development

3.4.1 Framework for Funding Allocation and Requests

Chasity provided a brief update on the professional development framework for funding allocation and requests. She reported that a Senate workgroup, including Peter, Dawn, Ro, and Chasity, has been working with Vice Chancellor Druley on a request form and business process for District Services classified professionals to request funding for professional development activities.

Chasity explained that the process is intended to support employees whose department budgets may not include professional development funding. The process would allow classified professionals to request use of the existing Classified Professional Block Grant funds and would also establish a longer-term District Services business process for requesting professional development support after those funds are expended. Requests would be reviewed and prioritized based on available funding at that time. Chasity stated that the item will return once the request form is live, and information will be announced to members.

4. Report-outs

4.1 SEIU

Rachel provided an SEIU update. She reported that the new evaluation form with the DEIAB addition is live on the district website and that related negotiations have been completed. She also reported that negotiations related to the compressed calendar and winter intersession have been completed. Rachel noted that the Wednesday before Thanksgiving remains a holiday for classified employees but is now an instructional day, which raised questions about how operations will be supported when classified employees are not working.

Rachel also shared that the District Services SEIU Vice President and site secretary positions remain vacant. She noted that the chapter is in election season and that employees interested in campaign-related opportunities may contact her for connection to the campaign coordination team.

4.2 Committee Reports: DEMC, PBC, TCC, Facilities

DEMC: update tabled for next meeting.

PBC: Rachel reported that Chancellor Gerhard presented the budget that had gone to the Board of Trustees. The meeting also included start-of-year items, including review of the committee charge, committee structure, and the IPBM survey. No major decision-making items were reported.

TCC: Cathy reported that the Technology Coordinating Committee met on September 11 for its first meeting of the academic year. The committee completed beginning-of-year housekeeping, elected tri-chairs, and reviewed the committee charge and prior-year items. Cathy reported that Tim Druley is serving as the classified tri-chair and Lisa Ulibarri is serving as the faculty tri-chair. The committee also discussed a form for academic software purchases that remains under review and received monthly updates from District IT, application services, network services, and the colleges. Cathy noted that the next meeting would be held the following day at 9:00 AM and that the meeting is open to attendees in person and on Zoom.

Facilities: Joy reported that the Facilities Committee held its first meeting of the year. The committee reviewed IPBM survey results, discussed goal setting for the year, and received updates from project managers for each campus. Joy noted that the next meeting is scheduled for October 23.

5. Future Agenda Items

Future agenda items include continued review of the Senate Constitution and Bylaws, BP 3775 Responsible Use of Artificial Intelligence and related feedback from Chancellor's Council, Program Review timeline updates, the professional development framework for funding allocation and requests, and standing committee report-outs. Chasity noted that most or all of the items discussed at this meeting may return at a future meeting.

6. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 1:02 PM.

7. Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for November 12, 2026.