

Academic Senate Meeting | October 14, 2025 | 11:30 am - 12:30 pm
 Student Union 214 | Zoom Link: <https://cccd-edu.zoom.us/j/88213592749>

Academic Senate Member Attendance

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

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

Guests (Optional & Voluntary Sign-In): Tara Giblin, Jeanette Grimm, Kayla LaBounty, Angelica Suarez, Madjid Niroumand, Kathy Gilbert, Vesna Kuo, Andreea Serban, Heather Dy, Kathy Gilbert, JohnPaul Nguyen, Anna Butler, Laurie Campbell, Laura Reese, Arabian Morgan, Kara Jones, Renee DeLong

1. Preliminary Matters

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

Motion 1: Secretary Kennedy moved to approve the September 30, minutes. **Approved.** **Motion 2:** Secretary Kennedy moved to approve the October 7, minutes. **Approved.**

2. Consent Agenda

Vice-President Gordon requested to pull the College Council appointee item from the Consent Agenda. As per *Robert's Rules* Section 41:32, it will be placed at the bottom of New Business for discussion.

3. Officer, Senator, & Committee Reports

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

1. **President Drew:**

Faculty House: President Drew welcomed everyone to the Faculty House, the first Senate meeting since the renovation, noting the new audiovisual setup. He thanked Dr. Suarez and VP Rich Pagel for their support, and Senate Support Misha Wang for her coordination on the project.

Data Coaching: He announced an upcoming opportunity for faculty to participate in Data Coaching sessions hosted by the Institutional Research Office. The sessions will be held on Thursdays—October 23, October 30, and November 13—from 12 p.m. to 4 p.m. Contact Diane Brown or Lucy Gramby October 21, if interested. Those who attend will receive a stipend at the non-instructional rate. **OCC President Angelica**

Suarez stated that she would verify, but the funding is believed to be coming from the categorical funds.

B. Curriculum Committee

Curriculum Chair Michael Lannom noted progress in reviewing and approving new courses through the CIM. On Tuesday the committee will again be discussing residency requirements, with Dr. Sheri Sterner attending to share some data on graduation to help inform and guide their decision. There will also be discussion on new catalog language primarily affecting Allied Health students. The committee will hear a presentation on the proposed changes, and once additional details are available, he will report back.

C. District Consultation Council (DCC) Budget/OCC College Budget Committee

Senator Cyndee Ely provided a brief update on the DCC Budget Committee and the OCC Budget Committee. At this time there was only a re-presentation of the same financial budget presentation made to the board. There was no detailed report, but she will share that information when it becomes available.

D. Transparency Committee, CPOS Report (see full report in the Appendix of these minutes):

Transparency Committee Chair Irene Naesse presented the Transparency Committee Report, focusing on the District's recent changes to Financial Aid and the Course Program of Study (CPOS). She explained that the committee examined three key questions: (1) whether the changes to financial aid constituted a 10 + 1 issue, (2) whether federal mandates fall outside of 10 + 1 purview, and (3) whether the district violated 10 + 1 by excluding faculty from the decision-making process.

Question 1: The committee unanimously determined the changes to financial aid are a 10 + 1 issue. She noted that students preparing to attend OCC must meet with a counselor to determine their education plan and program of study—a state requirement. Counselors identify and document courses in DegreeWorks for students receiving financial aid, including courses outside of their CPOS, which may qualify for exemptions from federal funding restrictions. She stated that faculty are responsible for implementing the district's policy, and they work directly with students and have a perspective and expertise that administrators lack.

Chair Naesse reviewed that at the May 13th Academic Senate meeting, Vice Chancellor Serban had acknowledged the important role of faculty and the Financial Aid Office in this process. Nonetheless, faculty were excluded from discussions on how to implement these new procedures, despite multiple requests to be included.

Question 2: The committee concluded that while some regulations, such as FERPA, do not directly affect instruction or student success, others, like ADA and RSI, clearly do. The ten + one is absolute, with no exception for federal mandates or regulations—and that applies to state regulations as well.

Question 3: After reviewing statements from District administration, Counseling, and faculty, as well as feedback from the town hall and the Board of Trustees meetings, the Transparency Committee concluded that the decision-making process violated faculty purview under Standards 5 and 6 of the 10 + 1. Federal compliance was implemented without collegial consultation with faculty, which not only violates 10 + 1, but also the District's own Administrative Procedure 2510, Participation in Local Decision-Making.

Chair Naesse stated that the District had been working on this policy change for four years and that at no time during those lengthy discussions were faculty included, despite repeated requests. Department chairs and faculty were not informed of the changes until March 10, 2025—when implementation was already complete. She emphasized that there was still time to make this right and improve the transition for students. The Transparency Committee, the Counseling faculty, the Academic Senate, CFE, and students all recommended that the District postpone implementation of CPOS to allow for proper training, student notification, and resolution of technical issues. Instead, the District ignored faculty concerns and moved ahead with these changes, despite there being no federal deadline to do so.

