

ORANGE COAST COLLEGE

Academic Senate Meeting | 11/19/19 | 11:30 am - 12:30 pm | Faculty House

Academic Senator Attendance

| | | | |
|---|---------|--|---------|
| Carol Barnes, Counseling | Present | Kelly Holt, at-Large | Present |
| Jamie Blair, at-Large, Vice President | Present | Darryl Isaac, Consumer & Health Sciences | Present |
| Cameron Brown, Athletics & Kinesiology | Present | Marilyn Kennedy, Lit & Lang, PDI Chair, Secretary | Present |
| Sean Connor, at-Large | Present | Doug Lloyd, Math & Sciences | Present |
| Eric Cuellar, at-Large | Present | Leland Means, Visual & Performing Arts | Present |
| Jodi Della Marna, Library | Absent | Jeanne Neil, Business & Computing | Present |
| Matt Denney, Technology | Present | Max Pena, at-Large | Present |
| Rendell Drew, at-Large | Present | Clyde Phillips, Student Services | Present |
| Cyndee Ely, Part-Time Faculty | Present | Loren Sachs, at-Large, President | Present |
| Diogba G'bye, Part-Time Faculty | Present | Jordan Stanton, Social & Behavioral Sciences | Present |
| Lee Gordon, at-Large, Parliamentarian | Present | Raymond Tu, ASOCC Representative | Present |
| Anna Hanlon, Curriculum | Present | | |

Guests (Optional & Voluntary Sign-In):

Kevin Ballinger, Angelica Suarez, John Taylor, Yuki Toyooka Smith, Dr. Andreea Serban, Dr. Marco Baeza, Claudia Montoya-Andrews

1. Preliminary Matters

A. Call to Order:

President Loren Sachs called the meeting to order at 11:30a.m.

B. Approval of the Minutes – November 5 & 12, 2019:

Postponed until November 26 meeting.

C. Opportunity for Public Comment:

Jessica Alabi, Darryl Isaac.

D. For the Good of the Order Announcements:

- **ASOCC Student Rep. Tu:** Noted that there is an ASOCC-hosted **Town Hall for Civic Engagement** today and BOT President Lorraine Prinsky will give the opening statement, President Suarez will be attending, as well various state political representatives. **Angel Christmas trees** will be around the campus with the names of children in need for the Christmas season so that anyone may take a name and purchase a gift for those children in need.
- **Senator Cuellar:** Noted a change of date for the CLEEO Summit to December 2nd, at 11:15am – 12:30pm, Robert B. Moore Theater. Dolores Huerta will be the guest speaker. **Senator Drew** stated he will be taking a large Political Science 180 class to this event, and encouraged others to attend.
- **Senator Phillips:** Is planning to host Dr. Karenga for the Kwanza celebration. He will present here on campus on December 4th at the Global Engagement Center, 12pm – 2pm.

2. Consent Agenda

Motion 2: Senator Kennedy moved to approve the consent agenda; motion seconded; motion approved unanimously.

3. Officer, Senator, & Committee Reports

A. Academic Senate President – Loren Sachs:

Budget Committee: Will meet Friday and Senator Ely will provide an update next week.

District Consultation Council: The committee prioritized a couple of goals for the coming year, one of those goals is student engagement. Our Guided Pathways group along with the two other colleges will be sharing that at DCC in January and we'll bring updates when we reconvene in the spring.

Accreditation Committee: VPI Ballinger and Carmella Hardy shared a spreadsheet that identifies the entities on campus that had writing responsibilities for various standards in the accreditation cycle in preparation for what is next. They are in the process of adopting that spreadsheet in the Decision-Making Guide.

B. Professional Development Advisory Committee (formerly Staff Development—a shared governance committee) – Rep. Kelly Holt:

The PDAC's role is to advise the Professional Development office about what campus-wide professional development activities all employees can partake in. It is time to request feedback from the college, so there is a survey in BoardDocs that takes a few minutes to look over and provide some feedback, as will return on December 3rd. Please note that Flex Day is not included in this survey, as they are doing their own survey.

C. Guided Pathways:

GP Onboarding Coordinator Jessica Alabi: For onboarding, we're losing momentum with nine people at each of the meetings. It initially started a very large group, but this has been a very busy semester, so there will be a campus-wide callout for participants. We're focused on five big projects where we want to make some recommendations to the campus and we need a broader cross-functional campus group. We are also currently working on a peer training with Equity for the six Guided Pathways student ambassadors that will be hired.

