

Academic Senate Meeting | May 5, 2026 | 11:30 am - 12:30 pm

Faculty House | [Zoom Link \(https://ccd-edu.zoom.us/j/88213592749\)](https://ccd-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	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	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	---
Vacant, at-Large	---

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

Guests (Optional & Voluntary Sign-In): Eduardo Jesus Arismendi-Pardi, Rozanne Capoccia-White, John Fawcett, Erin Fitzgerald, Tara Giblin, Erin Gratz, Jeanette Grimm, Anna Hanlon, Sue Harlan, Kelly Holt, Rachel Kubik, Vesna Kuo, Kayla LaBounty, Michael Mandelkern, Dan Matulis, Arabian Morgan, Kim Nguyen, Thuy Nguyen, Madjid Niroumand, Rich Pagel, Sara Qubbaj, Jim Rudy, Angelica Suarez, and Curtis Williams

1. Preliminary Matters

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

B. **Public Comments:**

Erin Fitzgerald, Tara Giblin, Eduardo Arismendi-Pardi

C. **Approval of the Minutes:**

Motion 1: Secretary Kennedy moved to approve the April 28, 2026, minutes with minor changes; approved.

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

Parliamentarian Boogar deferred his time to Senate President Emeritus Eduardo Arismendi-Pardi: President Emeritus Arismendi-Pardi, stated “When I was Senate President, I was involved with the viability process document. I think at the time I worked with Sheri Sterner, Emeritus Professor Georgie Monahan, and some others. The viability process was created to avoid any unilateral declaration of crisis by administration. I always represented the faculty. It was never intended for the administration to make substantive changes without proper faculty consultation. I always believed that there is no such thing as *pause* [in reference to program viability]. *Pause* is akin to having someone not breathe or eat. If you pause, you die.”

Parliamentarian Boogard deferred his time to Erin Fitzgerald: Erin Fitzgerald stated that the Program Mapper 2.0 software is being implemented, and we’re happy to come back and show you what that looks like. The goal of the software is to have students better understand their pathways and have that be on the website, which includes potential earnings and education levels needed for different pathways. This is the tool that is recommended by the State Chancellor’s Office, as it is subsidized and at zero cost to the college.

Senator Boogar: Noted that he had 35 seconds of his time left, and reminded faculty that Rupa was here from the district to talk about those IT matters and she has already our recommendation about the view online schedule—now it just says “View Schedule.” She shared that feedback and implemented it immediately.

Senator Kennedy: Recognized that President Emeritus Eduardo Arismendi-Pardi is a subject matter expert in shared governance and in particular about the last policies that were created.