Chair Naesse reported that the Transparency Committee met again on September 24, 2025, to review the draft report. During that meeting, Counseling faculty described how the CPOS changes were affecting

students. Many of the concerns raised in spring had come to fruition. Common course numbering errors were delaying financial aid disbursements, preventing students from purchasing books. Some student athletes could not count their three-unit athletics course toward their program of study, forcing them to “scramble to find a second eight-week class” to maintain eligibility and degree progress. This is especially difficult for students planning to graduate in the fall or competing for scholarships when they transfer. Counselors reported receiving calls from parents worried about their children’s ability to stay enrolled or compete, and some students are simply dropping out because they don’t have the financial resources to continue.

Chair Naesse suggested evaluating the issue with data in spring to assess the full impact of the changes. She noted that CPOS training for counselors occurred only one week before the start of the fall 2025 semester, which delayed their ability to assist students and troubleshoot issues. The technology available is unable to support these changes, explaining that counselors were creating workarounds so that students don’t have to visit multiple offices. Changes to course programs of study were often being made during drop-in visits, leaving no time for a holistic conversation and evaluation of student academic progress, not best practice. Had the District followed its own procedures and allowed the DegreeWorks Task Force to evaluate and vet the changes, many of these problems could have been avoided.

Compliance with 10 + 1 and inclusion of faculty results in better decisions and processes for supporting students—and this should be everyone’s goal.

Vice President Gordon commended the Transparency Committee for its thoroughness, diligence, and professionalism in preparing the report, noting that it was not the first time the Transparency Committee has found that the District is willfully ignoring its obligations for collaborative governance with the faculty.

President Drew noted that after last semester’s listening session, the Academic Senate had referred the matter to the Transparency Committee, which has now completed its report. He added that “another thing that happened in between was an MOU and asked if Senator Naesse could address that.

Chair Naesse explained that she did not have specific information on the MOU, as it might be outside of the Transparency Committee’s purview since it is more of a working issue with CFE. However, counselors who attended the committee’s September meeting expressed concern that the MOU’s language could place them in a position where they have to take punitive action against their colleagues if CPOS entries were incorrect. She noted uncertainty about who determines whether it’s entered correctly and what the standard is and said that while it was not directly part of the committee’s report, the issue was mentioned briefly because of its potential impact on faculty.

Senator Boogar added that the MOU had been discussed previously and was something supported by the union that they agreed to, emphasizing it is separate from the issue here. He clarified that while faculty may give feedback on MOU language when asked, the question of whether we like that MOU is distinct from how we feel about the District’s implementation and exclusion of faculty in the CPOS process. **Vice President Gordon** stated that through the Transparency Committee we have documented a clear pattern of activity by the District. They are not a series of isolated and unrelated incidents, and the question is no longer about particular incidents but what, if anything, we can do about the District’s fundamental refusal to engage with us constructively on issues within our purview. **Senator Chaityakal** asked Vice President Gordon to review the process that follows once the Transparency Committee presents a report to the Academic Senate. **Vice President Gordon** explained that the Senate has delegated its oversight and investigative authority to the Transparency Committee, noting that this structure exists largely because we meet for one hour once a week. Without the committee, he said, these investigations could overwhelm an individual one-hour Senate session. The Transparency Committee “holds hearings, conducts investigations, invites witnesses, and writes up its reports.” He emphasized that once it completes its report, it goes to the Senate, and it is up to the Senate to take action—if any—on the committee’s findings. **Senator Chaityakal** responded that her question was directed toward what the Senate intended to do with the recent Transparency Committee reports, noting, “We had a report last week, and we have a report this week. What is the Senate going to do with those reports?” **President Drew** stated that the next procedural step would be for the Senate to make a motion to accept the report—or not—of the Transparency Committee. **Senator Kennedy** said that what

happens after a report is varied. In some cases, it's actually resolved by the time it gets to the Senate, or it's in the process of being resolved. What is happening now is we're accumulating a lot of unresolved issues and now it is the Senate's responsibility to decide what actions to take, such as write a resolution, refer the matter to the ACCJC, present the issue to the Board of Trustees, or involve the ASCCC in having 10 + 1 counselors come down and help us with the District.

Motion 3: Senator Gordon moved that the Senate accept and endorse the report of the Transparency Committee on the District, and collaborative governance regarding course program of study; seconded.

Senator Becker asked for clarification regarding next steps, noting that last week's report has recommendations for next steps.

