



Date: February 9, 2023

10:00 – 11:30am

Location: Zoom meeting

Attending	Absent	Guests
Kara Rutherford, Chair	Tracey Crockett	Alan Nunes
Allison Dickerson	Laurie Chesley, COCC President	Annemarie Hamlin
Joshua Evans		Steve Broadbent
Tim Peterson		
Nicholas Recktenwald		
Mal Sotelo		
Sara Henson		
Erin Foote Morgan		
Kyle Matthews, Recorder		

Meeting called to order at 10:00 am.

1. Old Business

a. Minutes from December 8, 2023* – Kara Rutherford

Motion to approve meeting minutes from the December 8, 2023 meeting.

Motion made by Josh Evans.

Motion passed unanimously by all members present.

b. Proposal to increase LMT 100 level course fees starting Fall 2024, 2nd Reading – Alan Nunes

- Nunes explained that when he brought this proposal to Instructional Dean Julie Downing, she said that she and Shannon Waller had already submitted that proposal to cover all of the Allied Health programs’ increased fees a few years ago. He wanted to make sure the Licensed Massage Therapy (LMT) program was included because there was some discrepancy. He discovered that LMT *was not* included and needed to be presented to the College Affairs Committee (CAC) for approval.

- Rutherford recalled the Allied Health proposal that Nunes had referenced, but did not have the minutes readily available. She recommended moving forward to approve this proposal, but asked Nunes to explain the fees.

- Nunes explained that students usually complete the LMT program in four terms, receive their certificate, then take the national licensing exam. Over time, certain agencies have raised their fees, which has required COCC to do the same. LMT students are currently charged licensing fees at \$17.00 per credit during their second through fourth term, totaling at \$527.00, which is used to pay for their national exam fee and state licensing fee. The Oregon State Board of Massage Therapists has raised their fee from \$50-100 to \$100-200. The Federation of State Massage Therapy Boards’ Massage and Bodywork Licensing Examination fee has also increased by about \$50.00. This means that the new total cost of a student to take their national exam would range from \$550.25 to \$650.25.

- Nunes explained that the sliding scale is due to the Oregon State Board’s requirement of renewing your license depending on your birthdate. Most LMT students will want to get

*The January 9, 2024 meeting was cancelled due to the first week of term and a lack of discussion items.

**Comments submitted via email after the meeting adjourned.



their license as soon as they graduate from COCC, so they will take their national exam based on when they graduate. However, your Oregon license would expire on your birthday, so you are only required to pay \$100.00 for your first year if it would expire sooner than 365 days. Anyone who falls within the one-to-two-year window would be charged \$200.00.

- Nunes' proposal was to increase the \$17.00 per credit fee to \$21.00 per credit in order to meet this need. This fee was implemented to allow students to not have to worry about saving money after completing their certificate in order to not only pay their exam fees, but to make the trip from Central Oregon to Salem, Portland or Eugene where the exam takes place. The LMT program has seen a significant increase in pass rates since implementing this fee because it enables students to take their national exam as soon as they graduate from COCC.
- Nunes explained that attrition tends to happen in the first term of the program, so he did not like charging this fee to students who would not benefit from it, which is why they do not start paying until their second term.
- Dickerson commented that she wished other programs at COCC would do this.
 - Nunes commented that LMT students like this fee because they understand it is for something they would be paying for either way. It places their money in a savings account so they do not need to worry about it when they are ready for their exam and they are able to start working in the massage field as soon as possible.
- From a student's perspective, Sotelo found this fee to be justified in light of inflation. They asked whether students still needed to travel to take their national exam.
 - Nunes reiterated that students will need to travel to Salem, Portland or Eugene to take their national exam, but this fee covers the cost of registering to take the exam. He noted that he has been trying for years to convince the powers that be to allow an exam to be hosted in Central Oregon.
- Rutherford asked if exam fees are expected to increase in the near future.
 - Nunes observed that the fees tend to increase every five years, but they are never significant increases.
 - Rutherford noted the amendment of a cap of 20% increase before having to come back to the CAC for approval. She asked for the CAC's thoughts on this amendment.
 - No one had any questions or comments.
- Motion to approve 2nd reading of Proposal to increase LMT 100 level course fees starting Fall 2024.

