

Academic Senate Meeting | April 21, 2026 | 11:30 am - 12:30 pm

Student Union 214 | [Zoom Link](https://cccd-edu.zoom.us/j/88213592749) (https://cccd-edu.zoom.us/j/88213592749)

Academic Senate Member Attendance

Attendees	Attended
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	Yes
Jenny Chaiyakal, at-Large	No
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	No
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): Shelly Blair, Diane Brown, Anna Butler, Rozanne Capoccia-White, Don Carlson, John Fawcett, Tara Giblin, Kelly Holt, Nicole Ichiki, Vesna Kuo, Arabian Morgan, Rich Pagel, Kristen Peterik, Sara Qubbaj, Rob Schneiderman, Andreea Serban, Angelica Suarez, Cindy Voss, Michelle Wang, Maryann Watson

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:**

Motion 1: Secretary Kennedy moved to approve April 7, 2026, minutes; approved.

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

Senator Boogar stated that an email will be sent out to faculty noting openings on committees as opportunities for faculty to volunteer; he encouraged division senators to share these with their division faculty as all faculty have an obligation to serve on at least one committee.

Senator Paxton announced the *Friends of the Library* book sale today and tomorrow from 9-3. He shared that the AI Education Summit was a good day, with lots of guest speakers, about 100 attendees, and Art Professor Matt Newman as a highlight.

Senator Ely promoted “Communities of Practice” lunch event on Friday, from 11-12:30 on closing out this semester and preparing for the next one.

2. Consent Agenda

Senator Kennedy requested that the PDI item be pulled as it was not accurate as per which subcommittee and did not have any names of the volunteers on the agenda.

A. **PDI Committee:** ~~item pulled.~~

B. **Tenure Track Committee Replacement:**

Tenure Track Replacement for AI Cervantes (retiring) on Robert Lee’s Tenure Track Evaluation Committee: Hiring Committee: Ron Franz

Motion 2: Vice President Gordon moved to approve the consent agenda as amended; approved.

3. Officer, Senator, & Committee Reports

A. **President and Vice President’s Reports”**

President Drew: No report, due to time.

Vice President Gordon: No report, due to time.

B. **CFE Union/Bargaining Unit Report:**

CFE President Rob Schneiderman stated that the CFE faculty scholarships remain open, and you may contact either Maria or him to get the application. As CFE is preparing for negotiations in the fall, they will be sending out a survey to faculty to gather negotiations input. CFE OCC Executive Director Vesna Marcina Kuo stated that if any member gets a “witness notice,” they should contact the union ASAP.

C. Academic Freedom Committee:

Co-Chair of the Academic Freedom Committee Marilyn Kennedy announced that they are meeting on Friday to discuss issues related to **BP/AP 3900: Speech: Time Place Manner**, a recent Boston University case concerning faculty office expression, and the Chicago Statement.

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

Senator Kennedy noted that several AP and BP policy drafts—about residence determination, speech: time/place/manner regulations, and responsible and ethical use of generative AI—are having a last review in a week or so, and she will have them posted on the agenda for next week for a quick review.

E. Curriculum Committee:

Curriculum Chair Mike Lannom announced that their last meeting will be on May 6 to conclude their spring work, to tie up any loose ends.

4. Unfinished Business

No items.

5. New Business

A. Report from ASCCC Plenary Session & Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI):

President Drew reported on his attendance at the Senate Plenary. The plenary provides faculty an opportunity to present ideas, innovate, and address campus issues, with the opportunities to address them with statewide colleagues. This ASCCC Plenary was focused on the inclusion, diversity, equity, anti-racism, accessibility, through its publications, implicated in everything that they do. He explained the Area meetings, and that we are in the Area D, the lower southern part of California, and we meet at our individual meetings before we go to the plenary session.

This year there were sessions on equitable curriculum design, academic freedom, faculty engagement, emerging technologies, engaging faculty to build efficiency, longevity of rising scholars, listening to faculty voices on AI, professional development for faculty leaders of the Senate, state budget information, and guest speakers. There was a lot of discussion about decolonizing AI in education, to change things from the original ways that were more traditionally done and doing those in a newer fashion. There was a lot of talk about addressing attacks on academic freedom. On the last day we voted on 45-50 resolutions which will set how the ASCCC will focus and guide the CC senates and faculty.