2. Consent Agenda

A. **Tenure Track Evaluation Team – Outside Discipline Selection:**

1. **Anatomy and Physiology (Math & Science / Biology)**

Primary: Danny Matulis, Kinesiology & Athletics

Alternate: Caryn Plum, Student Services

2. **Aviation Maintenance Technology (Technology)**

Primary: Laura Reese, Student Services

Alternate: Mariana Voicu, Math & Science

3. **Communication Studies (Literature & Languages)**

Primary: Mariana Voicu, Math & Sciences

Alternate: Daniel Matulis, Kinesiology & Athletics

4. **Engineering (Technology)**

Primary: Rachel Ridnor, Social & Behavioral Sciences

Alternate: Laura Reese, Student Services

5. **English Generalist/Puente (Literature & Languages)**

Primary: Caryn Plum, Student Services

Alternate: Sherana Polk, Literature & Languages

6. Ethnic Studies (Social and Behavioral Sciences)

Primary: Eric Cuellar, Student Services

Alternate: Daniel Matulis, Kinesiology & Athletics

7. Math (Math and Sciences)

Primary: Kate McCaroll, Literature & Languages

Alternate: Rachel Ridnor, Social & Behavioral Sciences

8. Radiologic Technology (Consumer & Health Sciences/Allied Health)

Primary: Jessica Martin, Student Services

Alternate: Mariana Voicu, Math & Sciences

B. Committee Representatives:

1. Academic Standards Committee: Jeremy Zitter, Literature and Languages

2. Instructor Physical Therapy Assistant (1 Year) Committee Make-Up:

Hiring Manager: Kelly Holt

Committee Member #1: Diane Brown

Committee Member #2: Alison Riggio

Committee Member #3: Guido Sendowsky

3. Instructor Physical Therapy Assistant (1 Year) Committee Make-Up:

Hiring Manager: Kelly Holt

Committee Member #1: Diane Brown

Committee Member #2: Alison Riggio

Committee Member #3: Guido Sendowsky

4. Instructor Physical Therapy Assistant (1 Year) Committee Make-Up:

Hiring Manager: Kelly Holt

Committee Member #1: Diane Brown

Committee Member #2: Alison Riggio

Committee Member #3: Guido Sendowsky

C. Search Committee Representatives:

1. Educational Administrator – Academic Dean, Instructional (Business & Consumer Sciences): Michelle Craner.

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

3. Officer, Senator, & Committee Reports

A. President and Vice President's

Reports:

1. **President Drew:**

Announced that Cinco de Mayo is today, with events coordinated by CLEEO Project Center and Multicultural Center, followed by the Cultural Synergy Barbecue scheduled for May 12th at the Multicultural Center.

2. **Vice President Gordon:**

Garrison Fellow Awards: On Thursday, 11:30-12:30, you're welcome to come to the Robert B. Moore theater for the Garrison Fellows Awards. Students are recognized by the honors faculty for outstanding achievement. This is the first year that'll be hosted by one of the social sciences, so the topic will be on American government.

OCCHR and Demonstrations of Competency in Hiring Committees: I'd like to thank our Senate President for sending the following letter to OCCHR. The subject line of his email reads, "Request for HR Legal Background on Prohibition of Requests for Applicants' Demonstrations of competency". Here's the message in the email. " On April 28, 2026, at the OCC Academic Senate meeting, a faculty member reported that search committees have been advised by HR that it is unlawful for search committees, for full-time faculty, to request any demonstrations of competence by applicants for tenure track positions. The Executive Board of the OCC Academic Senate would appreciate being informed and advised as to any specific State of California or federal law regulations or executive orders that specifically prohibits requesting any demonstrations of competence by applicants when interviewing for tenured track teaching positions. " That is the text of President Drew's recent email. My comments are that the relevant administrative procedure gives the hiring committee latitude, and the administrative policy does not give the EEO rep a veto power. We need to clear this issue up, as hiring sets the direction of the college for decades to come, and each individual committee member has no idea how to respond when HR says there is a prohibition on something like demonstrations of competence. AB7120C Faculty Hiring states on page 7, "The search committee is encouraged to also consider demonstrations, a writing sample, or alternative forms of evaluation, such as electronic portfolios and recorded presentations as applicable." It stretches credulity to think that ordinary members of a hiring committee, when given a blanket prohibition by HR, are going to be able to cite the ninth bullet point under search committee from the seventh page of a Coast District Administrative Procedure. I think this is an important enough issue that it should be put in the queue for the Senate agenda for the fall 2026 semester. We must somehow restore common sense to our search process. It's time to take back control and to remove the EEO rep's power to arbitrarily veto legitimate and lawful decisions by search committees.

OCC Football Program: With respect to the OCC football issue, which is once again on today's agenda. Last week, I indicated that I would have a draft resolution for today's Senate session. I've reconsidered, and I think it would be better to hear from the college's athletic director before crafting a sense of the Senate resolution. President Drew has invited Director Keller to today's meeting, and we hope to hear from him later in this session. At the start of last week's session, I read for the first time this handout, which has the OCC seal at the top, but is unsigned. I assume it represents the views of the OCC administration. Last week, we also heard the prepared statements of Senator Bubba Gonzalez. I copied Senator Gonzalez's remarks from the draft minutes of last week's meeting, and I have printed them, and they are in front of you now. As for me, the issue in this case is not football, the issue is governance. The question is, does the administration have the authority, under the established viability process, to unilaterally pull the plug on a program without the participation of the faculty in the decision if the administration claims the action is a *pause* and not a *cancellation?*

OCC President Angelica Suarez: I wanted to address something that Vice President Gordon

mentioned, and I take very seriously, which is the issue of HR, and the case that Dr. Drew brought forward, that there was a situation where there HR might have advised a committee that they could not have demonstrations. What I can tell you is we've just completed five faculty position interviews at the second level. I interviewed fifteen faculty members, and each one of those had a demonstration, and the demonstration was carried forward from the first level interview. I've asked Rebecca Morgan to follow up on the specific case that you're talking about, so that we can better understand what that is. But I did not want you to all think that we were not including demonstrations, because I can just tell you, in the last fifteen interviews that we've done in the last two weeks every one of them has a demonstration, and I certainly have learned a lot about a lot of different things.

