

Santa Monica College AI Workgroup

Meeting Minutes

Date & Time: April 06, 2026 – 01:30 p.m. to 02:30 p.m.

Location: Information Technology & Media Center – Room M207 (2nd Floor)

Attendees: Dan Rojas, Gary Huff, Koda Kol, ~~Ernesto Barba~~, Yuriy Karpman, Carla Brown, ~~Wendy Liu~~, ~~Brian Pena~~, Calvin Madlock, ~~Lina Ladyzhenskaya~~, Sarah Kurtoic, ~~Ferris Kawa~~, Deyadra Blye

Quick recap

The SMC AI Workgroup met to discuss the development of AI policies and governance frameworks. Calvin presented a draft administrative regulation (AR 3775) for AI use at the college, which would establish guidelines for ethical, lawful, and secure AI implementation across instructional, administrative, and operational activities. The group discussed the Google AI for Education Accelerator program, which is currently under review by general counsel due to contract and privacy concerns. Members shared various use cases for AI, including Gary's use of agentic AI for website monitoring and content summarization, and Dan's development of a security analytics agent. The conversation also covered environmental concerns about AI data centers and the potential for energy costs, with Koda noting that while current AI searches consume similar energy to Google searches, costs could increase when platforms start charging for refined systems. The group agreed to continue meeting bi-weekly to develop policies and identify additional use cases for AI implementation at SMC.

Next steps

- All workgroup members: Review the draft AI administrative regulation (AR 3775) and compare with policies from other colleges (e.g., Long Beach, Mt Sac, etc.), then provide input or suggestions to CALVIN before the next meeting
- CALVIN: Schedule and confirm next workgroup meeting for April 20th to finalize the draft AI policy/regulation
- CALVIN: Follow up with general counsel and Dr. Jeffrey regarding approval and signing authority for the Google AI for Education Accelerator application
- CALVIN: Reach out to **Don Daves-Rougeaux**, Senior Advisor to the Chancellor, Workforce, Strategic Partnerships and GenAI Future of Learning (contact info to be provided by Gary) for support or information regarding the Google AI for Education Accelerator contract/rollout
- CALVIN: Bring up the idea of a shared, multi-college/university AI infrastructure (suggested by Sarah) at the next CISOA board meeting
- All workgroup members: Discover and bring forward use cases for generative/agentic AI, particularly those relevant to their departments or roles, for discussion at the next meeting
- CALVIN: Share information and ideas from UC San Diego's work with agents and governance at the next workgroup meeting
- Dan: Develop and propose a training plan/minimum understanding requirement for staff/faculty before they are granted access to AI tools at SMC

Summary

SMC AI Governance Policy Development

The SMC AI Workgroup meeting focused on developing AI governance policies and frameworks. Calvin led the discussion, reviewing previous meeting minutes and introducing new members including Sarah, Deyadra, Ferris. The group examined a draft administrative regulation (AR 3775) for AI use, which aims to establish ethical, lawful, secure, and transparent guidelines for district employees and authorized users. The regulation covers definitions of AI tools and sensitive data, with scope applying to district employees, contractors, and other users. Gary requested an addition regarding FERPA compliance, which Calvin agreed to incorporate. The meeting also noted that over 200 SMC users are already using AI tools, and the group plans to develop a comprehensive policy framework that will be reviewed by the Technology Committee and potentially incorporated into the upcoming 2025-2030 strategic plan.

AI Governance Policy Draft Review

Calvin presented a draft AI governance policy outlining standards for reviewing and approving AI tools, emphasizing the need for human oversight, data security, and compliance with regulations. He assigned homework for participants to review the draft and compare it with policies from other institutions like Long Beach and Mount Sack, with a follow-up meeting scheduled for the 20th to finalize the policy before submitting it to the Technology Planning Committee. Calvin also mentioned receiving a request from the state chancellor's office about funding needs for AI implementation, which he is preparing a response for.

Google AI Education Accelerator Review

Calvin discussed the approval process for the Google AI for Education Accelerator tool, which is currently pending review by general counsel due to contract authorization requirements. He explained that while the tool offers valuable AI training resources at no cost, legal concerns about data privacy and branding permissions need to be addressed before full implementation. Gary shared information about Don Dave Rougeau from the Chancellor's Office who could provide support for implementing the program, and Sarah raised concerns about why the program is free and potential data privacy implications.

AI Training and Data Protection

The team discussed implementing AI training models with appropriate data protection measures. Dan explained that while the tools have built-in guardrails to containerize data, additional staff training would be needed to prevent exposure of protected information, including methods like data obfuscation and monitoring tools to track AI usage. The discussion also covered concerns about access control for untrained users and broader environmental impacts of AI data centers, with Calvin sharing an example of community concerns about a data center in Mississippi regarding energy usage and greenhouse gas emissions.

California College AI Collaboration Plan

The group discussed the possibility of building a custom language learning model across California colleges, with Calvin agreeing to bring this idea to the CISAW board meeting for

consideration. Koda explained that while many AI platforms offer free access initially, they typically start charging once the data is refined and the system is optimized. The discussion highlighted challenges around server costs, power consumption, and environmental implications of running AI systems, with Koda noting that power bills for running servers can reach \$200 per month. The group explored potential collaborative efforts between colleges to share costs and control over data, with Calvin suggesting that LACCD might partner with local schools in the LA area. The conversation ended with a discussion of practical AI use cases, including agentic AI for generating status reports and website updates, and Gary mentioned the involvement of student AI club members in developing interesting projects.

AI Agent Development Strategy

The group discussed AI agent development and implementation within their organization. Gary shared his experience building an AI tool in Claude that automatically generates content for students, which he developed independently at his own expense. Dan mentioned creating an AI agent to analyze security logs and identify unmanaged events. Calvin encouraged the group to explore use cases for AI agents across different departments like compliance, security, enrollment, and marketing, suggesting they could produce bi-weekly checks to identify necessary guardrails and policies. The discussion concluded with Calvin expressing interest in creating an AI agent to generate status reports for Dr. Jeffrey, with human oversight built in before final distribution.

AI Energy Efficiency Discussion

The group discussed energy consumption of different AI systems, with Dan explaining that Gemini is the most efficient at 0.24 watt-hours per query compared to Llama's 0.9 watt-hours and GPT-4's 0.3 watt-hours. They explored the possibility of partnering with UC San Diego's Quantum Computing Compute Center rather than building an AI center internally, and Calvin mentioned he would bring back ideas about governance and university initiatives at the next meeting scheduled for the 20th.