

## Academic Senate Member Attendance

\* Please see the Voting Tally Chart after these minutes for individual members' votes and attendance roster notations.

✓ <b>Jason Ball</b> , <i>Part-Time Faculty</i>	✓ <b>Lee Gordon</b> , <i>Business &amp; Computing, Vice President</i>
✓ <b>Carol Barnes</b> , <i>Counseling</i>	✓ <b>Marilyn Kennedy</b> , <i>Lit &amp; Lang, PDI Chair, Secretary</i>
✓ <b>Lauren Becker</b> , <i>Consumer &amp; Health Sciences</i>	✓ <b>Mike Lannom</b> , <i>Curriculum Chair (non-voting)</i>
✓ <b>Allissa Blystone</b> , <i>Math &amp; Sciences</i>	✓ <b>Mickey Laux</b> , <i>at-Large</i>
<b>Tyler Boogar</b> , <i>at-Large, Parliamentarian</i>	✓ <b>Kate McCarroll</b> , <i>at-Large</i>
✓ <b>Eric Budwig</b> , <i>Technology</i>	✓ <b>Irene Naesse</b> , <i>at-Large</i>
✓ <b>Jenny Chaiyakal</b> , <i>at-Large</i>	✓ <b>Leland Paxton</b> , <i>Part-Time Faculty</i>
* <b>Jodie Della Marna</b> , <i>Library</i>	✓ <b>Katherine Sheehan</b> , <i>Visual &amp; Performing Arts</i>
✓ <b>Rendell Drew</b> , <i>at-Large, President</i>	✓ <b>Jordan Stanton</b> , <i>Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences</i>
✓ <b>Cyndee Ely</b> , <i>Part-Time Faculty</i>	<b>Anna Huynh</b> , <i>ASOCC Representative (non-voting)</i>
✓ <b>Carly Gonzalez</b> , <i>at-Large</i>	<b>Vacant</b> , <i>at-Large</i>
<b>Joel Gonzalez</b> , <i>Athletics &amp; Kinesiology</i>	<b>Vacant</b> , <i>at-Large</i>

**Guests (Optional & Voluntary Sign-In):** Eric Cuellar, Tara Giblin, Jeanette Grimm, Kayla LaBounty, John Fawcett, Kelly Holt, Melissa Broox, Andrea Serban, Anna Butler, Arabian Morgan, Cora Volkoff, Don Carlson, Erin Gratz, Heather Coddling, Heather Dy, John Taylor, JohnPaul Nguyen, Larissa Nazarenko, Laura Reece, Laurie Campbell, Maryann Watson, Melissa Rowden, Michael Mandelkern, Rich Pagel, Robert Schneiderman, Shannon Quihuiz, Sue Harlan, Vesna Kuo

## 1. Preliminary Matters

- A. **Call to Order: President Drew** called the meeting to order at 11:30 A.M.
- B. **Public Comments:** Jeanette Grimm, Tara Giblin.
- C. **Approval of the Minutes**

**Secretary Kennedy** stated that due to a request for some larger changes, she would resend out the November 4, 2025, draft minutes with those proposed changes.

**Motion 1: Secretary Kennedy moved to approve the December 9, 2025, minutes; seconded; approved.**

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

**Senator Laux** stated there were significant temperature fluctuations in his chemistry lab during the labs, noting that room temperatures were recorded in the low 60s and up to 100 degrees Fahrenheit depending on the season and often during classes. It is affecting the chemistry students' lab work and results, and impeding/disrupting their learning process.

## 2. Consent Agenda

None.

## 3. Officer, Senator, & Committee Reports

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

1. **President Drew's Report: Flex Day:** Reminded faculty of upcoming Flex Day activities and that there will be an AI workshops from various perspectives, and his colleagues Senator Kennedy [with Senator Naesse] and Professor Kuo are presenting some. **Committees:** He requested that more faculty volunteer to be on committees as Senate representatives to ensure the faculty voice is heard. The committee interest form will be redistributed clarifying that current openings are for full-time or part-time faculty.
2. **Vice-President Gordon's Report:** No report.

#### **B. Union/Bargaining Unit Report**

**CFE OCC Executive Director Vesna Kuo** announced that the union's Flex Day workshop will be held at 8:00 a.m. instead of 1:00 p.m. due to scheduling conflicts, noting that **CFE President Rob Schneiderman** must attend meetings at Golden West, Coastline, and OCC all on that day. She stated that CFE has calls for faculty volunteers on hiring committees for the Vice President of Administrative Services, Dean of Social and Behavioral Sciences, and Dean of Health Sciences positions and the deadline is tomorrow.