B. Reports and Updates on Faculty and Student Engagement and Activities:

Senator Chaiyakal reported on the recent Children's Center Open House where the Child Development students were doing curriculum demonstrations with the children and some students and faculty were there. There were a lot of questions asking if the center is still open. I would love the Center or the Senate to communicate to students that we still are supporting the children of student parents. There are openings for fall, and Rochelle Santa Cruz would love to get names of people who are interested in the program. It seems that there has been a rumor circulating that the Children's Center is closed. It is not closed. It is still open. It is just *downsized*, so if you have students who are in need of child care, please let us know.

C. Curriculum Committee:

Curriculum Chair Mike Lannom reported that the Curriculum Committee will convene its final voting meeting of the semester on May 5. The Committee will have elections for chair and vice chair and will review the Curriculum Committee Handbook.

D. District BP/AP Committee

Report:

Senator Kennedy provided a brief report that the **BP and AP for 3903: Safe, Responsible, and Ethical Use of Artificial Intelligence** were both passed. She added that at the last minute Golden West's Senate had inserted a paragraph that would have not allowed anyone to input anything into ChatGPT except peer-reviewed material. We discussed and removed this language, as it might have prohibited faculty from being able to use AI detectors. The rest of the policies will be brought back next week when we have more time, and they'll be attached to the agenda for you to review before the meeting.

4. Unfinished Business

A. Resolution on Chicago Statement on Freedom of Speech: Academic Freedom Committee

Academic Freedom (AF) Co-Chair Marilyn Kennedy introduced **AF Co-Chair Emeritus Eduardo Arismendi** to speak on this, as both he and **AF Co-Chair Richard Kraft**, who is in attendance, have been working on this for months, actually years.

AF Emeritus Arismendi-Pardi stated that the Chicago Statement should be incorporated, and the whole issue really is about respecting faculty primacy.

AF Co-Chair Kennedy added that **AF member Flavia Ruzi** mentioned last week that almost no community colleges have approved this yet, and that we would be included on a list of those who did approve it. Co-Chair Kennedy stated that she reviewed the list of colleges who did approve it, and there is only one community college in California who has approved this so far, Glendale Community College, in 2023. She stated that because OCC has had incidents since 2001 where we have had negative press and information about academic freedom in cases with Professors Hearlson, Perez-Stable-Cox, and Alabi, that she would like to see this be a statement making clear that the college embraces academic freedom under the purview and parameters that we all have to respect with academic freedom and freedom of speech. She asked if someone in the Senate would second the resolution. **Vice-President Gordon seconded the resolution.** AF Co-Chair Kennedy was asked to read the Resolveds. She read the only Resolved: "Be it resolved that on this day of May 5th, 2026, the Academic Senate formally adopts the Chicago Statement as a public acknowledgement of its full commitment to academic freedom."

A roll call vote was taken. Resolution/Motion 3: Adoption of the Chicago Statement on Freedom of Speech by Senator Kennedy; seconded' approved. [See Appendix at end of these minutes for resolution.]

B. Cancellation of Fall '26 Football Season:

President Drew introduced the issue noting that OCC has a cancellation of the fall 2026 football season.

Football Coach Joel "Bubba" Gonzalez: I need everybody to understand that this is difficult for everybody involved. It's not just me, it's not just my student athletes, it's not just the administration. The decisions that were made were difficult. I felt like the faith or trust was not put in me because I was not involved in that conversation. There are issues in our program that I have never run from. There are issues in our program that I have voiced on multiple occasions, and I've had conversations with my department administration. The problem I have is I'm expected to rebuild, and I'm being called the expert in this area, and my expertise is not asked or heard. This is about me trying to better my program. Unfortunately, I don't always feel like the support is wanting to be given and I did voice that opinion in our meeting yesterday with the Vice President as well as others in that meeting. I want nothing but the best for this school, for this football program, for my student-athletes, which are the most important part of this equation. I want to know that I'm going to be heard and supported.

President Drew: In the Senate, we're looking at things from the perspective of the 10 plus one.