State Academic Senate and Guided Pathways: There will be a webinar tomorrow, 11/20/19, on Guided Pathways and program review. This will focus on aligning the two together so we're not doing double the work. It will also be a more student-centered program review helping to focus on how not just majors but students who need general education, how are they doing in our programs?

VP Blair noted that a conference she attended last week in Milwaukee had a lot of Pathways discussion, and there was a session on a one-hour-a-week meeting with students to enhance student engagement. There is administration and faculty training. Outcomes showed that this is an opportunity for students to meet with administrators and faculty to talk about whatever training for student engagement. The training showed that there was an opportunity for students meeting with a faculty member to talk about whatever the student wanted to talk about, such as emotional problems or feeling comfortable about academics. The success was extremely high for the students who participated. Orange Coast College was lower than the state average on student's perception on faculty engagement. Something like this (student/faculty one-on-ones) would help it.

Other senators noted that this would be a good thing for OCC in regards to the survey results, although we need to know exactly what OCC students think is missing from faculty-student interactions.

D. Academic Rank Committee - Academic Rank Committee Chair Loren Sachs: Last week something in Class Climate was updated and right now we are unable to pull the report for academic rank changes. It's being worked on and as soon as they can access the data the changes will be published.

E. Ad Hoc Committee on Dual Enrollment with OCC in Japan: VPI Ballinger reported that this MOU draft is just informational, as the committee is talking about issues and working on development. VP Madjid Niroumand will engage the conversation with NIC. This draft MOU is an example of what we're thinking about and we're asking the Senate for any suggestions, as we're in the very early stages of this initial draft.

4. Unfinished Business

A. Comprehensive Evaluation for Continuous Improvement Processes – Anna Hanlon and Kelly Holt

Anna Hanlon informed the Senate the topic is evaluation of processes. There is an integrated planning process that starts with assessment, program review, and building strategies. The strategies are used to create ARR's to get the things that we need to implement our strategies. Every three years we evaluate our processes to ensure that they're working for us. The last evaluation was in spring 2017. The method used was that Gabrielle Stanco came to the different participatory governance committees and conducted a focus group with questions and gathered qualitative data. There was also a campus-wide survey sent out to all employees regarding our process of program review, assessment, planning, and ARR's. The data was analyzed by the researchers and the analysis was shared with the Institutional Effectiveness Committee. The group drafted some recommendations that were brought to the representative bodies, the planning councils, the senates, for further discussion for feedback, changes, and endorsement. One of the changes that resulted was a change to our program review from a comprehensive one every three years to every six years, with a midterm program review. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness is responsible for the oversight of the evaluation process. The role of the Senate is to review and endorse the plan for the evaluation. This will be completed in the spring. Research will develop the instruments and collect the data and analyze it. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee created the plan; the committee does have a Senate rep and there is still room for two more faculty members. Professor Steve Gilbert is on the committee and has provided feedback on the evaluation process. The feedback was incorporated into the process. The Senate's recommendation and endorsement are integral to this process because of the 10+1 and the faculty purview over the areas. Once the plan is endorsed by the Senate, it will then go to College Council for implementation in the spring. (The full plan is on Board Docs.)

The recommendations from the spring, three years ago, from that evaluation, were reviewed by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee. We found that there were recommendations for program review that were not addressed because we switched to a midterm program review. We discussed how we could fold those into this upcoming review and then develop the plan for spring. There are four components: One about the

prior evaluation, two about the general evaluation done in the past and a comprehensive review with regards to some of our other processes, and finally an in-depth evaluation of how we're using TracDat.

Kelly Holt noted that they were looking for four different projects and a working group to flesh out these specific areas. The first one being to investigate improvements to comprehensive program review. There are some comments that have not been addressed yet but looking to incorporate them into the new process:

- o Developing a mechanism for departments to identify what data they need because the existing data was not meeting their needs. We hope to get a working group together to let the Institutional Effectiveness Office know what type of data is needed for program review.
- o SLOs and AUOs being redundant.
- o CTE faculty reported that they have internal accreditation, bi-annual review, program review, SLO...and are serving a lot of masters, so is there a way to streamline everything that we do in CTE programs?
- o General review of comprehensive evaluation, including outcomes assessment, program review, peer review, and planning processes; how is it working, what can be added and be different?
- o Looking at the prompts. Are they meaningful, useful? Can we change them?
- o Focusing mostly on this review looking at how midterm review went. Did we like it? Was it meaningful? Do we stick with it?
- o Reviewing program outcome assessments two years ago, PSLO assessments. Will do a focused review on those two things to see how we have done in the past.
- o TracDat has a new version that is coming out. It will look a little different in the new version. We want to make sure that the way the new version is rolled out, is as good as it can be. We can do some minor edits to it. So, getting some faculty to use it and give feedback in terms of what going to work will be helpful. This will be a great opportunity to get a larger group of faculty to give input that will effectively impact how the migration happens and how we use TracDat.

