



Date: October 13, 2023

10:00 – 11:30am

Location: Zoom call

Attending	Absent	Guest
Kara Rutherford, Chair	Allison Dickerson	Frank Payne
Tracey Crockett	Tim Peterson	Shannon Waller
Joshua Evans		Rachel Knox
Mal Sotelo, ASCOCC		Sharla Andresen
Nicholas Recktenwald		
Sara Henson, Faculty Forum		
Erin Foote Morgan, COCC Board		
Laurie Chesley, COCC President		
Kyle Matthews, Recorder		

Meeting called to order at 10:00 am.

1. Old Business/Information Items

a. Minutes from June 9, 2023 – Kara Rutherford

Motion to approve meeting minutes from the June 9, 2023 meeting with amendments.

Motion made by Joshua Evans, seconded by Kara Rutherford.

Motion passed unanimously by all members present.

b. Proposal to discontinue/remove all policies related to the Copy Center in the General Procedures Manual, 2nd Reading – Frank Payne

- Payne is assuming oversight of this policy as Lori Benefiel has since retired.
- Foote Morgan asked if the copy center was closing. Rutherford explained that it had closed last spring. Payne clarified that this proposal was for the contract closing before the end of the fiscal year and removing the Copy Center from the Bookstore’s General Policy Manual (GPM).
- Evans asked if the Bookstore GPM was included in this proposal. Payne said it would be added to the proposal as the Copy Center was listed under the Bookstore in the GPM.
- Rutherford asked if Payne would include further details regarding paper distribution at next month’s Committee meeting, which Payne confirmed. Rutherford asked if the proposal was still valid. Payne believed it remained valid in its amended state and the he only needed to add updates to what kinds of paper the Bookstore can order for the college.
- Rutherford suggested tabling the proposal for the next Committee meeting.
- Andresen noticed G-31-8.4.1 the required the Vice President of Administration to approve surplus and it was amended to give that responsibility to the Vice President of Finance and Operations (VPFO). She asked for it to be corrected to show that Andresen makes approvals for surplus *under* \$5,000 and the VPFO approves surplus of \$5,000 *or more*. This responsibility was previously overseen by Alicia Moore until Michael LaLonde was hired as VPFO in May 2023.



- Motion to table 2nd reading revising G-31-10.2 Department Paper, G-31-8.4.1 Proceeds Received from the Sale of Surplus Property, and G-31-10 Bookstore.
Motion made by Josh Evans, seconded by Tracy Crocket.
 - ☑ Motion passed unanimously by all members present.

2. New Business

- a. Inclusive Access Course Fees for Winter 2024 Quarter, 1st Reading – Frank Payne
 - The proposal is to bring in three more courses under Inclusive Access, which offers course materials to be provided digitally through Canvas, rather than physical materials. 27 courses and 765 students are currently using Inclusive Access products.
 - The courses being proposed for addition to Inclusive Access are:
 - Business Math (BA 104) for \$75.00
 - Business Finance (BA 222) for \$100.00. (Print bundle: \$166.65.)
 - Spanish 101 (SP 101) for \$96.00. (Print bundle: \$160.00.)
 - This could help students save money by allowing them to purchase materials for individual courses instead of “print bundles” and shipping of physical materials. The Spanish textbook could also be used for up to two years’ worth of Spanish courses.
 - Evans asked for Payne to clarify whether this would include all of the Spanish courses from 101 to 203, and if a student had used Inclusive Access for one Spanish course, they could opt out from paying this fee for future Spanish courses. (Evans is a Spanish professor.) Payne confirmed this to be correct and added that students who opt out would be refunded this fee for future Spanish courses after their first payment. Evans asked if an amendment could be added to state that Spanish 101 – 203 would be covered, which Payne agreed to.
 - Rutherford asked if it was easy for students to notice the opt out option on COCC’s registration website. Payne confirmed there is a large red button in the upper right corner of the webpage that says “Opt Out.” Students will have until the second Friday of each quarter to opt out of paying this fee.
 - Foote Morgan asked if Payne had an estimate of how much students pay on average for textbooks and other course materials per quarter. Payne said it depends on what courses a typical student might take. Many courses currently do not require any materials for the students to purchase, and most of the courses have a physical or digital option for textbooks through the Bookstore. The Bookstore is currently not ordering physical textbooks that cost over \$200.00, especially if digital versions cost less. In this case, students are allowed to find a used physical copy of the book online if they prefer. Sales have reduced since there is less need for physical materials. Payne estimated \$300 per student per quarter. In terms of physical books, the EMT, culinary, and automotive courses are probably the three most expensive courses. The Bookstore and instructors are working hard to adopt digital options for students. The Bookstore has sold at least 700 digital products to students for the Fall 2023 quarter.
 - Foote Morgan asked if students know ahead of time how much they will need to spend on course materials. Payne said, in compliance with state law, the Bookstore has at least 70% of required course materials available on their website. These materials are linked to the course