Athletic Director Jason Kehler: This was a really hard decision to make. It took a lot of conversations over a few months that spanned back to the last fall. Bubba and I were meeting fairly regularly, every Monday or every other Monday, to talk about the end of the last season going into this season. What really changed things? We have full support in Bubba. We had to look at a few areas when we're making these types of decisions. Student athlete experience and player safety is the utmost concern for us, but we also have a commitment to our partners and the Southern California Football Association. I think one of the things that's lost in this conversation is

football is the only sport that has no say over their schedule. All of our teams, they're given a conference schedule, it's usually about half their schedule, and then the head coach has the responsibility to fill the rest of their games; however many are allowed. It is completely done by the commissioner and the competition committee of the Southern California Football Association. I bring that up because in the fall of 2004, I was a member of the executive committee of the SCFA. We were monitoring San Bernardino Valley College. It was well known that they had low numbers. It was well known that they likely were not going to be able to compete months before the season even started. They did eventually try, they lost two games, 65-0, and eventually canceled the rest of their season. This then took away competition opportunities for student athletes at eight community colleges, including Orange Coast College. That's an opportunity for student-athletes to be able to try and get scholarship opportunities for the next level. In our final game, we had less than forty student-athletes in uniform for that game. That was already becoming a little concerning. The spring semester started and it appeared that there would be a little uptick in numbers. We started to hear that assistant coaches were leaving in large groups. Three left in March and then another three in April. Current student athletes went with them and the recruits that they were promising or trying to bring here went with them as well. We got to a point where there were visibly less than twenty-five student-athletes on the football field. There was no support staff around Bubba to recruit what was needed to come back by summer, June 12th, or whatever the summer date was, for the fall season. Seeing what happened with San Marino Valley, seeing the competition opportunities that were taken away, it felt like it was the right thing to do for those 20 to 30 student-athletes that were on the field for us, to give them ample time to make a decision. Maybe they want to stay, maybe they want to transfer somewhere and get a competition opportunity. We also wanted to provide the SCFA an opportunity to fill 10 spots on a schedule, so that other institutions weren't losing an entire game. Also, I have constant conversations with our athletic trainers for all of our sport, 25 sports. We have to have conversations. Is it safe? If a soccer team needs 11, you only have 12, is it safe to play them? If someone is already a little injured, there's no one to rest them, those kinds of things. Football has two divisions: they have a playoff division and a non-playoff division. We are in the upper division. He told me we just don't have the numbers and the coaches doing the recruiting are no longer here. On April 13th we were looking at maybe being the earliest we might have gotten someone onboarded to start providing him support. There were 6 open coaching spaces. I was aware of 2 or 3 potential candidates. All of those things came together into one perfect storm that led to this decision.

Senator Boogar: I have a prepared statement, but in light of what you just said, I'll preface it with one thing. I think it is clear a lot of thought went into the decision, and so the question for this body is about consultation. I think we were all surprised and disappointed at the suspension of the football program. I have reflected on this topic a great deal and tried to get to the heart of what our purview is and where our concerns should lie. Clearly, football is an academic program, and there it falls under the 10 plus 1. I think our concern as a body lies in collegial consultation in two parts: The first is collegial consultation with the discipline faculty; this should have occurred, and there appears to be disagreement in the accounts between the faculty member and management as to whether it did. The second, Should the Academic Senate have been collegially consulted? At first, I compared it to a cancellation of my own department classes due to low enrollment. It would be unreasonable for every course cancellation to be a matter of Senate business. This happens all the time. That said, this seemed ultimately to be an inadequate comparison, as football as being canceled for a season as a program, not just a class or classes. On the other end of the spectrum is *program viability*, which is clearly a Senate process. However, this is not a matter of proposed program ending, but only a one-season cancellation. I think to say the viability process should have been used is also unreasonable. It is important for us as a body to acknowledge that if a program had under-enrolled students and depleted coaching staff and safety concerns, there needs to be space for deft decision-making. Practically, there's a need at times for faster decision-making, that our viability process would not allow for. I think we should acknowledge that. I find this current situation to be somewhere in the middle between a simple class cancellation and a program termination via the viability process. As we draw conclusions about whether we as a body should be collegially consulted in this situation, I worry about precedent, a less trustworthy future administrator could *pause*, and then continue pausing the program as a runaround to the viability

process. My conclusions are these: One, the discipline faculty should always be consulted in decisions affecting the programs. Second, if an entire program is being considered for a temporary cancellation, it would be appropriate to collegially consult the Senate or Senate leadership. Open discussion around this issue could have been possible, especially since it appears there isn't a matter of personnel. I'm curious to hear from Jason or other appropriate managers whether they agree that collegially consulting the Senate on this matter would have been appropriate in hindsight, and whether they are committed to doing so in the future. If not, why do you feel it wouldn't be?

