

**Academic Senate Meeting | April 14, 2026 | 11:30 am - 12:30 pm**

Faculty House | [Zoom Link](https://cccd-edu.zoom.us/j/88213592749) ( https://cccd-edu.zoom.us/j/88213592749 )

## Academic Senate Member Attendance

<b>Attendees</b>	<b>Attended</b>
Jason Ball, Part-Time Faculty	No
Carol Barnes, Counseling	Yes
Lauren Becker, Consumer & Health Sciences	Yes
Allissa Blystone, Math & Sciences	Yes
Tyler Boogar, at-Large, Parliamentarian	Yes
Eric Budwig, Technology	No
Jenny Chaiyakal, at-Large	Yes
Jodie Della Marna, Library	Yes
Rendell Drew, at-Large, President	Yes
Cyndee Ely, Part-Time Faculty	Yes
Carly Gonzalez, at-Large	Yes
Joel "Bubba" Gonzalez, Athletics & Kinesiology	Yes
Lee Gordon, Business & Computing, Vice President	Yes
Ana Huynh, ASOCC Representative	Yes
Marilyn Kennedy, Lit & Lang, PDI Chair, Secretary	Yes
Mike Lannom, Curriculum Chair	Yes
Mickey Laux, at-Large	Yes
Kate McCarroll, at-Large	Yes
Irene Naesse, at-Large	Yes
Leland Paxton, Part-Time Faculty	Yes
Katherine Sheehan, Visual & Performing Arts	Yes
Jordan Stanton, Social & Behavioral Sciences	Yes
Vacant, at-Large	No
Vacant, at-Large	No

**Please see the Voting Tally Chart after these minutes for individual members' votes.**

**Guests (Optional & Voluntary Sign-In):** Laurie Campbell, Julie Clevenger, Heather Dy, John Fawcett, Erin Gratz, Jeanette Grimm, Kelly Holt, Nicole Ichiki, Kayla LaBounty, Michael Mandelkern, Arabian Morgan, Sara Qubbaj, Juan Silva, John Taylor, Cora Volkoff, Michelle Wang, Rozanne White-Capoccia.

## 1. Preliminary Matters

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

B. **Public Comments:** None.

C. **Approval of the Minutes:**

**Secretary Kennedy** stated that the minutes will be brought next week, due to the initial draft being delayed.

D. **For the Good of the Order:**

**Senator Becker** reported on the development of the Bachelor of Science in Respiratory Care at OCC. The program is on the Chancellor's expedited approval list due to workforce demand, lack of duplication in CSU/UC systems, and no current offering in Orange County. Partnerships include Hoag, Kaiser, and CHOC. Professor Alison Riggio is the lead, and there will be further updates in the future.

**Senator Paxton** reported on the Thursday AI Town Hall with students. CCCD Board of Trustee President Liz Parker was in attendance. It went well, and everybody was passionate about AI, but the takeaway is that most of the students really were reluctant about AI, that they wanted more about real education rather than artificial, and they wanted more transparency from faculty, that if they used AI, that they wanted faculty to review it.

## 2. Consent Agenda

No Consent Items.

## 3. Officer, Senator, & Committee Reports

A. **President and Vice President's Reports:**

**President Drew** reminded senators to review the Senate website for MOUs and open positions. He previewed discussion items for the meeting and stated that he would offer more information in the AB 2053 area when we move to its discussion.

**Vice-President Gordon:** No report.

B. **SGOCC Report:**

**SGOCC Representative Huynh** stated that she and her fellow student senators were all not in support of it [single district transcript] based on the format, and they felt it wasn't fair they were not consulted beforehand on the formatting. Yesterday, their student representative on District Student Council went and spoke to Dr. Serban along with Dr. Suarez, and asked if anything could be done, whether it is integrating non-credit courses into their respective colleges, or just moving that to after the OCC section. Dr. Serban said that there were four levels for a class to be listed in the district format, which is in this order: Coastline College, Golden West, Non-Credit, then OCC. These classifications were made many years ago; changing them would require an overhaul of the entire system, so it would not be possible now. It's possible in the future. It's not completely ruled out yet, depending on the change in technology. She also stated that universities receive many types of different transcripts, so they won't really care about non-credit courses. **AGOCC Huynh** said that in her personal research, she did not think that is the case, because if there is a no-pass in a non-credit course, that would look very bad on a transcript, especially if it goes before the core classes. **Senator Laux:** Is this something the Senate can say we don't want; we don't approve of the