Chair Naesse stated that the current report did not include a list of new recommendations, as the original recommendation was to delay the process, and that didn't happen. Because the end of the semester was rushed when the issue first arose, the committee focused instead on meeting with counselors to understand the fallout of what had happened as a result of that original recommendation not being done, which was to postpone implementation to ensure students were informed and prepared. She stated that she would be updating the Transparency Committee's SharePoint site with the full reports and documentation.

Senator Ball observed that there were two separate issues: (1) the Transparency Committee's report about the issue and (2) the issue itself. He noted that it was important not to address the matter solely through the lens of 10 + 1 concerns. At the end of last semester, Vice President Gordon brought up how this fits into the overall vision, branding, and identity of the Coast Community College District, and that several faculty members had also raised questions related to race, class, and underrepresentation among those most affected by the District's policy changes. The Senate's overall resolution needs to be inclusive of the Transparency Committee's report but not limited to it. The Senate does not have direct administrative authority but remains the sole faculty body that can take political positions, make statements, and express preferences for larger issues that are out of our control. He referenced the prior listening session attended by approximately fifty faculty members, noting the feedback was pretty monolithic—faculty were not very divided about how bad this change is. There is an ongoing fundamental trust issue between the district and faculty, occurring at the district level repeatedly. Whatever action the Senate takes has to acknowledge that a breach of that level has occurred.

Motion 3 was voted on by roll call; approved.

President Drew discussed potential next steps, and one recommendation was for the Senate President to forward the report to the District and the Chancellor, and he asked for input on whether that was the appropriate course of action.

Chair Naesse suggested that the Senate consider inviting someone from the state-level Academic Senate to assist in resolving these ongoing governance and communication challenges. Ultimately, we want to be able to make better decisions.

President Drew acknowledged that this was not the first time the Senate had discussed contacting the state-level Academic Senate for assistance and that discussion could continue. He stated that since he meets regularly with the Chancellor along with the other two Senate presidents from the District on the third Friday of each month, that he has already submitted this as an item of discussion, and he would now be able to report out the action of what happened here today.

Chair Naesse stated that she would provide the full Transparency Committee report to **Secretary Kennedy** to be attached to the official Senate minutes [see Appendix].

4. Unfinished Business

A. OCC Academic Senate Resolution for Single District Transcript

President Drew provided an update on the Academic Senate's resolution regarding the proposed single district transcript. He reported that the topic was a major point of discussion at the District Consultation Council (DCC) meeting held the previous day, which he attended with Senator Naesse. Justin Smith, current Academic Senate President at Golden West College and former GWC Academic Senate President Damian Jordan introduced the proposal. Smith presented the idea of implementing a common transcript for the Coast Community College District, stating that it would benefit students.

President Drew reminded the Senate that former GWC Senate President Damian Jordan had visited the OCC Academic Senate in May to advocate for OCC's support in joining Golden West College and Coastline College in the development of a unified transcript. At the DCC meeting, Drew clarified OCC's current position: The OCC Academic Senate is not emphatically opposed to creating a single transcript; however, we would like to see an example of what it would look like to allow the Senate to address any concerns.

He explained that part of the discussion centered on ensuring the new transcript would clearly delineate the student courses and the units taken at the various colleges within our District, with each institution—OCC, Golden West, and Coastline—accurately represented on the document. President Drew noted that **Chancellor Whitney Yamamura**, who presided over the DCC meeting, stated he was leading the district-wide discussion and had already given approval to move forward with developing the common transcript. The vendor identified for the project is Parchment, which has been selected to produce the new transcript format. The earliest projected rollout date is spring 2026, possibly as soon as February.

During the meeting, President Drew inquired with Vice Chancellor Serban about whether new Board Policy or Administrative Procedure language would be required. She verified that we do not need to create any new language, as this falls under an operational matter. Student representatives from both Golden West and OCC were present at the DCC meeting and expressed strong student support for developing a common transcript. The concerns of the cost of a transcript continue to surface, but all three college presidents—including OCC's Dr. Suarez—independently voiced their agreement for the development of a common transcript.

He noted the need for continued collaboration and discussion among all three colleges and District personnel to ensure a well-designed and functional outcome.

Senator Boogar sought clarification on whether the District considers the decision to create a unified transcript—rather than maintaining separate transcripts for each college—to be an operational matter rather than an issue subject to 10 + 1 faculty purview.

President Drew responded that **Vice Chancellor Serban** had twice stated during the meeting that there was no need to create a BP/AP, confirming that the matter was classified as operational.

Motion 4: Gordon move to extend 5 minutes; seconded; approved.

OCC President Suarez explained that the Chancellor brought the topic forward to DCC because it is a constituent body that includes a faculty voice, and he wanted to hear feedback directly from the group regarding potential concerns. That is the participatory governance planning. Dr. Serban mentioned that this is an operational change. She added that she shared input from a previous Senate discussion, noting that she had heard from Linda Bagatorian, the faculty lead in the Transfer Center, as well as from Senator Barnes, regarding the importance of maintaining the Orange Coast College brand, in support of the common transcript. Suarez explained that faculty wanted to ensure that students applying for transfer don't get rejected because they don't have all their transcripts, and that the unified transcript would not negatively impact OCC's academic reputation nor its transfer success.