Athletic Director Kehler: This is my biggest introduction to the Academic Senate. I also have the same thoughts, as my department is currently faced with replacing the head coaches of five teams right now. Five teams that have a summer training programs coming up, and I referenced the HR timeline a minute ago. We're facing a depleted coaching staff with a small amount of time during the summer months, and does the Academic Senate meet during the summer months?

Senator Boogar: The E-Board will meet if needed on behalf of the Senate.

Director Kehler: We're going to be faced again with asking, Is cross-country viable? I don't want to use the term *viable*. Does cross-country have a safe competing roster? Does women's indoor volleyball? Does women's basketball? This happens all the time. San Diego Canyon College recently put their softball program on a pause for one year as they hired a coaching staff. I can go down the whole list. From an athletic standpoint, I view it from that extracurricular standpoint of games, not necessarily the class. As a full-time tenured faculty, Bubba was guaranteed his load. We weren't looking at classes being canceled, we were simply looking at competition, because that is our commitment to our partners in the conferences.

OCC President Suarez: I appreciate the Senate and the comment that you just made. I look forward to having these conversations with the Senate in terms of, for something like this, what would make sense? Because obviously we want to make sure that we're doing what's best for students. But also make sure that we engage in collegial consultation. Our college is committed to our program, and to Bubba, and I want to say that here. I've had the opportunity to serve on the Board of the California Community College Athletic Association. These are issues that come up. Just recently I got calls from this Southern California Football Association asking are you bringing this program back? I said, yes, we are here to support our head coach to rebuild and make sure that our students are safe coming back in terms of playing. For the purpose of our Senate, I wanted to be very transparent and tell you that we are very supportive of football. We want to make sure that we are supportive of you, Bubba, as you continue to work and rebuild that.

Senator Kennedy: I'd like to invite both CFE Executive Director Kuo and Emeritus Senate President Arismendi-Pardi to say if they believe there's a touch of viability in here, as I think this does lean on the viability issue, not to the extreme that the program is closing permanently, but this is the issue that viability was designed to also handle.

Senator Naesse (also Transparency Committee Chair): One of the things that is so frustrating is that in light of what happened with the Neurodiagnostic Program, what happened with Child Development and the Children's Center, what happened with CPOS, we're constantly getting this information after there's been a catastrophic decision made, or after it's been talked about for years by administrators before it comes to the Senate. I don't understand why we're constantly left out of this conversation when we've had so many recent examples of lack of collegial consultation and the negative impacts that that has had on the decision-making process. This is unacceptable. I would like to know from administration what commitments they have, in aggressively recruiting students, are we going to be increasing scholarships, offering housing? What is happening with the pay for coaches so that we can aggressively recruit and hire, so that we are ready? I would like to see, maybe not in this meeting, the exact specific support that they are going to provide the football program for recruiting both coaches and students.

Motion 4: Vice President Gordon moved to extend the agenda item for 5 minutes. A short discussion followed; the motion was approved.

Senate President Emeritus Arismendi-Pardi noted that the word *pause* was used at least seven times and when he was involved in the viability process, it was to create an orderly, effective means for the college to review programs. His intention was to implement a system that would be fair to all constituencies. That means perfect equilibrium as much as possible. The word *pause*, *what* defines pause and who does it benefit? It is good that President Suarez made a statement that collegial consultation and having these conversations, even if they're difficult, is the right thing to do.

Vice President of Instruction Tara Giblin stated that the Polysomnography Program, two years ago, had some turnover in faculty and some changes needed to be made to curriculum, so they didn't admit a cohort of students, and now for this coming fall, a full cohort has been admitted. The program is revived by giving that one year to renew the curriculum. In terms of viability, we're not opposed to the viability process. The Senate E-Board knows that there are two programs right now moving into the viability process to kind of revive and test out that process again. I have asked and will continue to ask for a process that has a little more streamlined nature to it, so that we can move into the process and make decisions a little more quickly as needed, and we're happy to follow that process.