District transcripts based on that feedback? **President Drew:** We can always bring that up. He was in the meeting when Dr. Serban talked about the district transcript, and the issue last week where we talked about the non-credit placement, and she showed some samples. CFE President Schneiderman was there. We requested that she provide us with more information so we could provide more input on it. **Vice-President Gordon:** Is there a way of correcting the record? It seems that District leadership says these are the facts, there's nothing else that can be done, this is what we're going to do with the premise is that it doesn't make any difference on the transcript. I have certain expertise, we have a counselor that has expertise, we have all kinds of people that could be consulted on this, in addition to district officials. We need to revisit the process of decision-making at the district level in the context of our purview and shared governance. **Senator Laux:** If the students say this doesn't work then our answer is it shouldn't be done. If this is not what the students want, why is the district overturning everything, saying they can't change anything? **SGOCC Representative Huynh:** This is the second time this has happened. The first time was the course program of study, and we don't know about what is happening until after the system was implemented, and so this is the second time around when we were introduced to the idea, in terms of the formatting, we weren't notified about that at all. There's definitely a disconnect. **Senator Becker:** We are often told that we are pinned in by a computer system, and I don't think we should be teaching or navigating by lack of a system. If a system doesn't work for us, we should implement something else. If this is only going to work alphabetically, then call *non-credit* something like *zero credit*, and it goes at the end. There are ways around a system.

**Point of Order: Senator Kennedy called a point of order as discussion during a report is not allowed this is a report item, and not on the agenda for discussion.**

**Senator Naesse:** One of the board policies for local decision-making states that issues that are going to predominantly affect students need to be brought to the student government. And so, if that's not happening, that's a violation of the board's own policies.

**Point of Order: Secretary Kennedy called a point of order as this is a report item, and not on the agenda for discussion as [per Brown Act]. President Drew acknowledged this.**

### **C. Curriculum Committee:**

**Curriculum Chair Mike Lannom** reported that the second to last voting meeting will occur this Wednesday, and a special meeting is planned for May 16 to finalize remaining spring items. Curriculum work is largely complete for this semester.

### **D. CFE Union/Bargaining Unit Report:**

CFE President Rob Schneiderman stated that he is going to email the State Chancellor's Office reimbursement reports from the past couple years, because the state has been reimbursing districts for part-time office hours at 90%. This is something I'm going to talk to all three senates about, as this falls directly into the 10 plus 1, and if it's the Senate's voice that they're interested in for offering office hours for students, we would be very happy to negotiate something just in case the state decides to stop doing 90%, to allay the fears of management that they'll be stuck with paying millions of dollars every year. We can negotiate something flexible for them. Students need to have office hour access to part-timers.

### **E. Professional Development Institute (PDI):**

**PDI Chair Marilyn Kennedy** announced that May 1st is the cutoff date for any PDI applications for the summer and early part of the fall. She will be sending out a notice before then, probably about ten days before, but just a little reminder, if you want to apply for a salary advancement credit or for funding through the summer and early part of the fall, that will be the timeline for you to get this submission in.

## 4. Unfinished Business

### A. AI Professional Development Strategic Plan:

**Senator Paxton** reported on the AI Task Force for Professional Development [not related to PDI], chaired by **OCC HR Director Rebecca Morgan**, and composed of faculty, staff, and managers. We are putting together a strategic plan for professional development and received a memorandum from the California Community Colleges which was used to dovetail what we were doing with what the state is requesting regarding AI literacy.

AI literacy is not mandating AI use but will help the staff to be aware of AI, how to use it, its biases and limitations, but not mandate the means. This is not geared towards students, but employees. It will start, hopefully, this summer, and continue in the fall. It'll be a combination of on-demand, online webinars and workshops, Flex Day offerings, in-person meetings, to meet the employees' needs. It is focused on understanding critically what AI is, how to use it, its limitations, privacy issues, cognitive offloading, and intellectual property issues.