Motion made by Josh Evans, seconded by Mal Sotelo.

Motion passed by five CAC members.

Nick Recktenwald abstained. There were no objections.

2. New Business

a. Discussion Item: Student Evaluations: Inappropriate Comments – Sara Henson

- Henson explained that in Spring 2021 when she was Chair of the Faculty Senate, they had discussed students' comments, specifically comments toward a faculty member that had nothing to do with their ability to teach. Instead, the student commented on a part of the



instructor's protected class (ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, etc.), which could be construed as offensive. A proposal was brought forth to the Faculty Senate to allow faculty members to request for such comments to be removed from their permanent faculty files. The intention was to prevent faculty members from having to routinely see these comments in their files and to prevent such comments from being part of consideration for a promotion or tenure. The proposed policy passed through two readings in the Faculty Senate along with insights and approval from Human Resources and the Vice President of Instruction (VPI).

- Two weeks ago, Henson was contacted by a faculty member who received a similar comment from a student and asked if this policy was still valid as they could not find it in the General Policy Manual (GPM). Henson could not find the policy in the GPM either. The only place she could find any record of this policy was on her pin drive. After asking others who had been involved with this policy, Henson suspected that there had been some confusion that led to the policy not being added to the GPM. She wondered whether it had ever been brought before the CAC and asked Matthews to check their records. Matthews found that the policy had passed its second reading from the CAC in the minutes from their June 3, 2022 meeting. A copy of the minutes from that meeting, as well as a document from the Faculty Senate explaining the policy, were included in the CAC's February 9, 2024 meeting packet. Henson suspected that the confusion came from the fact that the VPI who approved this policy retired not long after, and the Director of Human Resources had resigned around this time. The people that Henson has since consulted have disagreed on whether the minutes she presented were enough evidence that the proposed policy had received final approval, so she was presenting it to the CAC for their confirmation. Not only would doing so allow a current faculty member to request for an inappropriate comment to be removed from their file, but to ensure it is added to the GPM as soon as possible. She also pointed out that the document from the Faculty Senate mentioned that the proposal had a lot of nuances and they had suggested moving to approve the policy and discuss amendments at a later date, so Henson wanted to give the CAC the opportunity to discuss possible amendments.
- Sotelo asked for Henson to explain how the student comments worked. Were they part of the survey that students are required to complete at the end of a course?
 - Henson confirmed this.
- Evans asked if Henson could clarify that this proposed policy was approved in June 2022 and was never added to the GPM.
 - Henson confirmed this.
 - Rutherford added that Henson had also spoken with Human Resources and they were comfortable with adding the policy to the GPM. However, she also wanted to bring it before the CAC to remind them that their predecessors had approved it in 2022.
 - Henson added that she was open to further discussion of the policy of anyone on the CAC had a strong objection.
 - Evans and Recktenwald expressed their support for this policy.
 - Henson added that this policy is also being discussed in the Faculty Senate.
 - Recktenwald said that the Faculty Senate's work on this policy aligns with that of the CAC and felt it was important to have this policy in the GPM.
- Peterson asked why the proposed policy required that the affected faculty person submit their request to remove a comment within three working weeks.