Vice President Gordon: This is a document that is called Football Program Pause FAQs, dated 4-28-26. I assume it comes from the administration. In question number 13, it says. The viability process is thoughtful and data-driven. It typically takes about two years to complete. That is the administration's argument about why they need to bypass the viability process. I know how important the viability process is, and I've tried to volunteer to serve on viability review committees when one was announced. I have been on both contested and uncontested viability processes. It is true that one unique and contested viability process was dragged out into two years. Those circumstances are unlikely to recur and based on my experience with the viability process, I want to state my disagreement with the administration's assertion that viability is inoperative because they claim it takes two years. One could similarly claim that viability process takes two months, as one of the committees I served on was completed in roughly that time frame. Things are changing at an accelerated rate. The circumstances surrounding many of our programs are likely to be altered. We need an orderly process to review the situation when a program's circumstances have changed. The key issue to me is not football. The key issue is shared governance.

CFE Executive Direction Vesna Kuo: I do think program viability does apply here. Some of the outcomes can involve modifications to programs, and that's exactly what Bubba is being asked to do during the pause. It's program viability under a different name. Maybe the Senate needs to examine whether or not there needs to be an expedited process.

Athletic Director Kehler: One of the challenges here is that we had similar conversations in the athletics department with our softball program in 2018-2019. It had a high rate of turnover with coaches, low participation, almost canceling games. We worked with the coaching staff and we turned it around. It's one thing to find 15 to 20 softball players, 15 to 20 soccer players. Football is a different sport within itself. The safety aspect that goes along with it played the biggest role in this decision; without 5 to 10 offensive linemen, you cannot play a football game.

President Drew announced that the time had elapsed for this issue.

C. Online Advisory Board Updates:

Faculty Online Coordinator Cora Volkoff clarified that she was presenting on behalf of the District that is trying to decide whether or not to purchase some programs that benefit the whole staff: Simple Syllabus and Simple Prep. A decision does need to be taken back to the District to get everyone's input on whether we're going to purchase this software.

This is not the same as Liquid Syllabus. Simple Syllabus is for every instructor who would teach at OCC, and potentially everyone at the District. It is like a form you would fill out for your syllabus. It talks to Banner and automatically brings in everything for your term, the CRN, modality, how many

weeks long, course description from your COR, student learning objectives. It can provide a visual of your textbook for students.

People are worried about academic freedom and what is on their syllabus. This is very editable. It lives within Canvas. Instead of clicking Syllabus on Canvas, you would click Simple Syllabus. Something would load up, you fill in the template, so the very first time that you have to create this, it is a little more work.

If you're in chemistry and you have certain safety protocols, those safety protocols can be pre-written in there, and a new instructor can just click that on that, and they don't need to figure out what is happening at OCC. There is template language that can be used for Student Services, and when we have an AI protocol or policy set. There could be a couple of people who are in charge of updating those resources and links so those would be automatically updated in your syllabus.

It can be housed online. You can have two different versions of your syllabus that can be shown. One that's inside of your Canvas shell that shows to your students, and you one that shows publicly.

This is really good for students to be able to shop for classes and keep it equitable. Right now, everyone has a different level of design that they can do on their syllabus. Sometimes one faculty member's syllabus will look much better than others, and someone could automatically think it is a better class. This will level the playing field. Everyone's syllabus is going to look somewhat similar in the sense that it is going to be easy to read, and it's going to be accessible. It's going to have all of the correct items that can pass through an accessibility review. One of the biggest issues right now is that PDFs are changing, that you cannot have those online unless they are accessible, and making them accessible is very hard. Many people have a PDF or a Word document that is not accessible. It would remediate some of the problems that we have with accessibility. You would not be able to publish your syllabus until you pass an accessibility check. It will automatically be flagged if you put an image in it and then you could put alt text there. You can add video into your syllabus; you can add images. All of that would just kind of prompt you on what to do to make this accessible. It would be easy for us as a whole to make sure that everything that we're showing is accessible.