**Senator Laux:** Can you define the contrast between generative AI and agentic AI? **Senator Paxton:** Generative AI generates images, texts, charts, coding through a prompt. They have a large language model, LM that has trillions of points of information. Through your prompt things are weighted through an algorithm, and they give it back to you. Through the different tools, you would get very different responses. If you're using Anthropic Claude would be much different than using OpenAI and even within Claude using Opus compared to Sonnet or Haiku it will give you different results. Agentic AI is the newest thing and offers some of the more profound challenges for education. It's an autonomous AI system, so you give it parameters that you would like it to operate in. For instance, I have one for scheduling. I have an AI agent that connects to my calendar and then lets me know that I have a meeting. Why it's a challenge for colleges is that for an asynchronous online class, I can develop an agent and take that entire class using that agent. It would post on discussion forums, respond to other discussion forums, answer questions on tests and everything without me engaging in one and there's no detection software right now that would detect it. **Senator Kennedy read a faculty statement that reflected the concerns of the English Department about the plans:** "It is problematic that the policy takes as an uninterrogated premise that AI tools are 'necessary' for faculty, when anyone in our discipline would say that they are not, and that they have in fact ruined our professional lives and are in the process of compromising—perhaps beyond repair—our students' education and learning. This is not a neutral policy but clearly an ideologically-driven embrace of AI that threatens to replace any form of human learning, challenge, interaction, etc. Difficulty, friction, and time are all essential parts of teaching and learning, and touting the way that AI can simply remove all of those experiences for the sake of efficiency is basically bankrupting the entire college project and rendering it entirely unrecognizable as education, and I find it baffling and infuriating how willingly administration is willing to go along with that ruination while calling it 'progress.' I'd also like to know how much money and time is being directed toward new AI programs, training, etc., when we're so frequently told that our most basic need in order to provide quality education to our students--full-time faculty in the classroom--is impossible due to budgetary constraints." **Senator Chaiyakal:** I think the dialogue is important because we're trying to figure this out. I get concerned when I hear statements that are very pro-AI and then negative AI. It is very complex. I have huge concerns with grading as I just got an assignment via Turnitin, and it shows that it was 100% AI-generated. I can also see the benefits in child development when I am teaching it to students, and it can give us ideas in ten seconds. Education is really important. We are making policy before we're educated. **Senator Boogar:** My understanding is that what you're talking about is very specifically professional development for employees. It is not about the board policy, so this is a professional development series. Is this professional development series only focused on how staff, administrators, faculty can use AI in their professional lives, and not about pedagogy or education with students in any way? I'm professionally far less concerned if it's narrowed to that specific scope. **Senator Paxton:** It is a general case, it's not specific, just to get everybody to understand basic things of AI literacy. They were looking at this task force being in place for a year and a half to two years. This is just the first

wave of that, and then it would be more specific. **Senator Boogar:** When we get to the point of how faculty use it, if it starts to cross over into pedagogy, how they could use it in their classroom, then we're getting into an Academic Senate purview. **Senator Chaiyakal:** I think the difference is you can inform me of how I could use it, and then I get to decide if I want to use it. If I don't know what the options are, I'm at a disadvantage. **Senator Ely:** The sessions are for safety and security for AI usage, AI and accessibility, making AI work for everyone, AI in the classroom, but specifically engagement, equity, and effectiveness. It's not saying how to have it run your class. How can it help you make better decisions for your class? Let's get the education and be very aware that this is not going to change policy. **Senator Laux:** It's hard to make informed decisions on policy if we're not informed on the subject. Is there some kind of incentive to get faculty to participate? **Senator Paxton:** This is more about professional development rather than policy. I know that the policy that's coming out of the district is much more about federal law and legal issues. As far as specific things of how it operates in a classroom later those will be coming from the Academic Standards Committee and the AI guidelines that we're working on. **Senator Kennedy (and PDI Chair):** AI is like anything else, time and place appropriate, not pro/con. As to incentives, let's say there are workshops on campus, you can apply to PDI. As to this plan, I'd like to see more ethics focus in the list here, so that the students aren't confused about what's going on. I'm very concerned about the message we're sending them of the appropriateness and nuances for when and where they can use it in classes. We need to train them in the nuances, that's our job. **Senator Paxton:** The Task Force is not taking a position, it is not pro or con, it is here and we need to address all of the challenges.

## 5. New Business

### A. Discussion of Endorsement of AB 2053:

**President Drew** presented AB 2053, which would authorize Coastline College to offer a bachelor's degree in cybersecurity. He reviewed prior legislation (SB 850, AB 927). It would authorize the Board of Governors of the community colleges to allow the Coast Community College District to offer a workforce-aligned baccalaureate degree, via a cybersecurity degree at Coastline Community College. It requires the proposed program to demonstrate regional workforce demands, collaborate with public universities, and avoid unnecessary duplication of existing degrees and programs. Coast Community College District, through Coastline, currently offers the students an associate's degree in cybersecurity and it would be a natural fallout from that, and it is in high demand. Transferring elsewhere can cause students to face financial or regional challenges. This proposal would further expand opportunities for our students who may benefit from a more accessible pathway to a four-year degree.