Anna Hanlon asked for questions and stated that they are seeking endorsement.

- o A senator suggested that for accreditation, they had to do one extra thing in program review, but it's not on the list. We had to address why the goal didn't work.

Kelly Holt noted that they need to include addressing goals that did not work. There is also a recommendation that we strengthen the way in which we address areas on campus where we don't meet an established benchmark. This would be something that the working groups would need to flesh out.

Motion 2: Senator Blair moved to endorse; motion seconded; motion approved unanimously.

B. BP/AP 7310: Anti- Nepotism – Senator Kennedy, Vice Chancellor of HR, Dr. Baeza and, Vice-Chancellor of Instruction, Dr. Serban:

Senator Kennedy explained that the original Board Policy (BP) that was proposed by the District was actually more pared-down than the one the Senate worked on last week, and so the details and proposed changes not necessary to a BP will be moved to the Administrative Policy (AP) Senate draft. Therefore, the BP we are reviewing today is the pared-down version with the proposed Senate changes for a board policy; we will go over the AP with the Senate proposed changes for an administrative procedure after that.

Senator Kennedy read over the policy, noting the proposed Senate changes in red, also noting that the blue strike-outs align with the Senate's proposed wishes. Overall, this is a general, broad statement about nepotism that most districts make. She asked the senators to make comments and suggestions after she reviewed it.

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">Coast Community College District BOARD POLICY Chapter 7</p> <p>Human Resources—Updated on 11/18/2019 as per OCC Senate discussions</p> <p>BP 7310 Anti-Nepotism</p> <p>Revision 10/25/2019 Administrative Procedure 7310 Anti-Nepotism Board Policy 7120 and Administration Procedures 7120 A-E</p> <p>References: -Government Code Sections 1090 et seq. The District prohibits the practice of nepotism: For the purpose of this Policy, nepotism is broadly defined as the practice of an employee or Trustee using his/her personal power or influence to aid or hinder another in the employment setting where there is a current or past relationship by blood, adoption, marriage, cohabitation, or domestic partnership (as defined in Section 297 of the California Family Code). Examples of relationships covered by this Policy include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ spouses ➤ registered domestic partners ➤ parents and grandparents ➤ siblings ➤ children and grandchildren ➤ in-laws ➤ any person living in the same home <p>This Policy is established to ensure that no employee or Trustee uses his or her their position or authority to influence the hirings, compensation, tenure, retention, transfers, promotions, performance evaluations, disciplinary actions, discipline, supervision, or work assignments of a District employee or independent contractor, or any other aspect of the District's day-to-day operations based on relationships defined in this Policy Administrative Procedure 7310. Employment actions shall be conducted in a manner which prevents partiality, preferential treatment, improper influence, or conflict of interest, or the appearance thereof. This Policy applies to all types of employment, including, but not limited to, full-time, part-time, temporary, student assistants, professional experts, and as well as independent contractors.</p> <p>Except as otherwise noted herein, this Policy does not prohibit the employment of relatives or registered domestic partners within the District. However, District employees and Trustees shall not participate in making recommendations or decisions affecting any aspect of employment based on relationships as defined above in Administrative Procedure 7130.</p> <p>Additionally, as a matter of best practice and to avoid the appearance of impropriety, this Policy prohibits the hiring, promotion, or transfer of individuals who have a current or past relationship by blood, adoption, marriage, cohabitation, or domestic partnership, with a current District</p> | <p>51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82</p> <p>employee or independent contractor at the District site, or one of the three Colleges, where the relative or cohabitant is already employed.</p> <p>Board Members, Trustees and the Chancellor, Vice Chancellors, Presidents, Vice Presidents, Internal Audit employees, and Human Resources employees bear a higher responsibility to avoid the appearance of a conflict of interest. Therefore, the District shall not hire any person with whom a current or past relationship by blood, adoption, marriage, cohabitation, or domestic partnership relationship exists, as defined in Administrative Procedure 7310, with a Board Member Trustee, Chancellor, Vice Chancellor, President, Vice President, Internal Audit employee, or Human Resources employee anywhere within the District.</p> <p>If any relationship covered by this Policy develops subsequent to being hired, the employees are required to notify Human Resources in a timely manner of the change in their relationship or co-habitation status. At the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor of Human Resources, the Board of Trustees may allow exceptions to this Policy under the following circumstances:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The relationship is not or will not create an adverse impact on work productivity or performance of themselves or others in the workplace; • The relationship does not or will not create a conflict of interest, or a perceived conflict of interest, that has a negative impact on the work environment; • The relationship is between two faculty members, and there is no indication of a conflict of interest or a negative impact on the work environment. <p>Adopted February 5, 2003 Revised August 18, 2010 Renumbered from CCCD Policy 050-1-1.9, Spring 2011 Revised July 13, 2016 Revised DATE</p> |
|---|--|---|