Vice Chancellor Serban clarified that what she said is that this is not a BP/AP-level issue. Issuing a transcript is a legal requirement, obviously, and the format in which the transcript gets to be issued is an operational decision—it doesn't need to be in a BP or AP. **Senator Naesse** said the most critical point from the conversation is that you have to have on your official transcript, every college designated, and the

courses taken at each individual college, in order for it to be a legitimate transcript. **Vice Chancellor Serban** confirmed, yes. **Senator Naesse** said that the District is not an accredited educational institution, and she stressed the importance of ensuring each college's coursework is distinctly represented on the unified transcript. It is of utmost importance for us to ensure that the classes students take at Orange Coast College are clearly delineated in a separate section, which would be the same for the other two colleges.

Vice Chancellor Serban confirmed that they wouldn't move forward with a district-wide transcript unless they achieved that particular format—that's a fundamental piece.

President Drew thanked Dr. Serban and requested that both she and the Chancellor keep the Senate informed on the project's progress. "We would like to have continual discussions if there are any concerns as we move forward with Parchment to develop the transcripts," he said. "We don't want to let the same thing happen again—lack of collegial consultation, lack of discussion, all the things that we're talking about. So please keep us informed moving forward."

Vice Chancellor Serban replied because of the queue of projects they have, they will not even start working with the District on this project until February. **President Drew** acknowledged her response, reiterating that the Senate wished to remain informed should any developments arise, and thanked her for the clarification.

B. ASCCC Resolution Packets:

President Drew reported on his attendance at the Area D meeting held on Friday, October 10, where he participated in the statewide Academic Senate's resolution process. He explained that he reviewed the materials distributed at the meeting, streamlined the packet, and provided copies to the Senate containing the resolutions currently under consideration for the upcoming Fall 2025 ASCCC Plenary Session, scheduled for November 6–8 at the Hyatt Regency in La Jolla. He reminded senators that "at both the state and local levels, academic senates employ the use of resolutions to identify and record the will of the body." When new issues or situations arise, the ASCCC Executive Committee collaborates with various area groups, committees, and task forces to develop resolutions for deliberation and adoption. These resolutions help set the direction for the organization as a whole.

President Drew said that the first group of resolutions dealt with curriculum matters, including proposed updates to general education competencies and degree requirements under Title V. He also referenced several specific items—such as Resolution 102.3 addressing climate, environment, and natural sciences options; Resolution 105.1 regarding open educational resources (OER); and broader efforts aimed at "increasing transparency." He mentioned that **Senator Becker** would also be attending the plenary alongside him and emphasized his interest in seeing OCC's Academic Senate take a more active role in the statewide resolution process, and that he would really like the OCC Senate to consider submitting a resolution. He encouraged senators to review the resolutions, noting that Misha Wang would send the full document to all members for reference.

Senator Ely requested that the Senate revisit Resolution 102.2, noting that it directly relates to competency-based degrees, as they were discussed at the Senate before, and the minutes could be reviewed for that information.

President Drew agreed and reiterated that there was still an opportunity to provide feedback or submit resolutions for consideration. "If anybody sees any of these resolutions that you'd like to chime in on, or even submit, we can still do that," he said, thanking Senator Ely for raising the point and encouraging her to follow up.

Senator Becker asked whether there was a deadline for submissions.

President Drew explained that the original deadline had been the previous Friday, but following the Area D discussions, the state-level committee had extended the opportunity.

Senator Boogar thanked President Drew for presenting the material and outlined several ideas for strengthening the Senate's engagement with the statewide process. "When there's an open call-out where we could be potentially making resolutions in the first place, I'd like the body to be aware of that," he said.

Boogar suggested that the Senate president could remind members when those opportunities arise. He also commended the inclusion of the item on the agenda but noted that the packet itself had not been attached. “I would love if this could be sent out to the Senate so we can all individually review it and see if there’s anything worth discussion,” he said. He emphasized the importance of ensuring that the Senate’s delegate represents the body when voting at the plenary. Connecting us more with that statewide process is a great first step—and those are some of the next steps I see. **President Drew** thanked Senator Boogar for his earlier comments and emphasized the importance of greater visibility for OCC at the statewide level. **Senator Gonzalez** expressed appreciation as well, noting her interest in learning more about state-level initiatives. “Out of all of those,” she asked, “were all of them moved forward to go to plenary, or was only one pulled?”