Senator Boogar: Ased if there were any resolutions passed that might have a substantial impact on what we do here such as the one about math? **President Drew:** Yes, I have a full list of the vote counts that I can share with the E-Board.

President Drew: To continue, there was even a recent resolution on the Cesar Chavez issue. Another breakout session was on the IEPI, or Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative.

Motion 3: Vice President Gordon moved to extend the presentation for five minutes; seconded; approved.

We're working on an IEPI initiative here at OCC, based on what was developed and launched back in 2014 to help colleges and community colleges improve their operational institutional effectiveness. It includes the PRT, the Partnership Resource Teams, and they will come to your campus, if you want to be part of this, and there's a whole process for it. It starts with a letter from the president, the you write your proposal, and there are funds for up to \$250,000 for colleges to develop a plan. That money will help cover travel, hotel costs, or any expenses, including stipends. It is to help the college to establish the technical teams, rather, and move towards exceptional expertise and innovation in advancing best practices and avoiding potential pitfalls. Coastline was one of the first in our district who applied for and was awarded it, as they related it to areas of guided pathways, student learning outcomes, professional development, infrastructure, communications, including virtual reality, artificial intelligence, and competency-based education. This is a really good way to help launch any kind of new initiative, or program or activity within your college to help improve the institutional effectiveness. OCC has submitted a proposal Dr. Giblin, moving forward to develop a student centered-scheduling process, and with that process, it helps to strengthen the scheduling, support services, and students to focus on completion of their programs. We will be meeting with Dr. Giblin on Friday about the proposal. That concludes my report on the ASCCC Plenary session.

B. Revising Budget Assumptions:

Senator Cyndee Ely presented the following Budget Report:

Guidance on Revised Budget Assumptions and Treatment of Assigned Reserves Related to SCFF Revenue Deficits

Background

The District's long-term budget assumptions historically included a projected 0.5% reduction to SCFF revenue (and previously, to the funding model replaced by the SCFF) to account for potential revenue deficits. This practice has been widely adopted by community college districts statewide in recognition of the State's approach to funding community colleges.

The SCFF is funding by three revenue sources: local property taxes, student enrollment fees, and the State General Fund. The State General Fund SCFF Obligation represents the amount that remains after deducting statewide local property taxes and statewide student enrollment fees from statewide SCFF allocations.



SCFF FUNDING

Each year, the State Budget Act includes an appropriation for the estimated State General Fund SCFF Obligation. This estimate is calculated by the Department of Finance based projected statewide SCFF allocations, local property tax revenues, and student enrollment fees.

The final SCFF calculation, however, is not completed until the release of the Recalculation (Recalc) Apportionment in February following the end of the fiscal year. This seven-month delay allows sufficient time for the collection and reporting of local property taxes and student enrollment fees, as well as all the metrics required for the final calculation of total statewide SCFF allocations.

Once this information is finalized, the State General Fund Obligation is known and compared to the State Budget Act appropriation. A funding shortfall occurs if the State Budget Act appropriation is less than the actual State General Fund SCFF obligation. The SCFF revenue deficit is calculated as the statewide funding shortfall divided by the total statewide SCFF allocations and is applied proportionately to each district's Total SCFF funded amount (TCR), which in turn, reduces their State General Fund Apportionment.

Timing and Treatment of SCFF Revenue Deficits

SCFF revenue deficits are often projected well in advance of the Recalc Apportionment, sometimes as early as

the February P1 Apportionment in February when sufficient data on first-half-year property tax receipts indicates a potential statewide shortfall. In some cases, these projected deficits are later resolved due to timing issues or other revenue adjustments. In other instances, the Legislature has acted to appropriate additional funds to backfill the shortfall outside of the regular State Budget development cycle.

More commonly, the Administration commits in the January Proposal of the State Budget to backfill any SCFF shortfall through a subsequent budget appropriation. However, such commitments are subject to legislative approval and inclusion in the final State Budget Act. There is no guarantee sufficient additional funds will be appropriated, particularly during periods of economic constraint, and historically some SCFF deficits have remained unaddressed.