Dr. Baeza thanked Senator Kennedy for taking a lead in providing important input on the BP/AP from the Academic Senate; he stated that any further amendments to BP/AP, we need to receive those by November 26th. Dr. Serban noted that the blue strike-outs were suggested by the District Consultation Council Subcommittee on Board Policies and Administrative Procedures (DCCBPAP). The DCCBPAP will look at this new BP proposal on its last meeting of the semester, December 6, 2019. Senators asked a few clarifying questions about what language would be approved, and noting a typo.

Motion 3: Senator Gordon moved to approve BP 7310 Anti-Nepotism with additions, strike-outs, and typo correction for the BP number on line 45; motion seconded; motion approved unanimously.

Senator Kennedy presented the updated AP 7310 Anti-Nepotism, based on the feedback of what was discussed over the last two weeks and before in the Senate, and asked the Senate to comment after her overview presentation of the proposed procedural changes. She noted that she had added discrete, identifiable sub-sections for readability and referencing in the procedure:

1 **Coast Community College District**
 2 **ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE**
 3 Chapter 7
 4 Human Resources—Updated on 11/18/2019 as per OCC Senate discussions
 5
 6
 7 **AP 7310 Anti-Nepotism**
 8
 9 New – version as of 10-25-2019
 10
 11 References: Government Code Sections 1090 et seq. and 12940 et seq.
 12 California Family Code Section 297
 13
 14 **Section 1: Non-Discrimination.** The District will not discriminate in favor of or against anyone
 15 because of a family member's employment in the District. The District recognizes the potential
 16 for conflict of interest, claims of disparate treatment, and/or discrimination in the employment of
 17 relatives, as defined below in Section 2, in the same department or work unit or in a direct
 18 supervisory relationship.
 19 It is recognized that current employees' assignments may exist in conflict with this Procedure
 20 and that potential-conflicts could materialize after initial employment. Where such may occur,
 21 the Chancellor or designee will be responsible for determining the appropriateness of the
 22 assignment. The District will make reasonable efforts to assign job duties to minimize the
 23 potential-for-creating an adverse impact on supervision, safety, security, morale, or other
 24 potential conflicts of interest. The District retains the right to reassign or transfer employees
 25 where such assignments have the potential-for-creating created an adverse impact on
 26 supervision, safety, security, morale, or other potential-conflicts of interest.
 27
 28 No employee or Trustee shall use their position or authority to influence the hiring,
 29 compensation, tenure, retention, transfer, promotion, performance evaluation, discipline,
 30 supervision, or work assignment of a District employee or independent contractor based on
 31 relationships defined in Section 2 below.
 32
 33 **Section 2: Relationships;** Relationships covered by this Procedure are the following ones:
 34

- spouses
- registered domestic partners (as defined in Section 297 of the California Family Code)
- parents and grandparents
- siblings
- children and grandchildren
- step-children
- in-laws
- any relative living in the immediate household of a current employee

 42 ~~This Procedure prohibits such employees to be placed to an assignment within a department or~~
 43 ~~organization at a College or the District Office where the employee or the applicant for~~
 44 ~~employment would share the same direct supervisor, supervise another, or otherwise be placed~~
 45 ~~in a position with the authority to recommend or influence personnel decisions.~~
 46
 47 ~~Personnel decisions include appointment, retention, evaluation, tenure, work assignment,~~
 48 ~~promotion, demotion, or salary of the relative or domestic partner as defined by Family Code~~
 49