#### **C. Reports and Updates on Faculty and Student Engagement and Activities**

**Communities of Practice for Part-Time Faculty and Caring Campus Open House Series: Part-Time Senator Ely** reported on the Caring Campus that it is highlighted in the Communities of Practice for Part-Time Faculty email. The part-time faculty also discussed how to increase attendance and expressed appreciation for the stamp card drawing incentive. The Caring Campus is similar to the Annual Progressive Dinner Walking Tours previously hosted through Communities of Practice, which have been well-attended and well-appreciated events. **Flex Coordinator Blystone** noted that part-time faculty receive Flex credit for attending Communities of Practice events.

#### **D. Curriculum Committee:**

**Curriculum Chair Michael Lannom** reported that the Curriculum Committee held its first voting meeting of the semester, addressing unit alignments and new courses. A tech review meeting is scheduled tomorrow at Faculty House.

#### **E. Flex Committee:**

**Faculty Flex Coordinator Blystone** reminded faculty to register for Thursday's Flex Day.

**Senator Becker** shared that some evening part-time faculty were concerned that they had not received Flex options for that time. She asked for clarification about eligibility and requirements for part-time faculty.

**Coordinator Blystone** explained that participation was based on volunteer sign-ups and scheduling availability. She noted that extensive online options are available, including a minimum of 12 hours of Flex on Demand recordings, three additional hours tied to the keynote speaker series and workshop, and at least ten more hours of programming. She confirmed that the CFE deadline is March 15, with her reporting deadline on April 1, and said she would follow up with an email reminder. In response to a question about whether part-time faculty may complete additional hours beyond their obligation, Coordinator Blystone confirmed they may apply through PDI for up to three additional hours paid at the non-instructional rate. **PDI Chair Marilyn Kennedy** clarified

that contractually only full-time faculty can be granted PDI salary advancement credits for verified over-the-maximum Flex hours if they submit that to PDI directly.

#### 4. Unfinished Business

##### A. **Faculty MOUs for OCC Peer Course Review Coordinator, OCC Flex Coordinator, OCC Honors Program Coordinator, OCC Online Learning & Pedagogical Innovation Coordinator:**

**President Drew** explained that concerns were raised last week regarding the proposed MOUs advancing without language indicating appropriate Senate consultation; therefore, language was added to each MOU stating that the coordinator works “in close consultation with the Academic Senate” and reports directly to the OCC VPI or designee. He noted this addition addressed a key Senate concern and invited Senator Kennedy to add any further comments.

**Senator Kennedy** thanked President Drew and VPI Tara Giblin for the prompt communication and response to this concern, and that prior language had been restored in the MOUs. She stated that the second concern, the same as in the last years, is that individuals listed as part-time instructors on the District public list were not teaching students at all or currently, or teaching workshops to faculty but not our regular students, and could be anyone, and should not be eligible for those reasons. She stated that the Senate requested that anyone selected for these coordinator positions be teaching at least three LHEs in credit-bearing classes, either online or in person, rather than only teaching workshops or performing non-classroom duties. She noted that VPI Giblin indicated agreement with this expectation in writing, though the language was not formally included in the MOU, and she sought clarification. **VPI Giblin** explained that the District would likely remove explicit teaching-load language if it were inserted into the MOU, as has occurred previously. However, she stated that she provided written confirmation to the E-Board supporting the selection of actively teaching faculty for these coordinator roles. She agreed that the positions are best served by individuals who are currently engaged in classroom instruction and understand instructional needs. She also reminded the Senate that the coordinator selection process includes two Senate representatives, who can help ensure this expectation is upheld. **Senator Naesse** asked for clarification regarding the District’s position, questioning why the District would object to including language in the MOU requiring coordinators to be actively teaching faculty. She asked whether there was a known reason for the district’s concern about that provision. **VPI Giblin** stated that she did not know and was sorry.

**Motion 2: Senator Ely moved to approve the OCC Online Learning and Pedagogical Innovation Coordinator MOU, the OCC Peer Online Course Review Coordinator MOU, the OCC Honors Program Coordinator MOU, and the Online Flex Coordinator MOU; all as amended. Seconded; approved.**

##### B. **Board Efficiencies:**

**President Drew** revisited the Board Efficiencies document which included the Board of Trustees’ shift from two monthly meetings to one and asked for feedback on the proposed changes.

**Senator Kennedy** expressed that the proposed efficiencies could undermine transparency and democratic accountability by shifting responsibilities to administration and away from public purview. **Senator Ely** stated her concerns regarding the constant repetition of “summary report to the Board that's not on the Board agenda, non-agenda items with no report to the Board.” It's fine if you want to do a meeting once a month, but you're going to be busier on that one night a month, because these are things, especially part-time hiring, that need to go through Board minutes.