For these reasons, the District’s practice of budgeting a projected 0.5% SCFF revenue deficit has been considered to be prudent and reasonable, notwithstanding the relatively rare occurrence of unrecovered deficits.

Allocation of the Projected 0.5% SCFF Revenue Deficit to the Colleges

Historically, when the Recalc Apportionment confirmed that no statewide SCFF revenue deficit occurred, the District allocated the previously withheld projected SCFF revenue deficit amounts to the three colleges. Absent the practice of assuming a projected deficit, these funds would have been allocated through the Revenue Allocation Model alongside other SCFF revenues in the year received; therefore, subsequent allocation to the colleges was appropriate.

However, this practice resulted in a seven-month delay before colleges received these funds. In addition, because it was uncertain whether the funds would ultimately be available, the colleges were required to treat them as one-time revenues. This significantly their use, as the funds could not be applied to ongoing expenditures.

Beginning in 2019-20, during the COVID-19 pandemic, the District discontinued the allocation of the projected SCFF revenue deficit to colleges and instead retained the funds. Given heightened concerns about the economic environment and the District’s fiscal outlook, the retained amounts were placed in a reserve to address emerging and unanticipated fiscal needs.

The District continued to retain projected SCFF revenue deficit amounts through 2024-25. Once it was determined that sufficient reserves had been established, the District allocated the earliest retained amounts from 2019-20 and 2020-21 to the colleges to address critical needs. The remaining retained projected SCFF revenue deficits are reflected in the following table.

Fiscal Year	Retained Projected 0.5% SCFF Revenue Deficit
2021-22	\$ 2,053,581
2022-23	\$ 1,094,148
2023-24	\$ 1,208,987
2024-25	\$1,196,757
2025-26	<u>\$ 1,205,653</u>
Total Assigned Reserve for Anticipated Deficit Spending	\$ 6,759,126

Revised Budget Treatment of SCFF Revenue

The Assigned Reserve for Anticipated Deficit Spending, funded by the retained projected 0.5% SCFF revenue deficits from 2021-22 through 2025-26, totals approximately \$6.8 million. Since the inception of the SCFF model in 2018-19, the State has resolved all SCFF revenue deficits.

In light of:

- the State’s demonstrated practice of fully funding the State General Fund SCFF Obligation through subsequent budget actions,
- the availability of the \$6.8 million Assigned Reserve to backfill an unrecovered SCFF revenue deficit if necessary, and

- the colleges' need to access SCFF funds in the year they are earned and to treat them as ongoing rather than one-time resources,

the District is revising its budgeting practice.

Effective with the 2026-27 Fiscal Year Budget, the District will no longer assume or budget a projected SCFF revenue deficit. Instead, full projected SCFF revenue will be recognized and allocated to the colleges in through the Revenue Allocation Model in the year received.

Should a SCFF revenue deficit occur that is not restored or backfilled through a subsequent State Budget appropriation, a corresponding transfer will be made from the Assigned Reserve for Anticipated Deficit Spending to offset the shortfall.

In the immediately following budget year(s), the District will resume budgeting a projected 0.5% SCFF revenue deficit. Any retained amounts resulting from the resumed projection will be placed in the assigned Reserve until the reserve is restored to its prior level, or to a higher level deemed appropriate relative to total District SCFF revenues at that time.

C. Credit for Prior Learning (CPL): Guest Speakers, Dean Don Carlson, Cindy Voss

OCC CPL Coordinator Cindy Voss, and adjunct counselor, introduced herself and moved to **CPL Consultant Shelly Blair**, to present on CPL

Shelly Blair: Credit for prior learning allows students to earn college credit for knowledge and skills that are gained outside of the classroom, from work experience, military training, industry certifications, life experience, and CPL awards credit when learning aligns with specific course and program requirements. CPL saves students time toward degree completion, reduces the overall cost of their education, and their overall number of units. It also recognizes the value of real-world experience and expertise. It supports adult learners, veterans, and career changers. It helps students stay motivated and helps them persist.

At Orange Coast College you are doing a lot of credit for prior learning: AP, IB, and CLEP exams, for example. There's some military transcript evaluation, credit by exam, and then faculty-reviewed portfolios or professional experience reviews. There's some that is already happening. The key players in CPL at OCC are Dean Carlson, Faculty Coordinator Voss, and Dean Capoccia-White.