registration website and the Bookstore tries to give students as many options as possible. This includes non-textbook materials such as apparel or tools.

- Rutherford mentioned that the proposal included allowance to increase the course fee up to 20% each year without approval, which would allow for some flexibility in today's economy. She asked the Committee to clarify if this was meant to be "per year" or in general. Crockett recalled it to be "20% per year." Payne added that, unless there were any surprise rises in cost from a publisher, any increase in course fees would happen at the beginning of the Fall term, not in the Winter, Spring or Summer terms. Given the lead time, he would need to do his research in January in order for any proposed increases to be adopted. Fall term pricing should be decided by April because early registration begins in May.
- Henson asked whether there was a similar proposal for a Sociology course. Rutherford explained that there was a first and second reading during the previous academic year that were both approved via email, so it should not need to be included in this proposal.
 - Henson asked why all of the courses were not included in the same proposal. As Rutherford understood it, moving forward, Payne would include all proposed courses in the April meeting for the Committee. Payne confirmed this and explained that instructors tend to approach the Bookstore throughout the Fall and Winter terms, requesting Inclusive Access for their courses.
- Motion to approve 1st reading of Inclusive Access Course Fees for the Winter 2024 Term. Motion made by Mal Sotelo, seconded by Tracy Crocket.

Motion passed unanimously by all members present.

b. Proposal for Course Fee for MA 120, 1st Reading – Shannon Waller

- This proposal is for a \$120 fee for CPR and First Aid certification for MA 120, which absorbed this requirement after MA 140 was discontinued. The proposal was submitted last spring and has not been brought before the College Affairs Committee (CAC) until this meeting. Waller is requesting for the fee to be enacted for the Winter 2024 quarter.
- Crocket asked for clarification whether this is a new fee. Waller explained the proposal is to move an existing fee from one course to another (MA 140 to MA 120).
- Rutherford asked Waller if she thought the fee might increase or if it has a cap. Waller did not think this fee increases often, and that it was already higher than it needs to be at the moment.
- Henson asked if any students who already have CPR and First Aid certification could opt out of paying this fee, which Waller confirmed.
- Motion to approve 1st reading of Proposed Course Fee for MA 120 for the Winter 2024 Term. Motion made by Kara Rutherford, seconded by Joshua Evans.

Motion passed unanimously by all members present.

c. Proposal for Course Fee for HHPA 102, 103 and 104, 1st Reading – Shannon Waller

- The Health and Human Performance program has partnered with Bend Rock Gym (BRG) for many years and BRG's fees have increased from \$35 to \$50 per student. They have agreed to honor the \$35 fee for the academic year, but have asked for COCC to increase the fee for the 2024-25 academic year.



- Evans asked if a student could opt out of this fee if a student already has access to BRG. Waller did not know and said she would ask the course instructors, but did not see why COCC could not refund a student who already has access.
- Motion to approve 1st reading of Proposed Course fee for HHPA 102, 103 and 104 for the 2024-25 Academic Year.

Motion made by Tracey Crockett, seconded by Joshua Evans.

- Motion passed unanimously by all members present.

d. Proposed Revision to G-4-1 Lactation Accommodations Policy, 1st Reading – Rachel Knox