**Senator Carly Gonzalez** asked for clarification about consent calendar items and how often they are pulled. **Vice President Gordon** explained that any trustee may pull a consent item for discussion at their discretion and this occurs. While consent items are generally approved as a group, individual trustees have the authority to remove specific items from the consent calendar if they wish to address them separately. **Curriculum Chair Lannom** noted that from a curriculum perspective, all curriculum approved by the committee must also be approved by the Board before courses can be submitted to the state for chaptering. While Board approval is typically routine, he expressed concern that reducing Board meetings could significantly compress timelines. He explained that new courses and programs may need to be submitted within the first few meetings of the fall semester, leaving limited opportunity for approvals later in the year. He cautioned that this could restrict curriculum development in the spring and create scheduling challenges.

**Senator Kennedy** stated that she had received similar feedback from her division. Further, even when items on the consent agenda are routinely approved, their inclusion ensures a formal, public process. She expressed concern that removing items from visible Board agendas reduces accountability and transparency, as actions may no longer be clearly documented or accessible to public review. She noted that without that visibility, issues could go unnoticed for extended periods, limiting opportunities for public comment or interaction. Additionally, as PDI Chair, this could create extended timelines for international conference travel approvals. **Senator Laux** asked whether shifting from two Board meetings per month to one would reduce the total meeting time. If they are the same length, the Board would effectively be cutting its working time in half. This would reduce efficiency if the Board is rushing through the processes it did with more time. He questioned how the same volume of work could be handled without compromising review and decision-making. **President Drew** responded that there were proposed redistribution of responsibilities, as duties previously handled at the Board may be shifting to the administrative side, including vice presidents and other administrators. This is the broader discussion about how the changes affect governance and oversight. **Senator Becker** said that given the way that things have come up in the last academic year, the urgency of issues to be addressed publicly for transparency and community involvement at the Board meetings, going from two meetings a month to one reduces the ability for public transparency, public discussion, ability to address emergency situations, and the other issues Senators have addressed. This pushes our ability to hire out which is already a problem. This pushes our ability to get verification for funding out. This really reduces our ability to do our job efficiently. If the Board is only meeting once a month, are we paying them half as much? **Vice President Gordon:** There are two different issues here that are being conflated. One is the regularity of their meetings. The second is the concentration of power in the hands of the administration away from publicly elected and publicly accountable officials. We have a committee that deals with issues of transparency and administration, the Transparency Committee. I think it would be very appropriate before we take any further action on this, if the Transparency Committee would look at the chart that was just shown here. There's a difference between flashing something here at a meeting fast, and what we get in the documents. I would like to see the Transparency Committee re-evaluate those documents and come up with something that's easier to read, that isn't redundant, that is a single, clear, transparent overhead, like we would use as instructors, that says, this is how it is now, and this is the change, so that we can see very clearly what they are doing, which is taking a lot of things that have been publicly disclosed, and taking them out of public disclosure. That is an issue of transparency. I am requesting that the Senate President refer this to the Transparency Committee before the Senate takes any further action, that it be agendaized when the Transparency Committee is ready, and the Transparency Committee come back and take it in a clear form and says, this is what they're doing. **President Drew** agreed that was a good recommendation and invited additional comments. **Senator**