This term, we've had regular core team meetings, made a strategic plan, developed some initial pilot programs, so many of you will be hearing about that process. We also drafted the new CPL process flow. Right now, CPL is going through the Academic Petitions Committee, which is kind of a misfit in terms of the amount of time and its process. Under the leadership of Dean Capoccia-White, we're pulling that out into a different next-gen form. It's going to be a lot easier for the faculty, as well as the staff. We've drafted some templates for checklists and rubrics, and we have already reviewed the pilot form. Faculty Coordinator Voss is going to socialize the CPL rubric templates and department worksheets, so you will hear from her as she works with different departments who are interested in pursuing CPL, and the NextGen Forum we expect to have launched within the next couple of months with the pilot programs.

There was \$50,000 in state funding allocated for each college to support credit for prior learning. There are two templates that have been developed in collaboration with Faculty Coordinator Voss. The first is a template that really guides faculty to develop a clear rubric to assess a portfolio CPL request, with consistent, rigorous standards applied to all CPL requests. The departments can adapt that template in a manner that their faculty see fit.

There is a department checklist, to force a conversation in the departments about what they are comfortable with regarding CPL: What do we think will or won't work for our department? The goal here is to retain the faculty's right to have their specific say over what qualifies for credit for prior learning. We are hoping to have a CPL Senate Task Force meeting in the fall. Coordinator Voss will be socializing some of those documents, and then hopefully launching the NextGen Forum with Enrollment Services.

Dean Carlson: I know there was a resolution back in 2021 that we've talked about in the Senate here that needs to be adjusted, sometime in 2026. I think the voice for faculty, and then maybe other people who would serve on that team, whether administrative or staff, is important. I'd really encourage the Senate to consider that because we're at that point where we really would like to have that advisory, that guidance.

Coordinator Voss: This is all faculty-led, so this is a determination on the faculty whether they want to use the rubric, use the checklist. For CPL requests and submissions, it's up to the faculty to determine if they align with the SLOs in your course.

Senator Paxton: Is there a concern if we don't do this, that there's swirling students who will be going to other colleges in the district or somewhere else? **Dean Carlson:** There is probably some concern on that. If we can attract a student because we offer credit for prior learning in certain parts, that is a step forward. It could be an incentive for them to major here and to take more coursework. **Coordinator Voss:** I see a lot of adult reentry students and career changers. **Senator Paxton:** Are we working on articulation agreements? Would that go through the curriculum committee? **Coordinator Voss:** Cal State University will take some. We'll take UC's, and then again, it's up to the professor to decide whether they would like to articulate that or not. Everything goes through the department, goes through articulation. **Shelly Blair:** As far as swirling, I would actually reframe it and say that having effective CPL is a draw. It will draw students in. I know for Saddleback, that has been a huge draw for them, and they have a lot of credit for prior learning. As far as articulation and transfer, there are specific rules around what can articulate, and in those department checklists. There are also indicators for whether you would like this to be accepted for an internal OCC certificate, whether you think it should be accepted for transfer. We're trying to really embed as much faculty, decision-making into those documents.

Motion 4: Parliamentarian Boogar moved to extend the conversation by seven minutes; approved.

Senator Boogar: I have three questions specifically for Coordinator Voss. The first is that Credit for prior learning has been here for a long time. In the Math Department, we've been accepting the AP exam for credit and calculus for decades. It's something we've always done and want to make sure we have that perspective. Where do you see your authority stopping, and the individual department's authority starting? The second question is, If the ultimate authority lies with the individual department, what outcomes is your group specifically trying to attain, if ultimately it is the faculty that are determining which courses are for credit priority and how they're assessed? And then the third is, Can you clarify if you have any specific requests of the Senate today? **Shelly Blair:** The authority starts and ends with faculty. My job and our committee are providing resources, tools, and structure and will be able to help support you in determining what is something you would accept or not accept as far as your SLOs and the different materials that the student will give you. You might say to the student, I want an exam. I've had some professors give the final exam, and if they can pass that, along with the portfolio and any of the other certifications that they might need, then I will go ahead and approve this CPL. It depends on the faculty, and what they want, and what they deem necessary, to align with their SLOs, to keep that academic integrity. That's why it's faculty-led, because you know your class, you know what you're teaching, you know your SLOs. We are here as a support system. The second thing, the outcomes, we're all here, because we have such a great faculty here, to support the student. We have a lot of returning students; we have a lot of adult reentry students; we have career changers, and they come with a lot of experience. So, this helps them to complete a certificate, to complete their degree, and motivate them to get them in the career path and to that goal that they want to achieve. I've had faculty ask, We need seats for our classes? This will actually help with that because it'll motivate them to keep going. They may continue and complete. **Dean Carlson:** We need that voice from a shared governance component, as it is going to be really critical for us to continue to move forward.