- Henson believed this was requested by Human Resources to allow them to better manage the potential workload. She suspected it also had to do with COCC's expectation of faculty to review their evaluations as they are received, as well as their respective deans and department chairs.
 - Peterson explained that he felt that three weeks was a short amount of time for department chairs to review comments for *all* of the faculty members under their supervision.
 - Henson reminded the CAC that faculty reviews can now be accessed via Canvas, so faculty members and their respective chairs can see their reviews simultaneously, as opposed to an administrative assistant printing them out and delivering them. She added that the responsibility of this policy lies with the individual faculty member, rather than the chair, because the faculty member would be requesting permission from their chair to remove the comment.
 - While Peterson agreed with Henson, he felt it would be a good idea if the chair would be able to remove a comment they deemed inappropriate if the faculty member did not notice it.
 - Henson concurred and said she did not understand the reasoning for any limitations in this policy. She added that many faculty members do not even bother to read their comments because they receive so many inappropriate comments. They would claim it is traumatizing to read.
 - Rutherford felt it was appropriate to add this policy to the GPM.
- b. Discussion Item: Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) – Annemarie Hamlin
- Hamlin explained that the rise in popularity of AI tools like ChatGPT in the past 18 months has driven concerns about academic integrity. She was glad that faculty at COCC are having these important conversations and has been working to help them navigate these new territories. She felt it was also important for COCC and all institutions to ask how GenAI will change how people do their jobs beyond the classroom. What are our responsibilities to our students and members of the community? She was excited about the opportunities presented by this new technology and wanted COCC to make the most of it. In light of the college's Mission and Strategic Plan, she felt it aligns with "empowering students and engaging communities through high quality of equitable and accessible lifelong education," as well as all of COCC's other Strategic Plan goals. Her reasoning for bringing this before the CAC came from her desire for COCC to become a leader in creative, innovative and responsible use of GenAI. She proposed creating a collegewide strategy to address workplace and academic needs related to AI and believed the CAC was the appropriate place from which this could originate. She had discussed this over the past few months with the Senior Leadership Team and more recently with President Chesley.
 - The rise in GenAI is changing how educators work and teach and how students learn. Many of Hamlin's colleagues are already using GenAI for basic work functions including writing memos and interview questions, developing assignments, and summarizing long documents they need to understand quickly. She was also proud of faculty members who have explored how to create assignments that help students develop the critical thinking skills that they need while using AI tools. A guest speaker had talked about AI this past fall and another will meet with faculty in the spring. CBIPD recently invited a guest speaker and will invite more later this year. We are still learning the impacts of GenAI on the world around us, including the environment and individuals. It can impact



our work in helpful ways as well as harmful ways. GenAI also has limitations and faults. An example is hallucinations, which is when AI generates false information or sources. Another is embedded biases, which is generated from human biases and can be both explicit and implicit. And while gen AI can in some ways make our work easier, it can also increase expectations for output, which is why Hamlin was concerned about the capacity of COCC's faculty and staff and the college's stated commitment to work-life balance.

- Hamlin shared the following proposal with the CAC: That College Affairs develop an AI strategy that includes policies and practices for COCC that foster of a culture of informed and responsible experimentation and innovation using GenAI tools. Such policies and practices should take into account ethical and legal concerns, equity and fairness, as well as environmental, economic, and human sustainability. Policies should also consider how the institution will train its staff to use GenAI tools in a continuous learning and improvement environment. Some things to keep in mind:
 - All aspects of the institution may be affected by GenAI policies and practices, so multiple perspectives are needed, including those of students.
 - Such a policy may have multiple audiences (internal and external to the college).
 - A policy should be serious about identifying and addressing potential biases in GenAI systems.
 - A policy should enable innovation *and* expect responsible use.
 - All parts of the institution may not need the same policies and practices.
 - Our policies and practices will need to evolve along with GenAI tools.
 - This would be an ongoing practice.
 - A policy needs to consider privacy concerns as well as intellectual property rights.
 - Training in GenAI principles and tools should be part of our institutional practice, just as are policies on FERPA, data use, and others.
- Hamlin acknowledged that the above list is not exhaustive and that everyone may have something to add. Additional items we should consider include:
 - How industries and professions for which we are training students either are or will be using AI.
 - Addressing AI use in our curriculum so that we are preparing our students to use it in the way that their industries would be.
 - How GenAI can help us meet increased ADA legal requirements.
 - Ongoing attention to academic integrity.
- Evans said this was the first time he had heard GenAI discussed in the context of how it works in the day-to-day functions of an institution. Before, the question he usually heard was, "What are our students doing with GenAI and how can we prevent them from using it instead of doing the work themselves?" He has heard his students say they would use AI to write a report for one of his classes and did not know how to respond.
- Henson said she has been teaching her students how to use AI since the previous Winter term. Her students have been learning how to use AI to write prompts in four different modalities, then write prompts without AI and see how they compare as an exercise in information literacy. She supported students learning how to use AI appropriately, affectively and efficiently. She pointed out that AI is the latest in a series of technological advancements that have impacted the workforce and she assumed more advancements are coming. She was curious why AI was



being singled out, rather than forming a broader technology strategy in anticipation of other advancements.