**Senator Boogar:** I have no issue if Coastline wants to offer a cybersecurity bachelor's, but we should be aware that there is a process for doing this, and they have been unsuccessful in that process, and that is the reason for this legislation. Some local Cal states have rejected it, and the district's trying to lobby for legislation that would overrule local Cal State students who are claiming that we have too similar of a program, and therefore we shouldn't offer it. Other schools who have tried to do this with nursing, and local schools have rejected because there's nursing degrees, and those have failed. The governor has vetoed them. We are trying to get legislation to act to circumvent the process we have in place, so we should be aware that that's what we're recommending. I haven't heard from the Coastline Senate or faculty who are asking us to support this. I feel like this should have been a faculty-to-faculty thing. We also only have so much political capital as a district, and our governing board has only so much political capital. They're lobbying the state assembly to take action on behalf of the Coast Community College District. Is this the thing that we would want to push out of all the issues that are out there? We asked the district board to advocate for repealing some really harmful stuff that's affecting Math and English right now, and we got no response. Is this the thing that we want to put our political capital in, though, if the body wants to endorse it, I'm fine. **Vice President Gordon:** I never thought I would say this. I would like to speak on behalf of Coastline Community College. The argument about the use of the political capital, someone asked Lyndon Johnson, Why are you pushing for civil rights? He said, What's a presidency for? I think the same about this. What is the political capital for, if not to be

used? Specifically with respect to the Cal States. I could tell you so many examples of protectionism in California. The reason I didn't grow up in California is because California refused to license out-of-state optometrists. For thirty years, my dad, who was a professor of optometry, couldn't get a license in California because it's a protectionist state. Finally, we got out here. I'm not surprised that the Cal States don't want a community college to get a degree. That's what you do institutionally. You block out the competition. I actually admire Coastline College. I admire people, like colleges, for going around this blockage, this protectionist blockage by the Cal State system, which they can do in California, and seeking a legislative solution, so I think it's a very clever solution to a protectionist impact. **Senator Laux:** I keep hearing this is for Coastline, but I see it's for the whole district? **President Drew:** It's in our district, but to be offered only at Coastline. **Senator Laux:** It would be really nice if that allowed for Golden West and OCC to also offer that as a potential degree, make it a district-wide. **Julie Clevenger:** The way the process works is that the pilot program floats up from the faculty on the specific campus, not that OCC couldn't jump in, it would just have to be generated from faculty over at OCC. **Senator Becker:** I previously attended a conference about developing bachelor's degrees at your community college, and through the formal process that is in place. I do think that the Cal States and the UCs have outweighed veto power in it. One of the other things that came up in that conference was the administrative and physical requirements of the college to be able to offer a bachelor's degree. At the time I went, maybe three years ago, OCC, Coastline, and Golden West didn't have those necessary bureaucratic office management requirements in place for the students who would be coming for four years. Have we gotten to the place where we are meeting all of the other requirements of offering a bachelor's degree, and we're just hitting the barrier of the veto power of the Cal States? **Senator Naesse:** When we are introducing new programs and new curriculum, we have to identify if the college has the necessary faculty and technology in place in order to support that. That's a yes or no checkbox. In my discipline, one of the issues for offering advanced technical education is that we simply do not have the resources to provide and support the technology needed for these more advanced upper division courses, and so I'm wondering if we have that available for cybersecurity. Is this going to then be taking resources away from other programs that are supporting the lower division educational needs of our students? My question is really about the technology available to support this program. **Julie Clevenger:** Coastline feels that they've reached all those benchmarks that you're mentioning. They have been designated a center of excellence in cybersecurity. They're one of the only community colleges that offer that, and that the federal government has offered that designation to. For the tech side, I think they feel comfortable, for the administrative side, you are right in that it has made it all the way up to the review process of the Cal States and that's where it hit the roadblock. They are saying that there are duplicative programs within the Cal State. Those things that they offered us as duplicates were one at Sacramento State, which was a business degree with an AI component not related to cybersecurity. The one that is closest is at Cal State Fullerton, and that's a computer science degree with a cybersecurity concentration, not AI, as this one has an AI concentration. We were not quite sure if this would be heard by the Higher Ed Committee because of the things that you all are mentioning. Assembly Member Fong, the chair of that committee, did decide to hear it, and the hearing is set for April 21st. They are willing to hear the arguments, that they know that there's something not quite right with the process as it exists now.