President Drew: We need to go back and look at that resolution, as it needs to be updated. Part of that discussion is adding other possible members, and the other thing is the task force. **Senator Laux:** If individual faculty at different colleges are setting those parameters for what they accept for credit for prior learning, how does that avoid major inconsistencies? Say one college decides, we'll

accept this, but another college wouldn't, and then their student is allowed to take a class, we wouldn't let them in, and then they transfer over and maybe get crushed in one of our classes.

Coordinator Voss: For some courses they will need some alignment, and we do need to be mindful of that. There are different courses that might be general throughout that are part of that program that we do need to be mindful of. Where we're starting, and where most schools start, is with career education programs leading to certificates, unique programs that we have, like aviation maintenance, construction, HVAC, welding, so there's not that much swirl happening between the campuses.

D. Uniform District Transcripts Discussion:

Senator Boogar stated that at the last Senate meeting, we were having a report out from the OCC Student Senate, and it generated a lot of discussion, and so we put this on the agenda as an item.

Senator Kennedy: I ran into some interesting information that might be helpful. There are 23 multi-college districts in the community college system, and 10 of them have this district transcript, and one of them, which is LACC, has the non-credit on theirs. It might be helpful if we can find out some information from them related to our concerns and ask them about what they have on their single district transcript, and if there have been issues with students. It might be good to know what's already happened, or what is happening. I would be happy to share this list of schools with the E-Board or Senate. **President Drew:** That would be great, if you could send that. I will do that.

Senator Ely: One of the concerns was that we were being hampered by technological issues and that we don't understand why they exist. Why aren't they just taken care of? **Senator Laux:** It's

alphabetized, right? It seems like colleges who have a lower letter of the alphabet that show up earlier like this better than colleges who have a later letter in the alphabet who come down later on the list. The non-credit comes before OCC, and that's the issue the students had. How do you fix that with the alphabetization of that? And then the other factor, it sounded almost unanimous with the OCC Student Senate that they didn't like this. It still feels like it's being forced upon them when they said, We don't want this, like that is an insolvable problem. **Senator Barnes:** Last week,

Senator Becker mentioned the idea of the alphabetical listing, to call it "zero slash non-credit", so that way it's on the bottom. Is that a possibility? **VC Serban:** We tried to put UNC, like undergraduate no credit, which would be after OCC, but [non-credit] it's not a description, it's the actual code of the level. For us to change the code level is a very complex thing to do, that would create a major data transformation challenge that we can't do lightly, and it would be a major issue that I don't think can be solved in the near future. Because it's the level code, not the description, that forces that alphabetical order, if you will, non-credit would remain listed before Orange Coast College credit. **Senator Laux:** All of this just seems like smoke and mirrors. It's all these details

we're getting caught up in. If the students unanimously said this, if they unanimously don't want it, why are we even forced to talk about all these details that seem irrelevant to me? This shouldn't even be on the table. What can we do? Is there anything we can do to say, This shouldn't even be something we're discussing and wasting our time about if nobody wants it? **Senator Gordon:**

Further to what my friend and colleague just said, if there are 23 multi-college districts, and if 10 of them have a single transcript, doesn't that mean that 13 of them don't? **Senator Naesse:** I want to remind everybody that our original resolution was that we wanted to investigate it, but we were not going to approve anything until we understood how it was going to be laid out, and what the transcripts were going to look like. If the Senate at OCC doesn't like how it looks, and the Student Senate at OCC doesn't like how it looks, then that's our position. However, Golden West College and Coastline may have a different position, and at that point, it seems to me that it's going to move forward regardless. **Senator Kennedy:** I want to reiterate what Senator Naesse said. I think

a problem that's here at least from what I'm hearing and also with the BPAP committee, is that there is a Student Senate rep on those committees. I do not know if that person represents all three colleges, but somebody who was a Student Senate rep was there talking about this, and there's two colleges that like it and we don't. That's one of the reasons why I think it would be smart to investigate the 10 that do have it. They may be the ones that are leading the way, or they may be doing it wrong, but we don't know. I think it would be good to find out a little bit from a couple of the colleges, at the very minimum, about what is going on. Are the students unhappy about this? Did it not work out? I think before we do more, we should find out more, instead of speculating. **VC**