- Hamlin said that AI's newness and ever presence in publications on how higher education is dealing with it are the primary reasons for this focus. AI is also a popular topic in the business world and how it can change things. Hamlin has observed gen AI as something that will significantly change how we work, not to say that other technologies won't do the same. Gen AI is now widely available without training and guidance, so COCC should consider how to harness its power responsibly. How do we teach our students how to use AI responsibly and effectively as they prepare to enter a workforce that will only be using it more as it continues to develop? Hamlin was also open to the idea of broadening COCC's scope to other advancements in technology.
- Sotelo asked if there was a plan to discuss intellectual property (IP) rights and biases within AI systems. They pointed out that AI compiles existing work and combines it to create output, whether the result is a graphic or a body of text. They felt it would be important for students to learn about people's IP rights, as well as biases that can be found within the results.
 - Hamlin concurred, adding that more information has been coming out daily about what can be done about these sorts of issues, so COCC should pay attention to that.
- Foote Morgan asked what the process for thinking through such a large policy might look like. Would there be training for the CAC on these matters?
 - Hamlin said the CAC would need to concur that this project should be carried out. They would then decide whether they should address the issue as a committee or assign one of COCC's workgroups to carry out the following tasks:
 - Conduct research on GenAI and related issues.
 - Define the scope of the group's work as deemed appropriate.
 - Seek out training to better understand the subject matter.
 - Determine whether COCC's policies adequately address GenAI-related issues or if they should be revised.
 - Periodically discuss as a group what policies and trainings need to be available to the college as a whole.
- Peterson asked if there had been any consideration of involving the Technology Advisory Committee (TAC) on this project.
 - Hamlin said it did not come up in conversation and she did not know the broad representation of the TAC. The CAC was suggested because it covers all aspects of COCC. GenAI was seen as a collegewide matter, not just a technology matter.
 - Broadbent explained that the CAC approved the motion to dissolve the TAC on May 12, 2023. In lieu of a formal committee, the CAC approved G-21-1 Information Technology Governance, which says that the Chief Information Officer and ITS "will collaborate with other college stakeholders to prioritize technology initiatives across campus." ITS hosted the first COCC Technology Forum on January 22, 2024, inviting key stakeholders and other interested participants to strengthen collaboration on college technology. During the forum, Michele DeSilva provided a brief update on AI, but she did not raise policy questions that Hamlin had presented during this meeting.**
- Dickerson understood how it could be seen as a collegewide issue and agreed with Evans that, while she had been hearing about various staff members using GenAI, she did not know enough about it to feel comfortable being part of a committee that would set such policies in place with-



out additional training on the subject. She had a conservative view of AI and concurred with Sotelo's points on IP rights and biases. She preferred another committee or workgroup to make suggestions for the CAC to review.