**Motion 1: Vice-President Gordon moved to extend time for five minutes; seconded; approved.**

**Senator Chaiyakal:** If OCC is putting up their Bachelor of Science in Respiratory Care and going through those channels does this impact that, or are they completely separate? **Julie Clevenger:** They're completely separate. I don't know about the political impact or the political indirect impact, as that is always a consideration. I have talked to the State Chancellor's office. I just talked to them this morning, and they are comfortable at this point with us still moving forward with the individual one. San Diego's doing one, Cerritos is doing one, that's similar. The process itself results oftentimes in all of these bills getting absorbed into one bill and that might happen, and we'll find out from the hearing, as it's being discussed, what the proposal from higher ed is. After that, it has to go to the Senate side. **Vice President Gordon:** There may be more than one program at Orange Coast down the line that's interested in a four-year degree. If that happens, because it's a district issue, we will want the support of the other two colleges, and so I think we want to make sure now that when we go for it, the other

two colleges will support us. **Senator Barnes:** Students are very interested in this field of cybersecurity, and if it's offered at Cal State, or here, or somewhere else, they're going to go for it, so all those programs are going to fill up. They're not necessarily competing against each other. **Senator Chaiyakal:** I just want to be very clear that a district is allowed to have multiple bachelor's degree programs, and even a college is allowed to have multiple bachelor's degree programs? **President Drew:** Yes. Additionally, I followed up with the, other Academic Senate Presidents, and they are both in favor of it. There is a form letter that was sent to us, if I was to sign it as president with your blessing. It's already a pre-formulated letter that says a lot of what I've already said, and this one is signed by the board president, Liz Dornan, back on March 16th, giving her support. We'll just use the same form letter. Is it okay with this body for President Drew to give the endorsement for this, for Coastline Community College? I'd like to move forward with it.

**MOTION 2: Vice President Gordon moved to endorse the proposed legislation for AB 2053; seconded; passed unanimously by roll call vote.**

## **B. Part-time Faculty Office Hours:**

**Senator Boogar:** You all heard the President of the Union, Rob Schneiderman, and his comments today, about wanting to support paid part-time faculty to hold office hours. I think this is incredibly important. It's been a point of frustration for me, especially as a department chair of a department of struggling students. I think the experience that students have in a part-time faculty class versus a full-time faculty class is that access to the instructor, and equalizing that, is incredibly important. I think we should be doing it differently if we don't get reimbursed, but the fact that we get reimbursed 90% seems to make it a no-brainer that we should be doing this. The question I have for the body, I have a statement prepared that could be a Sense of the Senate statement. We could also choose to bring it back and do a more formal resolution. I don't know if Rob is still here and has an opinion on what he's looking for, but I'm open to discussion. Do we as a Senate want to formally go on record and say we support part-time faculty being paid for office hours? I also think there's maybe a potential part two. When they go into negotiations, is this a requirement or an option? I think we should separate those two, because we might have difference of opinions between those. I will also request that maybe we make it a two-prong approach. The process to get even reimbursed for the half hour a week that we can apply for through a lottery, and maybe, or maybe not we don't get it, is completely, absolutely ridiculous that that is the process. I'm in support of a two-prong, where one is, yes, we want to go for it. And the second half is, the process needs to be fixed. **Senator Paxton:** The current policy is we are paid a half hour per week, which works out, if you're lucky, if your division coordinator remembers to send out the email on time, is \$22 a week. It is usually a first-come, first served. We have to submit the syllabus with our posted office hours and post our office hours online and fill out a form saying that we are hereby requesting part-time office hours. It is optional. I tried to make people aware that they can do this, and they can get paid for it. We are paid at the end of the semester. **Senator Boogar:** Two more things I wanted to say in support of this. One is that, in departments like Math and English, and I'm sure many others, know how critical office hours are, and we have faculty, part-time faculty, who know how critical it is. We have a lot of unpaid work going on as a result of it. They're doing this because they care about their students, whether they get paid or not. I onboard part-time faculty all the time, and they're going to hold office hours, and they know they are not going to be compensated or only compensated for this amount. Despite everything I tell them, they do it anyway because it's what is the best, so we have a lot of volunteer work going on right now. The second thing is for the last year or so Math has some very specific money that's earmarked for Math because of all the legislative changes, and we've used those to sort of pilot part-time office hours, so we've been paying an extra hour and a half school weeks, so they can do two hours per week, and roughly half of our very large pool of part-time faculty take advantage of it. It is clearly something that is wanted and will be used. **Senator Laux:** If we're able to work out something where part-time faculty get paid for their office hours, would there be outside forces trying to make office hours for part-time faculty mandatory because they're getting paid or would it still stay optional? **Senator Boogar:** We should probably bring that up separately, but it's still both union and senate because it affects academics. **Senator Naesse:** Whatever we do, we need to tie this to the new funding model that focuses on completion rates and student success, because that is not