**Chaiyakal** expressed support for referring the issue to the Transparency Committee, as in recent years, public comments were limited at Board meetings with speaker caps and procedural constraints, even when interest was high. She voiced concern that reducing meeting opportunities could further restrict public input and obscure where decisions are being made and who is gets to hear concerns. As a member of the Transparency Committee, she stated she would welcome the opportunity to review the matter more closely and provide an informed analysis. **Vice President Gordon** stated that not everybody goes to Board meetings. What has happened several times is there have been contentious actions by the Board that have elicited a strong public response. I can recall when it looked like there were sixty people who wanted to speak and the Board has a policy of allowing, I think it's five public speakers. Each one gets five minutes. This is where there are sixty people, all of whom have come prepared. In many cases each one will have a piece of a topic, and the Board absolutely refuses. In fact, we as a Senate, with our colleagues at the Union, have held special events, I think twice, where we have taken people who were not permitted to speak at the Board because of this arbitrary enforcement of their own rule. We've had to hold a special event for the very people who came prepared at the Board to speak. So, the whole direction is how you chip away at public accountability. I appreciate very much the Senator bringing that up, because I think not enough people are aware that that's exactly what the Board's doing. **Senator Ely** asked what is the Academic Senate's role in the approval process? Is this part of, does the Board have to *rely primarily*, if we say no, after this goes through the Transparency Committee? What is our process, to create a resolution that would have to go to the Board saying that we disagree? **President Drew** referred the Board efficiencies matter to the OCC Academic Senate Transparency Committee for review, noting that several committee members were present and would take up the issue for analysis. President Drew stated the issue would be formally referred and noted the Board is expected to revisit the matter on April 15, 2026, with a request for a preliminary committee report prior to that date. Several members supported referring the issue to the Academic Senate Transparency Committee to analyze the documents and produce a clearer comparison of “current process vs. proposed change,” emphasizing that the central issue is not meeting frequency alone, but the removal of information from public disclosure. **Vice President Gordon** suggested that if the Transparency Committee completes its report before April 15, a representative should present a summary during Board public comment. President Drew agreed. **Senator Kennedy** mentioned that about a year earlier our District Internal Audit Director had raised similar concerns with the Chancellor and the District. Overall, there are a lot of other Community College District boards that are going to once-a-month meetings, so we have to present more of an argument than just that. The issue isn't the frequency, it's a lack of transparency in terms of public access and review on how we know if something's approved, where we can access that as public members. I think that needs to be stressed, too. **Vice President Gordon** concurred with Senator Kennedy and that the move of the Board to once a month is a distraction that takes attention away from the real issue, the removal of information for public disclosure. **Senator Ely** agreed, as no report to the Board, not on the Board agenda. That means that we don't see it. **President Drew** noted that these are very fair questions. When there were two meetings a month scheduled, the Academic Senate presidents were responsible to report out on that first Wednesday of the month. Now we only have one board meeting a month, and with all these other concerns going around, it really is a cause for a concern or transparency. **Senator Carly Gonzalez** observed that the proposed meeting schedule—such as meeting on the first and third dates—could create gaps of up to six weeks between meetings, depending on the calendar, which could create problems. **President Drew** stated that these scheduling concerns would be part of the Transparency Committee's review and noted that the Senate was not included in the initial discussions or decisions regarding the change. The Board efficiencies matter will be agendized for future discussion to ensure continued Senate input. He

committed to consulting with the Academic Senate presidents at Golden West and Coastline to understand how their campuses are responding and to report back. He also confirmed that the Senate would request a preliminary report from the Transparency Committee prior to the Board's April 15 meeting. The item would be formally noticed at the Senate before being advanced to the Board of Trustees. President Drew noted that Academic Senate presidents report directly to the Chancellor, which allows the matter to move forward without going through other Board members.

## 5. New Business

### A. AP 3903 Safe, Responsible, and Ethical Use of AI:

**Senator Kennedy** stated that due to time constraints, she would do a quick review of the policies AP 3903 and AP 4910. She clarified that the use of AI for these policies isn't about *sides*, as it is more complex than that: there are ethical uses with any new technology, those are the considerations.

**AP 3903:** At the last BPAP meeting, the committee pared back all of our colleges' faculty requests on policy 3903 to separate out faculty, students, and employees. They did add the words "ethical use" to this policy. However, on page 2 we still need some clarification on the plagiarism language, because it's worded poorly. On page 3, 5.2, addressing *noncompliance*, there is some undefined language about *unintentional* noncompliance versus *intentional*. It doesn't say if this section is addressing faculty or students, who makes those decisions, and what they are based on? Those were continuing concerns.

**AP 4910:** This potential/additional policy was provided to us by Vice Chancellor Fierro, and it's being used at Long Beach City College. It's from the Community College League of California, and we can use it, as it's already set up so we don't have to keep debating about this. We as faculty can fine tune this new policy to deal with our classroom and teaching issues. I received feedback from my division to line out the process by which faculty would have to state specifically in detail how they would assess originality of submissions. You shouldn't have to list to the students what AI detector you're using, or what methods you're using; It does state that faculty should use multiple assessments in determining if a work is original, which seems logical and fair. However, if you file a report, of course, that information would have to be included. Since AI detectors change their algorithms, they're different every semester, depending on the algorithm. Additionally, one of the things I learned from our student conduct officer is not to list things too specifically, because technologies change, and if you're committed to that in your syllabus, and you can't use something else, or you need to do something else, you're locked in.

Overall, this policy allows any faculty member on campus who wants their students to use AI to let them use it within the parameters defined by the professor in their syllabus; it would also allow any other variations, allowances, or restrictions for each class as the specific instructor, who is a discipline expert, sees appropriate.