- The Providing Urgent Maternal Protections for Nursing Mothers (PUMP) Act and Pregnant Workers Fairness Act were signed into law at the end of 2022 and went into effect in the middle of 2023, which expanded what already existed in COCC's policy. In this proposal, a sentence was stricken from the existing policy and the inclusion of the 18-month-old cutoff was expanded to parents of two-year-olds.
- Evans asked if this was a response to a mandate from the state of Oregon. Knox clarified that both of the acts were federal mandates.
- Henson asked if COCC had designated lactation spaces on campus. Knox confirmed they were available on all of COCC's campuses.
- Foote Morgan expressed her gratitude for the Human Resources department's work to provide designated lactation spaces. As a COCC employee from 2006 – 2011, she struggled as a nursing mother to find safe spaces for lactation. Henson shared that she had a similar experience in 2004. Knox added that the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act requires employers to provide accommodations beyond lactation for pregnant workers, including allowing pregnant workers to sit instead of standing, which is not covered by the Americans with Disabilities Act.
- Henson asked whether COCC's lactation spaces are made available to students upon request. Knox confirmed students can access lactation spaces through Student Services.
- Rutherford suggested motioning to approve a first and second reading of this proposal since it is a response to a federal mandate.
- Motion to approve 1st and 2nd reading of Proposed Revision to G-4-1 Lactation Accommodations Policy.

Motion made by Joshua Evans, seconded by Tracey Crockett.

- Motion passed unanimously by all members present.

e. Proposal to Revise G-2-2 Alcoholic Beverages – Sharla Andresen

- The existing policy states that the college President's approval is required to serve alcoholic beverages at an event on campus as COCC is an alcohol-free campus. The proposed revision is to move that responsibility to the Vice President of Finance and Operations (VPFO). Michael LaLonde was hired as the new VPFO in May 2023.
- Evans asked how often these requests are made. Chesley estimated five times per year and Andresen concurred. This is simply shifting the responsibility to the individual who oversees operations at COCC. (The Cascades Culinary Institute does not need to go through this process as they have their own license to serve alcoholic beverages.) LaLonde's former position as CEO of Deschutes Brewery adds credibility to him taking over this responsibility.



- Motion to approve 1st reading of Proposed Revision to G-2-2 Alcoholic Beverages.
Motion made by Kara Rutherford, seconded by Nicholas Recktenwald.
 - ☑ Motion passed unanimously by all members present.
- f. Discussion Item: Commencement Speaker Committee (CSC) Charge – Laurie Chesley
 - After the controversy regarding the choice of keynote speaker for the 2023 Commencement ceremony, President Chesley wrote a post in COCC headlines with an offer to allow more individuals from COCC beyond the Senior Leadership Team to give suggestions for future guest speakers. She received feedback from one person regarding this post with minor suggestions regarding whether members of the CSC should be publicly named or only identified by their COCC employee/student status.
 - Chesley drafted a potential charge for a CSC and presented it to the CAC for their feedback.
 - Sotelo expressed appreciation for the inclusion of student voices in the proposed CSC. The proposed CSC would include two current COCC students jointly selected by the Student Government (ASCOCC) and the Office of Student Life.
 - Evans asked for clarification regarding the proposal for the Chair of the Commencement Committee to also serve as Chair of the CSC. Chesley confirmed that the Chair of the Commencement Committee would also serve as Chair of the proposed CSC.
 - Henson asked for clarification on how a student would be appointed by the Office of Student Life. Chesley suggested that the Director of Student Life could make the selection based on their close work with ASCOCC, as opposed to a group vote from the Office.
 - Rutherford and Recktenwald asked if this aligns with bylaws from other standing COCC committees. It was Chesley's understanding that such selections were normally made jointly, but offered to verify this.
 - In Sotelo's experience, ASCOCC does not oversee the students that are on committees, though they can ask questions about them. Foote Morgan asked for Sotelo's opinion on this policy. While Sotelo was comfortable with ASCOCC helping select students for a committee, they suggested both ASCOCC and Student Life should be involved. They also asked whether both students on the CSC should be current ASCOCC officers who hear student voices and can bring them to the CSC. Foote Morgan suggested both students appointed *should* be ASCOCC officers and asked for Chesley's opinion. Chesley assumed this would be the case as ASCOCC officers are typically the most involved students when it comes to campus issues. She offered to add language that states *one* of the two students on the CSC *must* be an ASCOCC officer.
 - Foote Morgan asked how the Board is normally involved with committees without a sitting Board member and why that might be. Chesley said that in a policy governance model, which the COCC Board of Directors operates under, the Board deals with broad-based, Board-level policies, strategic plans, and other high-level issues, rather than operational issues. College Affairs is the only standing committee that includes a member of the Board. In a policy governance mode, board members typically do not participate in committees because the board speaks as one voice. Foote Morgan is one of seven Board members participating in the College Affairs Committee as a non-voting member, which is less problematic. If one Board member



votes on an issue that no other Board member can vote on, that could create conflict. There is also the possibility of public disagreements that don't help the college understand what issues are in each person's prevue. The President is the only college employee who reports to the Board and the President oversees campus operations. While past Board members have expressed interest in participating on committees, Chesley does not recommend it, and Foote Morgan concurred. Sometimes COCC employees will want a Board member on a committee, but that can also be problematic as it goes around the chain of command. In Chesley's view, the best option is for the President to keep the Board informed of what's happening in each committee.