President Drew confirmed that one resolution had been pulled from consideration that was to encourage the Chancellor to facilitate training on the Equal Employment Opportunity Plan,” he said. “It was just kind of all over the map, and everybody decided to pull it.” He referred to resolution number four, titled Protecting Student Course Information Integrity and Preventing Last-Minute Course Attribute Changes, noting that it was “put on hold because it was convoluted.”

C. BP/APs for Discussion 3903:

AP/BP 3903 Safe, Responsible, and Ethical Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence:

Senator Kennedy presented the changes she had proposed and added to the draft of the policy based on faculty feedback she had received.

She began with the BP, noting that she replaced the phrase “academic integrity” with “employee professional integrity” to better distinguish between student and employee conduct, as faculty had asked her to ensure a clearer definition between students and employees or faculty. She added a “Student Integrity” section that specifies that “students must ensure that AI-generated content or coursework, *if allowed by the professor*, is clearly cited and does not violate copyright,” mirroring the citation and copyright expectations for faculty, but adding “if allowed by the professor” to be consistent with the BP/AP 5500 Student Code of Conduct in terms of specific faculty course policies. She clarified that a prior edit had removed too much of the shared governance language and corrected that oversight.

In the AP she explained that most of the revisions paralleled the BP but included additional clarification to avoid confusion for students. Faculty had shared with Senator Kennedy that if students had read this policy as originally written and proposed and then the Student Code of Conduct, they’re going to be confused. Some faculty were concerned that students might read this proposed draft, if finalized as it was, and say, “Well, I cited it, and it says in the board policy I just have to cite it.” The qualifying phrase *if permissible* clarifies that use of AI-generated content is only acceptable when explicitly allowed in the class course work.

The word “coursework” was removed in the section specific to employees or faculty and moved to the students’ area. On subsequent pages, she made parallel edits, inserting *if permissible* under the plagiarism section, and adding faculty and staff in several areas to clearly distinguish expectations for employees from those for students.

She explained that she also removed language referring to “intentional” or “unintentional” violations for faculty because many faculty were concerned about how that would be determined fairly across the board with employees or students. However, the Student Code of Conduct allows the Student Conduct Officer to make those determinations, and this wording will not alter that.

Senator Kennedy stated that her primary edits added academic freedom to the policies based on our CFE language and board policy for faculty, clearly delineated faculty and employees from students, and removed language that might interfere with the Student Code of Conduct or suggest students could simply cite AI-generated content without permission from the faculty teaching the course.

President Drew thanked Senator Kennedy for her thorough revisions, noting that her edits made the language much clearer.

5. New Business

A. Consent Agenda Item 2A – Participatory Governance Committee Assignment

Vice President Gordon explained that he had requested to pull the item regarding Academic Senate representation on the College Council and move it to New Business because “it’s my personal opinion that the Academic Senate’s representative to College Council should first be made available to incumbent members of the Academic Senate, because you’re speaking for the Senate on behalf of the Senate.” He added that, in his view, “it would make more sense to have that person first be a member of the body, and only in the event that no members of the body wanted to serve, then go through the fedora process.”

President Drew agreed that the reasoning made sense and provided clarification, stating that Irving Chavez Jimenez is serving as a representative on the College Council as a replacement for Nathan Jensen, and that Jimenez was representing the Instructional Management Council (IMC), not the Academic Senate. **Senator Ely** asked and it was confirmed that the item had been placed and consequentially pulled simply due to an administrative oversight.

President Drew shared a brief comment regarding committee participation. He noted that over the summer, he had worked with Misha Want on distributing information and identifying faculty members who serve on various committees. He added that the update would be brought forward as a future agenda item.

6. Adjournment

President Drew adjourned the meeting at 12:30 PM.