50 **Section 297.**
 51
 52 **Section 3: Reporting.** If any relationship covered by Sections 1 or 2 of this Procedure develops
 53 subsequent to being hired, the employees are required to notify in writing the Vice Chancellor of
 54 Human Resources in a timely manner of the change in their relationship as defined by this
 55 Procedure. At the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor of Human Resources, based on
 56 consultation with the Hiring Manager, the Board may allow exceptions to the Procedure only if
 57 the relationship is not and will not create an adverse impact on work productivity or performance
 58 of themselves or others in the workplace, supervision, safety, security, or morale; and the
 59 relationship does not and will not create a conflict of interest, or a perceived conflict of interest.
 60 Employment and transfer applicants may participate in the recruitment process and have the
 61 ability to be considered for an interview regardless of an existing relationship as defined in this
 62 Procedure. The Vice Chancellor of Human Resources shall not remove an applicant from the
 63 recruitment process prior to determining that a conflict of interest or a violation of this Procedure
 64 exists, based on consultation with the Hiring Manager.
 65
 66 **Section 4. Appeal Process**
 67 Each applicant is required to disclose on their application for employment if they have relatives
 68 employed for the District, as defined above in Section 2, that would affect the position being
 69 applied for, working in the District. If such a disclosure was made on the application for
 70 employment, after the application is submitted and reviewed by HR staff, the HR staff will
 71 contact the applicant and ask them to submit an appeal. The HR staff will also inform the Hiring
 72 Manager about the disclosure and the applicant who made the disclosure.
 73 Within two business days, the applicant will need to email to the HR staff who contacted them a
 74 written explanation as to how the existing relationship would not create an adverse impact on
 75 work productivity or performance of themselves or others in the workplace, and, how the
 76 relationship would not create a conflict of interest or a perceived conflict of interest through the
 77 recruitment process. The Vice Chancellor of Human Resources and the Hiring Manager will
 78 review the appeal and will consult in making a determination. The HR staff will inform the
 79 applicant of the decision in a timely manner which ensures the continuation of the application
 80 process.
 81
 82 **Section 5: Complaints.** Complaints about possible violations of BP/AP 7310 should be
 83 submitted to the Vice Chancellor of Human Resources. Violations of BP/AP 7310 may result in
 84 discipline up to and including termination of employment or disqualification in the hiring process
 85 and in accordance with the respective collective bargaining agreements, as applicable.
 86
 87
 88 Ratified DATE
 89

Senator Kennedy noted that Section 1 defines non-discrimination, since we have been objecting to blocking or prohibiting family members from working in the same department with another family member, as that is so broad (as departments vary vastly in size) and that's the reason for the line-out of the word "or" and its replacement with "in a direct supervisory relationship." Part of this was taken from Yosemite District's policy. Lines 19-22 are standard language in almost every policy. Lines 22-26 have the word "potential" removed to avoid predicting or "the crystal ball effect" that we had before. In lines 24-26, the language with "morale" is law, and lines 28-31 are moved up from a lower section.

She noted that in Section 2, Relationships, that area has the same relationships lined out from before; however, another prohibited relationship was added, the bottom bullet, which is standard in many college nepotism policies, regarding relatives, but not roommates, which it excludes. Lines 43-36 were struck out, as it was not clear what we wanted: Do we want to limit to direct supervisory relationships? Yosemite and others have an exclusion only to an immediate supervisory relationship, but even that can be excepted if reviewed and approved by the Chancellor.

In Section 3, Reporting, *lines 52-54 have been* problematic. We did not change the language because the language in sections 1 and 2 was narrowed down to direct supervisory or influencing personnel decisions.

In Section 4, Appeal Process, the union did most of this. We did recommend the text in blue, "in Section 2, that would affect the position being applied for." The rest is pretty much the way it has been. We removed "or a perceived conflict of interest." We may need to work on the timeframe of this.

Section 5, Complaints, as these are pretty heavy hitting and have not been altered too much, I don't think we can solve this today in our time frame.

