



Academic Senate Meeting | October 28, 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 Cha yakal , <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>	✓ Ana 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): Curtis Williams, Angelica Suarez, Sheri Sterner.

1. Preliminary Matters

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

Motion 1: Vice President Lee Gordon moved "To put New Business ahead of Unfinished Business."
There were no objections; the motion passed.

B. **Public Comments:** Curtis Williams.

C. Approval of the Minutes

Secretary Kennedy reported that October 21, 2025, minutes were unavailable as the draft normally provided by the Senate administrative support staff was not sent to her as usual. Secretary Kennedy was not apprised by staff support of administration as to why this occurred; she stated the E-Board would discuss the situation further.

President Drew acknowledged that Thuy Nguyen would be providing today's Senate meeting support and thanked her for her assistance in stepping in at the meeting.

D. For the Good of the Order

No statements.

2. Consent Agenda

There were no consent agenda items.

3. Officer, Senator, & Committee Reports

A. President and Vice President's Reports

1. President Rendell Drew:

ACCJC: President Drew summarized the Accreditation Coordinating Committee meeting held the previous day, noting that OCC is at a “very important, crucial point with the accreditation findings that requires our immediate attention.” OCC received three core inquiries:

- **Potential Commendation:** For the “regular review of meaningful disaggregated data” and effective planning processes.
- **Institutional Evaluations of Employees:** Requires additional documentation.
- **Regular and Substantive Interaction (RSI):** *Critical focus areas:*
 - OCC’s sample of online courses did **not** meet the 85% RSI threshold.
 - Only 11 of 17 courses (approx. 65%) met standards.
 - A second sample will be submitted for Fall 2025. It must meet 85% to avoid consequences such as probation.

Dr. Sheri Sterner informed the committee that if the second sample fails to reach 85%, the college will receive compliance recommendation and an 18-month accreditation approval. Continued failure would require repeated 18-month reviews and additional samples.

President Drew emphasized how critical it is that *we move beyond this point of noncompliance.* He stated *Coastline passed their RSI but GWC did not and that our faculty must ensure their online courses meet RSI requirements per the ACCJC rubric.* Faculty should upload RSI evidence—including activities occurring outside Canvas—so they are documented. VPI Giblin has already emailed faculty outlining immediate next steps. Division deans will convene faculty this fall to review and strengthen RSI practices. **Senator Becker** asked whether the reviewed courses would be identified and whether faculty would receive feedback. **Dr. Sterner** responded that the sample must remain confidential, per ACCJC. The only information provided was that *“11 of the 17 met RSI standards.”* Two reviewers evaluated each course independently before reconciling their findings. The rubric linked in Dr. Suarez’s email was used for scoring. No hybrids were involved in the sample. **Senator Kennedy** shared her past experience with the ACCJC reviewing her attendance sheets years ago where she had annotated with dots who was present and slashes who was absent, and smaller notes to herself. The evaluators were confused about the notations and she was asked twice to explain, but they had difficulty understanding them. **Dr. Sterner** noted that evaluators currently review only the Canvas shell. Any RSI occurring outside Canvas must be documented and uploaded for accreditation purposes. In response to a question, **President Suarez** explained that the ACCJC samples 20% of online offerings and emphasized the importance of faculty using the self-check rubric. **Senator Boogar** reminded senators of the seriousness of the accreditation risk: “Part of our requirement of having an online class is this RSI. That’s non-negotiable.” He encouraged senators to discuss RSI with their divisions to support compliance. **Senator Budwig** asked whether student–faculty emails routed through Outlook from Canvas count as RSI evidence. It was clarified that evaluators do not automatically have access to email communications, but such documentation may be uploaded as supplemental evidence.

2. **Vice President Gordon:** He reported on behalf of the Business and Computing Division, highlighting the value of the Computing Center. He stated that it provides a valuable service to our students. He would like to see that service continue.