possible without our fantastic part-time faculty having office hours. Senator Ely. Could you read your statement? **Senator Boogar:** "I move that we adopt the following Sense of the Senate statement: 'Given that access to instructors can improve student success, the fact that the district can be reimbursed at 90% for the cost of part-time faculty office hours, and a lack of office hours is one of the key distinguishing features between a students' experience in a full-time instructor's class versus a part-time instructor's class, the Orange Coast Academic Senate fully supports the efforts of the Union in negotiating for additional paid office hours for our part-time faculty.'"

**MOTION 3: Senator Ely moved to approve the Senate of the Senate Statement: "Given that access to instructors can improve student success, the fact that the district can be reimbursed at 90% for the cost of part-time faculty office hours, and a lack of office hours is one of the key distinguishing features between a students' experience in a full-time instructor's class versus a part-time instructor's class, the Orange Coast Academic Senate fully supports the efforts of the Union in negotiating for additional paid office hours for our part-time faculty." Seconded; passed unanimously by roll call vote.**

## 6. Adjournment

**President Drew** adjourned the meeting at 12:28 PM.

## 7. Minutes: Approved On April 28, 2026

**MINUTES:** First draft written by Senate Support, Nicole Ichiki. Revision of first draft and Senate-approved drafts written by Academic 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 Academic Senate bylaws.

Senate Membership & Voting Tally Chart	Motion 1  AB2053 Extend Discussion by 5 Mins	Motion 2  Endorse Legislation for AB 2053	Motion 3  Sense of Senate Statement in Support of Negotiation for PT Faculty Office Hours
Jason Ball, Part-Time Faculty (2025-2026)	Absent	Absent	Absent
Carol Barnes, Counseling (2024-2027)	Aye	Aye	Aye
Lauren Becker, Consumer & Health Sciences (2023-2026)	Aye	Aye	Aye
Allissa Blystone, Math & Sciences (2023-2026)	Aye	Aye	Aye
Eric Budwig, Technology (2023-2026)	Absent	Absent	Absent
Jenny Chaiyakal, at-Large (2025-2028)	Aye	Aye	Aye
Jodie Della Marna, Library 2023-2026	Aye	Aye	Aye
Rendell Drew, at-Large, President (2023-2026)	Aye	Aye	Aye
Cyndee Ely, Part-Time Faculty (2025-2026)	Aye	Aye	Aye
Carly Gonzalez, at-Large (2024-2027)	Aye	Aye	Aye
Joel Gonzalez, Athletics & Kinesiology (2023-2026)	Aye	Aye	Aye
Lee Gordon, Business & Computing, Vice President (2025-2028)	Aye	Aye	Aye
Marilyn Kennedy, Lit & Lang, PDI Chair, Secretary	Aye	Aye	Aye
Mike Lannom, Curriculum Chair, Non-voting (2024-2026)			
Mickey Laux, at-Large (2025-2028)	Aye	Aye	Aye
Kate McCarroll, at-Large (2024-2027)	Aye	Aye	Aye
Irene Naesse, at-Large (2023-2026)	Aye	Aye	Aye
Leland Paxton, Part-Time Faculty (2025-2026)	Aye	Aye	Aye
Katherine Sheehan, Visual & Performing Arts (2024-2027)	Aye	Aye	Aye
Jordan Stanton, Social & Behavioral Sciences (2025-2028)	Aye	Aye	Aye
Ana Huynh, ASOCC Student Representative, Non-voting (2025-2026)			
Vacant, at-Large (2024-2027)			
Vacant, at-Large (2023-2026)			