- Hamlin shared a link in the Zoom meeting's chat from *Educause Review* on developing campus-wide approaches to GenAI policies. She also shared a link to an article from the Russell Group, an organization in the UK, on how several universities collectively decided what principles they should operate under in regards to AI.
 - <https://er.educause.edu/articles/2023/12/cross-campus-approaches-to-building-a-generative-ai-policy>
 - <https://russellgroup.ac.uk/news/new-principles-on-use-of-ai-in-education/>
 - Recktenwald liked the idea of starting with establishing principles around AI. While he agreed this was needed, he was concerned that working with AI would undermine the college's workforce development mission. He observed that the management class in the United States was very excited about AI while the labor class was very concerned, noting what was happening in Silicon Valley. He felt that AI can make higher educators' work more effective or it could be exploited against the workforce. He expressed desire for a committee that wrestles with these questions and has a strong commitment to workforce development without ignoring a clear catalyst in society.
 - Hamlin referenced the article she shared from the Russell Group and noted how some of their established principles addressed Recktenwald's concerns. She concurred with his point that workers are concerned that AI might replace them as opposed to helping them do their jobs. She recently attended a conference with a panel on AI and one of the experts said that they are often asked whether AI might take someone's job. Their usual response is, "you probably are not going to lose your job to AI, but you may well lose your job to someone who knows how to *use* AI." This seemed to be the emphasis of the room; to get our students AI literate and job ready for whatever field they might be entering.
 - Henson expressed concern that the principles referenced in the Russell Group's article are too narrow, reiterating her point that AI is only the latest in technological advancements available to the public. COCC already has policies that address many of the issues that Hamlin had mentioned. She suggested broadening the language, asking how COCC can help its students become digitally literate with a variety of tools, including AI. This could be more relevant long-term as technology continues to evolve. Henson felt the focus on AI was too reactionary.
 - Hamlin reiterated that she was open to broadening the focus of the group if that is what they decide to do.
- Foote Morgan suggested that she could discuss with her fellow members of COCC's Board of Directors whether they could create a policy that provides collegewide protection for every employee's work in light of AI implementation.
 - Hamlin added that COCC would want to use its shared governance approach to get as many people involved in the conversation as possible. She was open to the possibility of such a policy coming before the Board as Foote Morgan suggested.
- Recktenwald reiterated a comment from Evans in the Zoom meeting chat, suggesting they start with a community event where COCC could invite all broad-based stakeholders to discuss GenAI use in higher education before forming a workgroup.



- Hamlin concurred that broad representation from the community would be important.
- Evans added that it would be helpful for people who are not fully on board with GenAI but are willing to learn more about it. He would be more open to it if he knew how his colleagues were using it in their work. He also expressed his appreciation for the principles established by the Russell Group, especially for maintaining academic integrity.
- Dickerson concurred, adding that it should go beyond academic integrity and into support staff integrity as well. She also liked the idea of creating an informal event where people can discuss how they are using it in their work, especially students like Sotelo.
- Sotelo said that most of the students they talk with enjoy discussing AI both inside and outside of the classroom. However, Sotelo was concerned about how artists are taken advantage of when their work is used without their permission, as well as the biases in the system. On the positive side, Sotelo has used GenAI to help them break apart scholarship prompts when they have trouble formatting their ideas into a thesis. They offered to discuss AI further with anyone who was interested after the meeting.
- Hamlin asked the CAC if they would be willing to endorse/sponsor an open forum on GenAI.
 - Evans and Recktenwald confirmed.
 - Hamlin added that, having discussed this with her counterparts at other community colleges, many of them have hosted similar forums and she knew of two that had formed task forces to further study GenAI. None of them formed new policies right away, but instead followed similar procedures that the CAC had discussed.
- Rutherford said that taking on a project like this does not guarantee any specific outcome. Part of the process is coming up with ideas and presenting them to other parties. She asked if anyone had thoughts on placing a vote to accept this project.
 - Peterson suggested forming a task force.
 - Rutherford concurred with the idea that a topic of this size would require one.
 - Evans noted that there was a faculty group that was investigating AI and its use in the classroom, but it was led by a faculty member who is no longer with COCC. He suggested reaching out to members of this group to ask if they wanted to participate.
 - Hamlin had spoken with DeSilva who had taken over leadership of that group for Justin Jory. They were trying to form a panel of experts for an event during the Winter term, but they could not find enough people. They are now arranging a workshop for faculty in the Spring term. Hamlin recommended reaching out to DeSilva to discuss this further.
- Dickerson pointed out that new incoming CAC members would need to be informed about this ongoing project.
- Hamlin said she would leave this project to the CAC and offered to return if they requested more information on the subject.
- Rutherford summarized that the CAC would further examine Hamlin's proposal and discuss at their next meeting what to do next.
 - Hamlin offered to modify her proposal based on what was discussed in this meeting.

Motion to adjourn the meeting.

Motion made by Allison Dickerson, seconded by Mal Sotelo.



- Motion passed unanimously by all members present.

NEXT MEETING: Friday, March 8, 2024 at 10:00 a.m. via Zoom