B. CFE Union/Bargaining Unit Report

CFE Executive Director Vesna Marcina Kuo stated she did not have a report, but **Senator Becker** reported that she is working on a subcommittee, as part of the union, to look for faculty members who would be interested in having a District board member attend their class. She noted that this applies to faculty who teach lecture–lab courses and explained that the subcommittee is looking at unit parity between lecture and lab. The goal is for a board member to observe what actually goes on in lecture–lab. Interested faculty were encouraged to contact Senator Becker.

C. SGOCC Student Senate Report:

SGOCC Student Senator Ana Huynh invited the senators to attend an upcoming Student Senate meeting to discuss a potential resolution on financial aid regulations and to get faculty perspectives, Friday, 9-11, with public forums from 9:05 to 9:15, and again at 10:50.

D. Curriculum Committee

Curriculum Chair Lannom deferred his commentary until the Senate Business item on *catalog language*.

Senator Boogar asked if it is still the practice of the Curriculum Committee to invite those departments whose courses are up for discussion to the meeting, as he saw on the agenda for this week that some of the courses he submitted are there, and some aren't, even though they were all launched at the same time and are at the same point in the queue. He had not received any communication and was asking about the new system protocol. **Chair Lannom** stated that they are still trying to figure that out, as there have been some issues. The practice has been and remains that if there's new courses or massive changes to a course, they generally invite the faculty to the review meeting to address committee comments and concerns. The goal is that the courses are ready to go by the time they reach the voting meeting.

E. Academic Standards Committee:

Academic Standards Committee Chair Paxton reported that the first AI Communities of Practice meeting was held on Thursday from 10–11:30 a.m. with fifteen participants via Zoom. The meeting reviewed the structure of the program, which will continue monthly to support faculty in addressing AI-related issues. He added that the group also presented to the Associated Students of OCC to do a student forum regarding AI. The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, November 20, 10–11:30 a.m. on Zoom.

F. Online Advisory Board:

Online Advisory Board Member Lauren Becker provided an extensive update on RSI (Regular and Substantive Interaction) requirements, stating that the OAB is looking for solutions for the RSI issue. She is creating a "cheat sheet" of items that must be in online synchronous or asynchronous course to make sure faculty are meeting RSI. She emphasized that OAB members are available to review courses and that this has to be done or we will be put on probation. She added that faculty must be honest when reviewing their courses: "It's not 'I think this is RSI.' It either is or it's not." Laura also noted the timeline is right now, fall of 2025, that they are going to pull the sample from. You can fix it now—after the semester's done, there is nothing we can do.

Senator Kennedy asked for clarification on RSI expectations for hybrid classes: "I teach hybrids... half of my coursework is in Canvas; the other half is either in person or on Zoom. Somebody said I need to document that to accreditation. What am I supposed to do? Do I record Zoom every time? What do I do with the in-person class?" **Dr. Sterner** stated that "The immediate answer is the sample that we will pull—ACCJC only wants fully synchronous online or fully online. No hybrid courses are part of this sample."

President Drew reminded the Senate that the agenda had been reordered to proceed to **New Business**, beginning with the first item under that section.

4. New Business

A. Endorsement of Faculty Hiring Ranking from IPC

President Drew introduced the item, noting that this portion of the agenda reflects the Instructional Planning Council's (IPC) finalized faculty hiring rankings for the 2026 cycle. A slide was displayed showing the **Round 1** and **Round 2** rankings, scores, and final totals.

President Drew explained that on October 15, 2025, the IPC concluded and endorsed its second round of rankings. All 19 members submitted their Round 1 ratings, and 14 members submitted Round 2 ratings.

There were 51 full-time instructor requests; the top five ranked positions were presented:

1. Radiological Technology Program Director
2. Radiological Technology Program Coordinator
3. Diagnostic Medical Sonography Clinical Coordinator/Instructor
4. Professional Mariner Faculty
5. Electronics Faculty

President Drew explained the Rankings Sheet: “You see where it says R1, R2, and then the score... Dr. Sterner’s office put all these ratings together. This year’s rankings included information about the recently discussed swirl... and high waitlist numbers as well.” He emphasized that the rankings incorporated waitlists greater than 100, as well as information on licensure requirements and accreditation impacts.