Serban: If I may comment on that, we actually have talked to districts that have had, for many, many years, district-wide transcript. It's not an issue. It hasn't had any adverse impact on students, on the receiving universities, where students want their transcripts submitted. **OCC President Suarez:** I just wanted to share that at the District Consultation Council that was an item on the agenda. Dr. Serban was there, and there was a representative from the student body from Orange Coast College, and Anne, the Senate rep here, had briefed him, his name is Connor, on the students' comments regarding the non-credit. He did share that at DCC. He reiterated that the students support a district-wide transcript for all the reasons that were discussed previously, but he did ask if there was a possibility to explore basically the reordering of the non-credit. **VC Serban:** Yes, I remember that. **President Drew:** Well, hopefully we can make that happen. **Senator Boogar:** I just wanted to reiterate what Senator Naesse said, because it's the last stance this body took, not an initial support of it, but that we wanted to see an example before we decided to support it. Now that we have seen an example, there's things I do like about it. I like that it's very clear which college all these classes were taken at. I don't have any expertise in whether the non-credit being above OCC is going to matter at all or not, but I know that students, from our student rep, felt like they were not consulted with the full picture, and now they have hesitancy based on it. I think that should be considered. It would be nice if we could have some sort of inclination about whether this causes issues. I agree with Senator Kennedy about that. I'm still worried about having non-credit on there at all. I have a fear about what that's going to do to our tutoring programs here, because of the perception that exists. That's not about whether people can read it or not, that's about what students perceive, it's not even about whether it's a reality in question, the things we're hearing on the ground. I think there's a lot of value in the district transcript. I'm not strongly opposed to the concept, but I really dislike making decisions based on what technology can do, rather than what we think is right for students. That seems to be a pattern in this district that I personally find frustrating.

6. Adjournment

President Drew adjourned the meeting at 12:30 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 Approval of April 7, 2026 Meeting Minutes	Motion 2 Approval of the Consent Agenda as amended	Motion 3 Extend ASCCC Plenary Session and IEPI Discussion by 5 minutes	Motion 4 Extend Credit for Prior Learning Discussion by 7 minutes
Jason Ball, Part-Time Faculty (2025-2026)	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent
Carol Barnes, Counseling (2024-2027)	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
Lauren Becker, Consumer & Health Sciences (2023-2026)	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
Allissa Blystone, Math & Sciences (2023-2026)	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
Eric Budwig, Technology (2023-2026)	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
Jenny Chaiyakal, at-Large (2025-2028)	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent
Jodie Della Marna, Library 2023-2026	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
Rendell Drew, at-Large, President (2023-2026)	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
Cyndee Ely, Part-Time Faculty (2025-2026)	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
Carly Gonzalez, at-Large (2024-2027)	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
Joel Gonzalez, Athletics & Kinesiology (2023-2026)	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
Lee Gordon, Business & Computing, Vice President (2025-2028)	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
Marilyn Kennedy, Lit & Lang, PDI Chair, Secretary (2025-2028)	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
Mike Lannom, Curriculum Chair, Non-voting (2024-2026)				
Mickey Laux, at-Large (2025-2028)	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
Kate McCarroll, at-Large (2024-2027)	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
Irene Naesse, at-Large (2023-2026)	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
Leland Paxton, Part-Time Faculty (2025-2026)	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
Katherine Sheehan, Visual & Performing Arts (2024-2027)	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
Jordan Stanton, Social & Behavioral Sciences (2025-2028)	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
Ana Huynh, ASOCC Student Representative, Non-voting (2025-2026)				
Vacant, at-Large (2024-2027)				
Vacant, at-Large (2023-2026)				