- One thing Chesley likes about this proposal is that the President cannot choose a speaker that the CSC does not want. She can give them options, but she cannot veto any of their choices and choose someone else. This should ensure that the President listened to the input of the CSC.
- Evans asked whether a commencement speaker is necessary. In the recommendations from the Commencement Reimagining Task Force, the very first bullet-point was to remove the keynote and faculty speakers. Why is a keynote speaker still under consideration when COCC can experiment with having no speaker for next year's Commencement ceremony? Why not focus on students as they are who the ceremony is ultimately for?
 - In Chesley's proposal for the CSC, she included language stating that the CSC can outright reject having a keynote speaker. Public speakers have become more polarizing in today's politically divided society, so Chesley is open to this possibility.
 - Sotelo asked, instead of a keynote speaker, if more students, faculty and staff could speak. Chesley was open to the possibility and offered to add language to the proposal to allow this alternative.
- Henson thanked Chesley for creating this proposal and listening to everyone's feedback. In Henson's research of other colleges' commencement speaker policies, she found that several schools offer an open survey for people to submit speaker suggestions. Would it be possible for students, faculty and staff to submit to such a survey that the CSC would consider? Henson also found through research that ritual *does* have a place in peoples' lives, so in her opinion, the pomp and circumstance of Commencement should be preserved if possible. Other schools have divided their ceremonies into a student convocation, which has more pomp and circumstance, and a commencement, which is more celebratory. Is that something the CSC could consider?
 - Chesley appreciated Henson's points and offered to add language that the CSC can consider broad-based feedback.
- Recktenwald suggested more explicit language stating the CSC could recommend a Commencement speaker or they could recommend to not invite a Commencement speaker. He also asked whether there was confidence that COCC would be able to fill the seats suggested for the CSC. He has observed other committees having trouble filling faculty seats. Should there be more student seats on the CSC since it is a student-focused matter? Are we over-committing COCC personnel by creating more committees?
 - In Chesley's opinion, after the recent controversy, the CSC will be a highly desired committee. Crockett and Evans concurred.



- Evans said there is a general desire from the faculty to be more involved in decisions made by the Senior Leadership Team.
- Henson suggested the scope of the CSC should remain limited as they would only meet for a limited amount of time each year, which could make participation more attractive. She appreciated Recktenwald bringing up the question regarding overcommitment of committee members and reminded the CAC that Commencement is a faculty contracted day, when requires their attendance. For this reason, she believed it was useful for faculty voices to be part of the CSC.
- Sotelo expressed their appreciation for how many faculty members expressed their support for students who felt hurt by the controversial choice in last year's keynote speaker. Based on that, they believed that many faculty members would be interested in participating in the CSC.
- Recktenwald clarified that his comment was *not* to suggest that any group have less representation on the CSC, but with other essential committees struggling to find faculty members to participate, would the CSC face the same issue? Will the controversy fade from memory?
- Rutherford expressed appreciation for the assessment portion of Chesley's proposal.
- Chesley concluded that the CAC recommended the following for the proposed CSC:
 - At least one of the students on the CSC must be an ASCOCC officer.
 - Broad-based solicitation of ideas for a keynote speaker made by the CSC.
 - The CSC may suggest alternatives to having a keynote speaker at Commencement, such as more student speakers.
- Chesley asked whether enough feedback had been given to start recruiting for the CSC, or should it be discussed further at a future CAC meeting?
 - Rutherford was comfortable with the feedback given and felt that to delay it any further could make it more difficult to book a speaker if and when the CSC is initiated. Evans and Recktenwald concurred. Evans thanked Chesley for receiving their feedback.
- Chesley thanked everyone for their feedback.

Motion to adjourn the meeting.

Motion made by Kara Rutherford, seconded by Mal Sotelo.

Motion passed unanimously by all members present at 11:15 a.m.

NEXT MEETING: Friday, November 17, 2023 at 10:00 a.m. via Zoom