Dr. Sterner stated “What’s different is that IPC brought back those Ranking 1 and Ranking 2 formally... going back to an older model. The last three columns you see were meant as a help to maybe overlay what the board of trustees’ criteria is for considering positions.” In response to a question, Dr. Sterner explained that zeroes were applied for Round 2 but did not create inequities since all had completed Round 1.

Senator Boogar acknowledged the IPC for their extensive efforts in completing the rankings and noting the work involved. He emphasized that his concerns were not with the committee members, but rather with the *overall process which has broken*. He explained that during his time on the IPC when he attended presentations and participated in ranking that he “witnessed exaggerated [comments] by presenters that didn’t reflect reality. I don’t begrudge anyone for advocating for their program to the best of their ability, and it continues to sicken me that we have to beg for scraps and fight each other just to protect the health of our programs.” He stated that data, facts, and practical campus needs were not being adequately represented in this year’s scoring. “There is no voice heard during rankings that can present a balanced or campus perspective, and so those charged with ranking are left without a complete picture.” Because of these concerns, he concluded he would not support endorsing the rankings: “It is for these reasons that I will be voting against endorsing the IPC ranking.” He noted that regardless of Senate action, “I understand that regardless of our actions here today, President Suarez will be advocating for positions based on whether they meet the Chancellor’s criteria for hiring for these exemptions. Last year, we received the same number of positions as Golden West College, despite being notably larger as a campus and shouldering much more of a full-time faculty attrition. **Senator Kennedy** stated that the Literature & Languages Division supported Senator Boogar’s concerns and she shared several email comments from her division and noted that several people suggested the people who are ranking aren’t trained in reading data-driven numbers, and that is problematic. Additionally, hires needed by state certifications are included in the rankings when they should not be. Ultimately, the methods for ranking are missing what the heart of our institution is about, academic learning.

Motion 2: Vice President Gordon moved to extend the meeting by 10 minutes. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

Vice President Gordon remarked that “The process of full-time faculty hiring prioritization rankings should be 100% faculty-driven... This is the planning process — the real planning process — that determines where the college is going for the next 30 years.” **Senator Ball** asked what action could be taken to move toward a faculty-driven process. **Vice President Gordon** responded that the Senate signed an agreement adopting the current process. **Senator Sheehan** expressed concern about campus morale: “I don’t want to say yes to this. I want better representation to the board that this is not okay.” **Senator Becker** stated that in her experience she did not know if all members took it as seriously as they should as she saw five people not voting in the second ranking. She also requested clarity on how enrollment and accreditation data should inform rankings.

Motion 3: Senator Boogar moved “That the Senate does not endorse — in other words, rejects — the full-time faculty hiring rankings.” Vice President Gordon seconded.

Senator Boogar stated “I just want everyone to understand the significance of voting yes on this now, is to reject the ranking. At our campus, the president is endowed with the authority to make whatever recommendations she chooses. That's true whether we approve the IPC ranking or don't approve the IPC ranking. So, to vote yes would be to say, in some sense, give more authority to the president to select which positions that she's going to advocate for, because there is no official faculty voice, although there is the IPC-endorsed ranking. Still, it is not ranked, it is not supported by the faculty, so I want everyone to understand the significance of what that means. It doesn't really change authority or anything official but does sort of symbolically mean that the President can still move ahead, even if we do not endorse”.

Senator Ely added that she will be in support of the motion, because the top ranking on there is an accreditation issue. It negates this whole thing, because there's a hiring freeze. That's the bigger problem.”

Senator Barnes added that the top items were licensed programs that would be lost if positions were not hired.

Motion 4: Senator Chaiyakal moved to amend the motion by adding: “Our President should be advocating to remove the hiring freeze for both faculty and for staff.” The amendment was seconded and approved.

Motion 3, As Amended: Roll Call Vote: “The Senate does not endorse—in other words, rejects—the full-time faculty hiring rankings. Our President should be advocating to remove the hiring freeze for both faculty and for staff.” Motion passed.