Minutes Approved on October 21, 2025

MINUTES: First draft written by Senate Support, Misha Wang. 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	Motion 1 Approval of Sept. 30, 2025, minutes	Motion 2 Approval of Oct. 7, 2025, minutes	Motion 3 Accept and endorse TC Report on CPOS	Motion 4 Extend Item 4A for 5 minutes
Ball, Jason: Part-Time Senator (2025-2026)	Aye	Aye	Yes	Aye
Barnes, Carol: Counseling Senator (2024-2027)	Aye	Aye	Yes	Aye
Becker, Lauren: Consumer & Health Sciences Senator (2023-2026)	Aye	Aye	Yes	Aye
Blystone, Allissa: Math & Sciences Senator (2023-2026)	Aye	Abstain	Yes	Aye
Boogar, Tyler: Senator-at-Large; Parliamentarian (2023-2026)	Aye	Aye	Yes	Aye
Budwig, Eric: Technology Senator (2023-2026)	Aye	Aye	Yes	Aye
Chaiyakal, Jenny: Senator-at-Large (2025-2028)	Aye	Aye	Yes	Aye
Della Marna, Jodi: Library & Learning Support Senator (2023-2026)	Aye	Aye	Yes	Aye
Drew, Rendell: Senator-at-Large; President (2023-2026)	Aye	Aye	Yes	Aye
Ely, Cyndee: Part-Time Senator (2025-2026)	Aye	Aye	Yes	Aye
Gonzalez, Carly: Senator-at-Large (2024-2027)	Aye	Aye	Yes	Aye
Gordon, Lee: Business & Computing Senator; Vice President (2025-2028)	Aye	Aye	Yes	Aye
Kennedy, Marilyn: Literature & Languages Senator; Secretary (2025-2028)	Aye	Aye	Yes	Aye
Lannom, Michael: Curriculum Chair; Non-Voting E-Board (2024-2027)				
Laux, Mickey: Math & Sciences Senator-at-Large (2025-2028)	Aye	Aye	Yes	Aye
Legaspi Kiaha, Jodie: Athletics & Kinesiology Senator (2023-2026)	Aye	Aye	Yes	Aye
McCarroll, Kate: Senator-at-Large (2024-2027)	Aye	Aye	Yes	Aye
Naesse, Irene: Senator-at-Large (2023-2026)	Aye	Aye	Yes	Aye
Paxton, Leland: Part-Time Senator (2025-2026)	Aye	Aye	Yes	Aye
Sheehan, Katherine: Visual & Performing Arts Senator (2024-2027)	Aye	Aye	Abstain	Aye
Stanton, Jordan: Social & Behavioral Sciences Senator (2025-2028)	Aye	Aye	Yes	Aye
Huynh, Anna: ASOCC Representative; Non-Voting (Fall 2025)				
Vacant: Senator-at-Large (2023-2026)				
Vacant: Senator-at-Large (2024-2027)				

APPENDIX

Transparency Committee Report: Finding of Fact

Orange Coast College Academic Senate Minutes May 13th 2025

Senator Gordon: *...The Transparency Committee has been commissioned to report on this to the Senate, and my question to the Vice Chancellor is simply, **is it your contention that there was sufficient and timely consultation with the OCC faculty on this issue before the email was sent to the students?***

Vice Chancellor Serban: *In my view, this is a federal regulation. We tried very hard to get to a point where we can use the systems we have, to better do the job, rather than how we were looking at this information before. **Implementing federal regulations or adhering to federal regulations is not a 10-plus-one issue. It's a federal regulation.** Things could have been done better; we could have had more advanced notice. I will take that on me, but in the end, I do want to underscore, this is not a 10 plus one issue. I will admit we could have provided advanced notice.*

#5 Standards or policies regarding student preparation and success

The first step for any student preparing to attend OCC is to meet with the counselor and determine their education plan (SEP). This includes choosing a program of study (CPOS). Identifying a program of study before registering for courses is a state requirement. For students receiving financial aid, counselors identify courses that are outside of their CPOS that may receive exemptions from being excluded from federal funding. Counselors make notes in DegreeWorks so that specific courses outside of the CPOS are eligible for federal funding.

Limiting federal funding for courses and certificates outside of the identified programs of study recommended by counselors, negatively impacts student opportunities in their career or at transfer institutions. This was articulated at the Board of Trustees meeting on May 7th during Public Comments by Dr. Sridhar (Sri) Sundaram the Dean, College of Business and Economics at CSUF.

#6 District and college governance structures, as related to faculty roles

Faculty are responsible for the implementation of the district's policy. Because faculty work directly with students they have a perspective and expertise that administrators lack. Their practical experience is necessary to incorporate into the counseling process to best support students in achieving their educational goals.

At the May 13 OCC Academic Senate meeting, Vice Chancellor Serban acknowledged the role of faculty, particularly Financial Aid Office, in this process. Yet the faculty were excluded from discussions on how to implement these new procedures.

“Which comes directly from the federal financial aid handbook. Another very important item is c. iv:

*iv. If courses are required for transfer or completion, or in the case of programs such as nursing, pre-requisites of the declared program of study, but they are not formally listed as part of the program, Counselors have been trained on how to add a note on the necessary course in the online Student Educational Plan (developed in DegreeWorks). **This allows the Financial Aid Office to review the note and override the system to include those courses in the calculation for federal financial aid.** Importantly, even if a course does not meet the eligibility for federal financial aid, it is still covered by state and institutional financial aid. Utilizing state and institutional financial aid, and, in some cases, their own financial resources, students can continue to explore additional subject areas and courses unrelated to their declared program of study.” ~ Serban, OCC Academic Senate Minutes May 13, 2025*

“We are offering any additional training one-on-one or individually. We have commitment from the three college campuses to augment the counseling hours in summer 25. We anticipate a larger number of requests from students for counseling appointments, and we want the counseling hours to be extended.” ~ Serban, OCC Academic Senate Minutes, May 13, 2025

The role of faculty in financial aid was further identified in the document Brief Course Program of Study and One Program of Study Starting in Fall 2025.