Senator Boogar: If we were to adopt this, would all faculty be required to use it? **Coordinator Volkoff:** Yes. **Senator Boogar:** Then there are two things to consider: Do you like the tool? Do you want to mandate it for everybody else? You were talking about shopping, but usually we aren't expected to have our syllabus even done until the week into the semester, so how does that even work? **Coordinator Volkoff:** Well, you can search for old syllabi that are housed in archives. So, one of the arguments that people have about their Word document or PDF linked directly into the syllabus page in Canvas is that students need to be able to download that document to be able to have it for transcripts later or to waive a class. This has that option. You have that option to download this as a PDF or Word document. Students can go into this public hub, and they can go to an old class, they can find the syllabus. To find the course description it's three clicks in; this would just have it in the same place on every syllabus. **Eric Wilson:** Another nice thing about this is that it integrates with Banner, so it's a class schedule system. There's a syllabus icon in there, and they will tie into this. You get to choose what's released. **Senator Chaiyakal:** I'd love to have a little bit more conversation about what gets released in our division. There's been a lot of discussion, particularly with part-time faculty, whom we very much want to support, who are worried about putting something online. **Coordinator Volkoff:** On every section, there's a toggle switch that says *hide/show*. **Senator Chaiyakal:** What I'm asking is what is required to be released if we are adopting this? **Coordinator Volkoff:** I think that would be something we can bring to the Senate for those requirements. I don't think that's something that can be decided for today. We were just trying to be able to have something that was easily implementable when people need to have the RSI because they're teaching online. We could have easily input a section where you can actually select the things that apply to your class and be able to put that in your syllabi really quickly. There's got to be a minimum standard that the school has that we should show on our syllabi as far as accessibility statements, ARC resources, objectives, class description, CRN, that type of thing. **Senator Ely:** What is the cost? **Coordinator Volkoff:** It is at a District level for all

three schools. There is an implementation cost to get everybody trained and everything connected to Canvas and Banner. We're trying to make sure that all of the three schools want to do it, and then it would be a district-level cost. **Senator Kennedy:** We should not vote on this today. There are a lot of academic freedom issues here. CFE already has in the contract what we are obligated to do with and in our syllabi. This needs a lot more dialogue.

5. New Business

A. Online Advisory Board Updates:

This item was to be rescheduled under Unfinished Business for the May 12 meeting.

6. Adjournment

President Drew adjourned the meeting at 12:33 PM.

7. Minutes: Approved on May 12, 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 April 28, 2026 Minutes	Motion 2 Consent Agenda Items	Motion 3 Adoption of the Chicago Statement	Motion 4 Extend topic by 5 mins- Cancellation of Fall '26 Football Season
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)	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
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	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)				



Appendix:

Orange Coast College Academic Senate Resolution Adoption of the “Chicago Statement”

Spring 2026-2

Moved by Senator Marilyn Kennedy

Seconded by Vice President Lee Gordon

Approved on May 5, 2026

WHEREAS, The Coast Community College District recognizes and supports academic freedom in its Board Policy 4030, and

WHEREAS, the CFE faculty union contract recognizes and supports academic freedom in its Article VI Academic Freedom and Responsibility, and

WHEREAS, OCC’s Academic Freedom Committee recommends that the OCC Senate adopt the Chicago Statement, and

WHEREAS, Orange Coast College has a continuing commitment to free and open discourse, including robust and uninhibited debate and deliberation among all members of the college’s community, and

BE IT RESOLVED, that on this day of May 5, 2026, the Academic Senate formally adopts the “Chicago Statement” as a public acknowledgement of its full commitment to academic freedom.

["Chicago Statement"] Report of the Committee on Freedom of Expression

The Committee on Freedom of Expression at the University of Chicago was appointed in July 2014 by President Robert J. Zimmer and Provost Eric D. Isaacs “in light of recent events nationwide that have tested institutional commitments to free and open discourse.” The Committee’s charge was to draft a statement “articulating the University’s overarching commitment to free, robust, and uninhibited debate and deliberation among all members of the University’s community.”

The Committee has carefully reviewed the University’s history, examined events at other institutions, and consulted a broad range of individuals both inside and outside the University. This statement reflects the long-standing and distinctive values of the University of Chicago and affirms the importance of maintaining and, indeed, celebrating those values for the future.

From its very founding, the University of Chicago has dedicated itself to the preservation and celebration of the freedom of expression as an essential element of the University’s culture. In 1902, in his address marking the University’s decennial, President William Rainey Harper declared that “the principle of complete freedom of speech on all subjects has from the beginning been regarded as fundamental in the University of Chicago” and that “this principle can neither now nor at any future time be called in question.”