Senators made these comments:

- The removal of the paragraph starting on line 43 could complicate this in getting implemented. We're close enough here, that there's some things in a negotiation process you have to take that are not perfect. If we leave it in, we're more likely to get a deal.
- What do we do about current situations? What if you have something that already exists with relatives working within the same department. Does this policy address that? (already addressed in the policy)
- Make it clear that an applicant can only state to the best of their knowledge, not absolutely.
- An applicant for a position in this district may or may not know that they have a relative in that employment area.
- If an applicant checks that box that they do have a relative, I'm concerned with the timeframe; it seems unnatural and not workable.

Dr. Baeza stated that one of the improvements of this proposed policy is the fact that no individual, when they disclose they are potentially related to somebody, is ever removed from the application process. They continue through the process; they disclose to HR; we evaluate and discuss with the HR director and the supervisor; they determine what is the relationship. Then if there is a conflict or a nepotism concern, then we remove them at that point and give them an opportunity to appeal. So never at any point is an applicant ever removed from that applicant pool until it is finally determined that there is a concern.

Dr. Serban noted that the applicant stays in the process. It's only at the end of the appeal process if the process finds a problem, that they are removed. In order to ensure the person in the appeal is totally resolved it needs to be fast enough that the search process is not slowed down to a point. Two days was what the subcommittee recommended.

- If we look at the last sentence of reporting and put a qualifier that would include the appeals, then I think it works better. That will make the statement a lot more definitive and allows the person to participate throughout the entire process. It's the other section that is more ambiguous. If we can get the appeals process to run, I think it works.

Dr. Serban noted that in Section 3 there are two paragraphs, the first paragraph is about people who have already been hired; the second paragraph relates to those who are applicants or may be transfers.

5. New Business

New business moved to next week's agenda.

6. Adjournment of the Regular Meeting

President Loren Sachs adjourned the meeting at 12:32pm.

Approval of the Minutes: November 26, 2019

MINUTES: First draft written by Michelle Ozuna, Administrative Assistant II, HR. Revision of first draft and Senate-approved drafts written by 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 Senate bylaws.

Voting Tallies Chart

| Mot 1 | Mot 2 | Mot 3 | Senate Membership |
|---------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|---|
| Consent | Comp. Eval. for Cont. Improvement | BP 7310 Anti-Nepotism | |
| Aye | Aye | Aye | Barnes, Carol: Counseling Senator (2018-2021) |
| Aye | Aye | Aye | Blair, Jamie: Senator-at-Large (2018-2021) |
| Aye | Aye | Aye | Brown, Cameron: Athletics & Kinesiology Senator (2017-2020) |
| Aye | Aye | Aye | Connor, Sean: Senator-at-Large (2017-2020) |
| Aye | Aye | Aye | Cuellar, Eric: Senator-at-Large (2018-2021) 11:34 arrival |
| Absent | Absent | Absent | Della Marna, Jodi: Lib & Learning Support Senator (2017-2020) |
| Aye | Aye | Aye | Denney, Matt: Technology Senator (2017-2020) |
| Aye | Aye | Aye | Drew, Rendell: Senator-at-Large (2017-2020) |
| Aye | Aye | Aye | Ely, Cynthia: Part-Time Senator (2019-2020) |
| Aye | Aye | Aye | Diogba G'bye: Part-Time Senator (2019-2020) |
| Aye | Aye | Aye | Gordon, Lee: Senator-at-Large (2019-2022) |
| --- | --- | --- | Hanlon, Anna: Curriculum Chair (Non-Voting) |
| Aye | Aye | Aye | Holt, Kelly: Senator-at-Large (2017-2020) |
| Aye | Aye | Aye | Isaac, Darryl: Con. & Health Sciences Senator (2017-2020) |
| Aye | Aye | Aye | Kennedy, Marilyn: Lit & Lang Senator, PDI Chair (2019-2022) |
| Aye | Aye | Aye | Lloyd, Douglas Math & Sciences Senator (2017-2020) |
| Aye | Aye | Aye | Means, Leland Visual & Performing Art Senator (2018-2021) |
| Aye | Aye | Aye | Neil, Jeanne: Business & Computing Senator (2019-2022) |
| Aye | Aye | Aye | Pena, Max: Senator-at-Large (2019-2022) |
| Aye | Aye | Aye | Phillips, Clyde: Student Services Senator (2017-2020) 11:34 arrival |
| Aye | Aye | Aye | Sachs, Loren: Senator-at-Large (2019-2022) |
| Aye | Aye | Aye | Stanton, Jordan: Soc & Beh Sciences Senator (2019-2022) |