As to *ethical use*, the higher education academic standard is that you require the students to cite their work and document how and where they used AI or any other outside source. That's done different ways with the MLA, APA, Chicago Style, etc. but it's like any other source. You cite it and say where you used it and how you used it.

If you have a prohibition against it, as many classes may do, you state that in your syllabus. I added a whole page to my syllabus explaining *cognitive offloading* and how it negatively affects critical thinking skills and cognitive development in my class and discipline.

If you want it to be used as a product in your classes, or for something that you are a discipline expert on, that's your personal choice. This proposed policy allows complete academic freedom per instructor.

**Senator McCarroll** noted that the policy talked about one of the repercussions for student use if it isn't permitted in a class, is to utilize academic support services, but the plagiarism module that students currently have to complete does not include anything about AI. **Senator Kennedy** said that she knew that and agreed with the senator. Senator Kennedy said she had lined that out that area and will request that it be removed. Not only that, but the educational use portion in the policy also acknowledges that we are an educational institution as that's what we do, we teach people; the teaching has to be about AI in an AI policy. However, after a student goes through the ethics training if they are found "responsible" a second time by the Dean of Students office, educating them over and over is the wrong approach as it is now about something else.

**B. Zero Textbook Cost:**

**OER Coordinator Melissa Broox** reported that the ASCCC continues to support Open Educational Resources (OER) and Zero Textbook Cost (ZTC) pathways to promote academic freedom and student equity. OCC has received \$525,000 in state funding to support ZTC conversion and currently offers twenty ZTC pathways, with about thirty more expected by summer. ZTC courses increased from 18% five years ago to 42% in Fall 2025, while Golden West College reports 72% with a goal of 100%. Faculty may receive stipends to convert courses by adopting, adapting, or using library resources that eliminate student costs. She clarified that low-cost textbook designations are handled by the District, not her office, and confirmed that library resources can qualify a course as ZTC. She plans to continue promoting stipends, supporting faculty projects, and offering workshops on ZTC adoption and OER use.

**Vice President Gordon** asked about low-cost textbook thresholds and designation. **Coordinator Broox** stated that is the District's purview and something they should be considering that designation.

## 6. Adjournment

**President Drew** adjourned the meeting at 12:30 PM.

## Minutes: Approved on March 3, 2026

**MINUTES:** First draft written by Senate Support, Nicole Ichiki. 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.

Senators & Voting Tally Chart	Mot 1	Mot 2
	Approve 12-9-25 Minutes	Approve Coordinator MOUs as amended.
Ball, Jason: Part-Time Senator (2025-2026)	Absent	Absent
Barnes, Carol: Counseling Senator (2024-2027)	✓	✓
Becker, Lauren: Consumer & Health Sciences Senator (2023-2026)	✓	✓
Blystone, Allissa: Math & Sciences Senator (2023-2026)	✓	✓
Boogar, Tyler: Senator-at-Large; Parliamentarian (2023-2026)	✓	✓
Budwig, Eric: Technology Senator (2023-2026)	✓	✓
Chaiyakal, Jenny: Senator-at-Large (2025-2028)	✓	✓
Della Marna, Jodi: Library & Learning Support Senator (2023-2026) * attended via Zoom, but address not posted on agenda—cannot vote/considered absent for vote or formal motions	Absent	Absent
Drew, Rendell: Senator-at-Large; President (2023-2026)	✓	✓
Ely, Cyndee: Part-Time Senator (2025-2026)	✓	✓
Gonzalez, Carly: Senator-at-Large (2024-2027)	✓	✓
Gonzalez, Joel “Bubba”: Athletics & Kinesiology Senator (2023-2026)	Absent	Absent
Gordon, Lee: Business & Computing Senator; Vice President (2025-2028)	✓	✓
Kennedy, Marilyn: Literature & Languages Senator; Secretary (2025-2028)	✓	✓
Lannom, Michael: Curriculum Chair; Non-Voting E-Board (2024-2027)		
Laux, Mickey: Math & Sciences Senator-at-Large (2025-2028)	✓	✓
McCarroll, Kate: Senator-at-Large (2024-2027)	✓	✓
Naesse, Irene: Senator-at-Large (2023-2026)	✓	✓
Paxton, Leland: Part-Time Senator (2025-2026)	✓	✓
Sheehan, Katherine: Visual & Performing Arts Senator (2024-2027)	✓	✓
Stanton, Jordan: Social & Behavioral Sciences Senator (2025-2028)	✓	✓
Huynh, Anna: ASOCC Representative; Non-Voting (Fall 2025)		
Vacant: Senator-at-Large (2023-2026)		
Vacant: Senator-at-Large (2024-2027)		