“...counselors enter a financial aid note in DegreeWorks to indicate why the course should be covered by federal financial aid (e.g., required for transfer). Financial Aid staff will review the courses which have counselor notes, and, if approved, will override the system such that these course are counted for federal financial aid.” ~ Serban, Brief Course Program of Study and One Program of Study Starting in Fall 2025

Does compliance with federal regulation fall outside of the 10 + 1?
--

No. Some federal regulations such as FERPA (Title 34, Part 99--Family Educational Rights and Privacy) do not affect classroom instruction, student preparation and success.

Compliance with other federal regulations such as ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, Title II Subpart A); RSI (Title 34 Part 600, 602, 608)

In this case, compliance with the federal regulation was implemented without collegial consultation with faculty.

Not only does this violate the 10 + 1, it also violates the board's own policy AP 2510: Participation in Local Decision Making.

10 + 1 Question

After reviewing statements by the CCCD Administration, Counseling and Academic Program Faculty, the Transparency Committee concluded that the decision making process “to more accurately track course eligibility for federal financial aid” (Serban, Brief Course Program of Study and one Program of Study Starting in Fall 2025) violated faculty purview of Standard 5 and 6 of the 10 + 1.

Faculty were not included in discussions of the process and denied collegial consultation.

#5 Standards or policies regarding student preparation and success Faculty set policies to support student readiness and achievement, including placement and remediation strategies.

#6 District and college governance structures, as related to faculty roles Faculty participate in shaping governance structures, ensuring effective faculty involvement in decision-making processes

Vote: Approve Date: 10-1-2025

How did the District Violate 10 + 1?

The district has been working on changing this policy **for four years**. At no time during the lengthy discussion phase were faculty included.

Department chairs and faculty were not notified until March 10, 2025 when the process was completed. According to OCC Financial Aid counselor, Laura Reese,

“She (Laura Reese) was not communicated with about any of this until March 2025. She asked earlier to be involved, and reached out to the Financial Aid Director, and was told that Counseling would be brought in later. When they were finally brought in, it was not to consult; there was no consultation. It was to tell them that “this is

what it's going to be.” The Counselors’ concerns were ignored. This will impact 30% of our students. That's not a small percentage.” ~ OCC Academic Senate Minutes 5/13/25

Counselors contacted the Vice Chancellor’s office numerous times with questions and concerns regarding implementation. Questions were not answered satisfactorily, and concerns were dismissed.

An example of the concerns being raised is the issue with new common course numbering. If the counselor entered the old course number which is now changed, will DegreeWorks recognize that or will this student be denied financial aid? The district maintains that there will be no problem, yet counselors are experiencing that DegreeWorks is unable to substitute the new course or the old one.

E-mail from Melissa Barrios (EOPS counselor) to Vice Chancellor Serban 5/7-8/2025

Barrios Question: *How do students receive Federal Financial aid for COMM A110. That course is not the accurate CCN, DegreeWorks does not allow us to put this on students’ plan.*

Serban Answer: *COMM A110 can be added to the student educational plan (SEP), and, once added, the display of the subject and number will be COMM C1000. While this is naturally confusing, COMM A110 is equivalent to CMST A110 and, therefore, will be substituted where necessary. Similarly POLS A180 is a direct substitute for PSCI A180.*

Barrios Question: *Currently, we are unable to input COMM A110 into DegreeWorks but that is the course that is showing up on students’ transcript. I understand that they are the same course but will Financial aid see COMM A110 as a Financial Aid eligible course if the “FINANCIAL AID” note is on COMM C1000 not COMM*

A110? We are unable to put anything other than COMM C1000 on DegreeWorks now. This is true for all CCN courses which is why I am asking if we need to advise students NOT to take CCN courses until this error on Degreeworks is rectified.

According to Laura Reese:

“DegreeWorks has a testing team to test changes. This did not go through that process.” ~ OCC Academic Senate Minutes 5/13/25

“DegreeWorks has critical limitations in handling the complexities of community college pathways. It struggles to accurately audit transfer scenarios, often overwrites student data when records change, and requires significant manual intervention to process multiple transfer pathways or evaluate transcript data. These

shortcomings reduce the system's reliability, increase staff workload, and undermine its ability to support accurate financial aid and educational planning for community college students.” ~ Reese email exchange with Serban 5/1/2025

Despite the serious concerns that faculty brought to the district, the district rolled out this new policy May 2nd at the end of the spring semester when many students had already met with counselors and completed their SEP for the Fall 2025.

Faculty and students attended the board meeting of May 7th to express their concerns to the Board of Trustees. Over 50 people submitted public comment cards, yet the board held public comments to 20 minutes. Student public comments at the May 21st board meeting illustrated the anger, confusion and misinformation the districts implementation of this new policy is causing.