B. 10 + 1 and Why It Matters, presented by Senator Kennedy.

Senator Kennedy presented a Power Point review entitled “What Is the 10 + 1 and Why Does It Matter? She cited California law, explaining the historical foundation and practical implications of the “10 + 1.” She stated she was asked to present to clarify what we are doing here in the Senate, what our power is, and what to do if shared governance is not followed as per AB 1725. Her research was taken from the ASCCC and “Legal Advisory Regarding Shared Governance (Legal Opinion M 07-20)

She explained that AB 1725 (1988) established the modern shared governance structure for California community colleges: “In 1988, California AB 1725 was signed into law, which created the power and purview of the Academic Senate in sharing the governance and decision-making with the administration and the Board of Trustees.” The Senate holds two types of rights and obligations in shared governance matters—*rely primarily* and *mutual agreement*. For *rely primarily*, the Senate provides judgment and advisement to the Board of Trustees; for *mutual agreement*, both parties must come to a mutual agreement or things stay as they are. There are exceptions to these rules.”

At Coast CCD, seven of the 10+1 areas are designated as *rely primarily*, per District Policy 2510, meaning the Board is expected to accept the Senate’s recommendations in those areas except under rare “exceptional circumstances and compelling reasons.” Senator Kennedy listed the seven areas where faculty judgment carries primary authority: curriculum, degree and certificate programs, educational program development, standards or policies regarding student success and preparation [CPOS], Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation, policies for professional development, Processes for program review. The remaining three areas fall under *mutual agreement*, requiring both Senate and Board approval: grading policies, college and district governance structures as related to faculty roles, institutional planning and budget development. “Rely primarily is advice and judgment of our professional expertise. Mutual agreement is the Senate and the Board agree together.”

Do These Regulations Have the Force of Law?

“Yes, if a district board does not make a good faith effort and does not ultimately abide by these regulations it would be in violation of the law.”

“The statewide Academic Senate may be contacted for useful advice and direct support” if a local senate “feels that it has exhausted all sincere internal efforts to work cooperatively with the local governing boards and believes the regulations continue to be ignored.”

“If the local academic senate believes that there is clear and consistent noncompliance, the local senate may contact the Legal Affairs Division of the Chancellor’s Office and file a written complaint”

Goal: The OCC Academic Senate should move towards strong and consistent communication with the administration as per the 10 + 1. The goal is a fully functioning shared governance process working together collegially.

10

The Senate Has Been Legally Granted Authority to Follow Through

Senate’s Responsibility

It is the Senate’s responsibility to make sure there is accountability to the 10 + 1 by the Administration in having the Senate’s voice heard in both “rely primarily” and “mutual agreement” issues.

Administration’s Responsibility

The BOT is required to adopt policies and procedures on the 10 + 1 by either “rely primarily” or “mutual agreement.”

Must “normally accept” advice and judgment of senate over other groups for “rely primarily”—except for “exceptional circumstances” and “compelling reasons”—upon Senate request, these explanations must be put in writing

For “mutual agreement,” there must be mutual consent or the existing policy cannot be changed—unless of exposure to legal liability or financial hardship.” If there is no existing policy the BOT may act if it has made “good faith efforts” and there are “compelling legal, fiscal, or organization reasons” why it must do so.

9

Title 5 Requirements: Title 5 §53203: “A governing board shall adopt policies delegating authority and responsibility to its academic senate... Policies shall be adopted through collegial consultation with the Academic Senate.”

She highlighted the legal force behind the regulations: “When rely primarily, the recommendation of the Academic Senate will normally be accepted, and only in exceptional circumstances and for compelling reasons will they not be accepted.” She added that in cases of mutual agreement: “If an agreement has not been reached mutually, the existing policy remains in effect except in cases of legal liability or fiscal hardship.”

Senator Kennedy explained that the Senate has both authority and responsibility to ensure compliance: “It’s our duty to make sure we don’t merely advise or mutually agree, but to follow up to ensure those do happen. Noncompliance has legal consequences: “If a district board does not make a good faith effort and does not ultimately abide by these regulations, it would be in violation of the law.” Finally, she noted that if the Senate exhausts internal processes, it may file a formal complaint with the Legal Affairs Division of the Chancellor’s Office.