Thirty years later, a student organization invited William Z. Foster, the Communist Party’s candidate for President, to lecture on campus. This triggered a storm of protest from critics both on and off campus. To those who condemned the University for allowing the event, President Robert M. Hutchins responded that “our students . . . should have freedom to discuss any problem that presents itself.” He insisted that the “cure” for ideas we oppose “lies through open discussion rather than through inhibition.” On a later occasion, Hutchins added that “free inquiry is indispensable to the good life, that universities exist for the sake of such inquiry, [and] that without it they cease to be universities.”

In 1968, at another time of great turmoil in universities, President Edward H. Levi, in his inaugural address, celebrated “those virtues which from the beginning and until now have characterized our institution.” Central to the values of the University of Chicago, Levi explained, is a profound commitment to “freedom of inquiry.” This freedom, he proclaimed, “is our inheritance.”

More recently, President Hanna Holborn Gray observed that “education should not be intended to make people comfortable, it is meant to make them think. Universities should be expected to provide the conditions within which hard thought, and therefore strong disagreement, independent judgment, and the questioning of stubborn assumptions, can flourish in an environment of the greatest freedom.”

The words of Harper, Hutchins, Levi, and Gray capture both the spirit and the promise of the University of Chicago. Because the University is committed to free and open inquiry in all matters, it guarantees all members of the University community the broadest possible latitude to speak, write, listen, challenge, and learn. Except insofar as limitations on that freedom are necessary to the functioning of the University, the University of Chicago fully respects and supports the freedom of all members of the University community “to discuss any problem that presents itself.”

Of course, the ideas of different members of the University community will often and quite naturally conflict. But it is not the proper role of the University to attempt to shield individuals from ideas and opinions they find unwelcome, disagreeable, or even deeply offensive. Although the University greatly values civility, and although all members of the University community share in the responsibility for maintaining a climate of mutual respect, concerns about civility and mutual respect can never be used as a justification for closing off discussion of ideas, however offensive or disagreeable those ideas may be to some members of our community.

The freedom to debate and discuss the merits of competing ideas does not, of course, mean that individuals may say whatever they wish, wherever they wish. The University may restrict expression that violates the law, that falsely defames a specific individual, that constitutes a genuine threat or harassment, that unjustifiably invades substantial privacy or confidentiality interests, or that is otherwise directly incompatible with the functioning of the University. In addition, the University may reasonably regulate the time, place, and manner of expression to ensure that it does not disrupt the ordinary activities of the University. But these are narrow exceptions to the general principle of freedom of expression, and it is vitally important that these exceptions never be used in a manner that is inconsistent with the University’s commitment to a completely free and open discussion of ideas.

In a word, the University’s fundamental commitment is to the principle that debate or deliberation may not be suppressed because the ideas put forth are thought by some or even by most members of the University community to be offensive, unwise, immoral, or wrong-headed. It is for the individual members of the University community, not for the University as an institution, to make those judgments for themselves, and to act on those judgments not by seeking to suppress speech, but by openly and vigorously contesting the ideas that they oppose. Indeed, fostering the ability of members of the University community to engage in such debate and deliberation in an effective and responsible manner is an essential part of the University’s educational mission.

As a corollary to the University’s commitment to protect and promote free expression, members of the University community must also act in conformity with the principle of free expression. Although members of the University community are free to criticize and contest the views expressed on campus, and to criticize and contest speakers who are invited to express their views on campus, they may not obstruct or otherwise interfere with the freedom of others to express views they reject or even loathe. To this end, the University has a solemn responsibility not only to promote a lively and fearless freedom of debate and deliberation, but also to protect that freedom when others attempt to restrict it.

As Robert M. Hutchins observed, without a vibrant commitment to free and open inquiry, a university ceases to be a university. The University of Chicago’s longstanding commitment to this principle lies at the very core of our University’s greatness. That is our inheritance, and it is our promise to the future.

Geoffrey R. Stone, Edward H. Levi Distinguished Service Professor of Law, *Chair*

Marianne Bertrand, Chris P. Dialynas Distinguished Service Professor of Economics, Booth School of Business

Angela Olinto, Homer J. Livingston Professor, Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics, Enrico Fermi Institute, and the College

Mark Siegler, Lindy Bergman Distinguished Service Professor of Medicine and Surgery

David A. Strauss, Gerald Ratner Distinguished Service Professor of Law

Kenneth W. Warren, Fairfax M. Cone Distinguished Service Professor, Department of English and the College

Amanda Woodward, William S. Gray Professor, Department of Psychology and the College