“As there is no way to declare a sport as a student's official program of study, student-athletes could be directly affected. Schneiderman said there was an attempt to help student-athletes with this new transition, however, they will simply have to take more classes to receive the aid they were receiving before.” OCC Coast Report, 5/23/2025

The Transparency Committee, Counseling faculty, Academic Senate, and students all recommended that the District postpone the implementation of the CPOS. This would allow time for the Counseling faculty to be properly trained, students provided advanced notice and technical issues resolved.

According to the Chancellor there is no mandate or deadline by which this needs to be implemented.

“It is important to note that this is not a new regulation – CPOS has been in place for decades. Our efforts to implement CPOS are not in response to any proposed or pending changes to federal regulations” ~ Yammamura email 5/16/2025

Vice Chancellor Serban further stated,

“CPOS has been in place for decades. Our efforts to implement CPOS are not in response to any proposed or pending changes to federal regulations. Rather, we are now in a position to deploy the tools and systems needed to more accurately track course eligibility for federal financial aid, as required by existing CPOS federal regulations. Reaching this stage has required extensive collaboration and coordination across a large district-wide workgroup.” ~ Serban, Brief Course Program of Study and One Program of Study Starting in Fall 2025

That work group did not include faculty.

Students require proper timely notification to adjust course programs of study. The district must work with counseling faculty to determine a timeline that works with the reality of student schedules for meeting with counselors. A rushed and problematic rollout is leading to inadvertent mistakes and errors that negatively impact student success.

- Misinformation at the college and feeder schools (insert copy of flyer)
- Lack of opportunity for counseling faculty to properly vet and troubleshoot the changes in DegreeWorks
- Students on financial aid may transfer to neighboring college districts.

Currently, students on financial aid can choose to attend college at a neighboring district that has not implemented these restrictions yet. Only Cypress College and Mira Costa College are listed as implementing the same policy for Fall 2025. Students have a number of other options, including RSCCD, SOCCCD. Postponing implementation will encourage students to remain at OCC rather than transfer to a college in another district where more courses will be covered by federal financial aid.

Collateral Impact

The Transparency Committee met on September 24 2025 to review the draft report. Because the district chose to move forward with the changes to the CPOS, counseling faculty were able to share how students were being affected by the changes to CPOS.

Impact on Students

It is the nature of the community college that most incoming students do not have a program of study selected. Students are exploring various disciplines and careers. They are being forced to select a program of study when they are not yet competent to make that decision. This is not best practice.

Common course numbering is not reflected correctly and it is delaying student financial aid disbursement. Students are unable to purchase their books which puts them at a disadvantage and negatively impacts student success. This is not best practice.

Student athletes are unable to use their three unit athletics class towards their program of study. Therefore they are scrambling to find a second eight week class or other course so that they maintain both eligibility and work towards completing their degree. This is especially difficult for students who are planning to graduate in the fall or are competing for competing for scholarships when they transfer. This is not best practice.

Counselors are receiving calls from parents who are concerned about their child's ability to play their sport and complete their degree.

Students are simply dropping out because they do not have financial resources to continue their education.

Impact on Counseling Faculty

The counselors who were assigned to financial aid were not consulted.

The CPOS training did not occur until a week before the fall 2025 semester started. Therefore, counselors were delayed and their ability to assist students with the change to program and troubleshoot technical issues with the software.

The training was not provided by a counselor with practical experience advising students and using the software.

There is no software for the development of student educational plans that are specifically designed for community colleges. DegreeWorks is not compatible with community colleges and was designed for a four-year university. As a result, counselors have to create workarounds.

The technology available is unable to support these changes. Counselors are having to create workarounds to address the problems so that students do not have to visit multiple offices.

This has disrupted the workflow of counselor duties and time spent in consultation with students. Instead of having time for a holistic evaluation of a student's academic progress, the conversation is focused on change of program of study issues. Counselors must manually enter "Notes" to ensure students can receive financial aid for courses outside of the course program of study.

Changes to course program of study are being done during Drop-in visits. There is no time for a holistic conversation and evaluation of student academic progress.

A recent MOU places punitive consequences on counselors who do not apply the CPOS correctly. It is unclear what standards and who sets the standards that will be used for evaluating counselor use of the CPOS.

Impact on College Programs

Negative impact on completion rates students are unable to afford courses outside of the CPOS.



Scheduling and faculty load are affected by courses no longer supported by student financial aid.

Conclusion

If the district had followed its own procedures and allowed the DegreeWorks Task Force to evaluate, troubleshoot and vet these changes, many of these problems would have been avoided.

Report by: Irene Naesse Naesse Approved 10/01/2025

Submitted to the Academic Senate: October 14, 2025