C. Catalog Rights Update – Michael Lannon

Curriculum Chair Micael Lannon explained that counselors—particularly those working with Allied Health Programs—proposed adjustments to catalog rights language due to complications caused by recent GE pattern changes. “There have been cases where a student who is on the waiting list to get into one of the allied health cohorts has lost catalog rights because they were on the waiting list for the program, but they weren’t continuously enrolled.”

“The purpose of this language is to solve that problem and allow students in those programs, if they’re on one of the waitlists, to maintain their catalog rights until they’re accepted into the Allied Health Program.” Due to time constraints, he requested feedback to him as this issue will be taken up at the next Curriculum Committee meeting.

President Drew asked for confirmation that it would return to Senate.

Chair Lannon confirmed that, “Absolutely... We will draft our suggestions, and I will bring it back to this body, for sure.”

Motion 5: Senator Ball moved to reorder the agenda to discuss the Financial Aid Issue [under item “Senate Action on Shared Governance Concerns”] rather than moving to the “Caring Campus” agenda item; seconded; approved.

D. Senate Action on Shared Governance Concerns

Senator Ball explained that he knew how passionate the Senate feels about this issue and the Senate has never taken an official position, despite our discussions.

Motion 6: Senator Ball moved that “We demand that the District Board rescind their financial aid policy and we work with the Student Senate to craft a resolution reflecting that demand.” The motion was seconded.

Senator Boogar noted that “Senator Ball is correct as it is on the agenda as Senate Action on Shared Governance.”

Motion 7: Vice President Gordon moved to extend the meeting by three minutes; seconded; motion passed.

Senator Barnes commented that the financial aid issue is now a law and it is not going to go away, and it will not go away just because we want it to.

Roll Call Vote Was Taken: Motion 6 passed.

5. Unfinished Business

Caring Campus for Faculty

Program Viability

6. Adjournment

President Drew adjourned the meeting at 12:33 PM.

Minutes

MINUTES: First draft written by Senate Administrative Support Staff. 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, District Audit Director, union presidents, GWC and Coastline Academic Senate presidents, OCC College President, and faculty as per OCC Senate bylaws.

Senate Members/Voting Tally Chart

	Mot 1: Move New Business	Mot 2: Extend Time	Motion 3: as Amended	Mot 4: Amend Motion 3	Mot 5: Reorder Agenda Back to Financial Aid Isse (under item Shared Governance Concerns)	Mot 6: Demand the BOT Rescind its Financial Aid Policy and Work with Student Senate to Craft Resolution. . .	Mot 7: Extend Time
Ball, Jason: (2025-2026)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Barnes, Carol: (2024-2027)	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Becker, Lauren: (2023-2026)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Yes
Blystone, Allissa: (2023-2026)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Yes
Boogar, Tyler: (2023-2026)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Yes
Budwig, Eric: (2023-2026)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Yes
Chaiyakal, Jenny: (2025-2028)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Della Marna, Jodi: (2023-2026)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Yes
Drew, Rendell: (2023-2026)	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Abstain	Yes	Abstain	Yes
Ely, Cyndee: (2025-2026)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Gonzalez, Carly: (2024-2027)	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent
Gordon, Lee: (2025-2028)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Kennedy, Marilyn: (2025-2028)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Lannom, Michael: Non-Voting							
Laux, Mickey: (2025-2028)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Yes
Legaspi Kiaha, Jodie: (2023-2026)	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Yes

McCarroll, Kate: (2024-2027)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Naesse, Irene: (2023-2026)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Paxton, Leland: (2025-2026)	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Sheehan, Katherine: (2024-2027)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Stanton, Jordan: (2025-2028)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Huynh, Ana: Non-Voting (Fall 2025)							
Vacant: Senator-at-Large (2023-2026)							
Vacant: Senator-at-Large (2024-2027)							