



Date: March 8, 2024

Time: 10:00 – 11:30am

Location: Zoom meeting

Attending	Absent	Guests
Joshua Evans, Interim Chair	Kara Rutherford, Chair	Annemarie Hamlin
Tracey Crockett		Frank Payne
Allison Dickerson		Shannon Waller
Tim Peterson		
Nicholas Recktenwald		
Mal Sotelo		
Sara Henson		
Erin Foote Morgan		
Laurie Chesley, COCC President		
Kyle Matthews, Recorder		

Meeting called to order at 10:01 am.

1. Old Business

a. Minutes from February 9, 2024 – Josh Evans

Motion to approve meeting minutes from the February 9, 2024 meeting.

Motion made by Nick Recktenwald, seconded by Allison Dickerson.

Motion passed unanimously by all members present.

b. Discussion Item: Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) in Higher Education – Annemarie Hamlin

- Evans reminded the College Affairs Committee (CAC) of the discussion that began in their previous meeting and mentioned another discussion he and Hamlin had the day before this meeting. In reviewing the minutes from February 9, the CAC had discussed hosting an open forum on GenAI for COCC at-large in order to maximize participation from COCC personnel and the greater Central Oregon community. There had also been discussion of speaking with COCC Library Systems and Discovery Librarian Michelle DeSilva, who is leading the COCC faculty group that is investigating GenAI. What are the next steps for the CAC? Do we move forward with organizing a forum? Who should we invite? What are the logistics?
- Henson recalled the conversation on February 9 went in different directions, suggesting more education on GenAI was needed before forming a strategy. Should both things happen simultaneously?
  - Hamlin felt they could happen simultaneously as one would inform the other.
- Hamlin shared a link to an article in the Zoom meeting chat from the WICHE Cooperative for Educational Technologies. This article discussed a framework for how institutions can begin using AI.
  - <https://wcet.wiche.edu/frontiers/2023/12/07/developing-institutional-level-ai-policies-and-practices-a-framework/>
  - Sotelo asked if there were other institutions with AI framework that COCC could look at to base its own framework on.



- Hamlin said the most robust local example she knew of was Oregon State University as they have good resources available. She offered to resend a link to their resources to the CAC members via email. Other community colleges were developing their own frameworks as well, but she had not seen anything published yet.
- Evans asked who should take charge of coordinating an open forum and continuing education on GenAI. Should it be the CAC, the Vice President of Academic Affairs' office, or another party had not yet been considered?
  - Chesley assumed that one reason Hamlin brought this topic to the CAC was because the Senior Leadership Team had discussed elevating the CAC to handle matters beyond college fees (which are still important). The CAC could form a taskforce that reports to them or collaborate with Academic Affairs as a joint effort. Or the CAC could decide to go a different route.
  - Hamlin concurred and said Chesley's comments reflected a prior conversation between Chesley and Hamlin. She added that the CAC was considered for its broad representation and the fact that GenAI will affect the entire college.
  - Sotelo suggested that it would be important for the whole CAC to learn more about GenAI before forming a taskforce. Hamlin concurred.
  - Recktenwald suggested forming a taskforce would be good first step to strategize how to approach such a broad topic.
- Evans asked whether a taskforce should be members of the CAC or should they recruit other COCC personnel?
  - Recktenwald felt it would make sense to have a CAC liaison as part of the taskforce and other COCC personnel being involved.
- Evans asked whether a charge needed to be drafted for the taskforce.
  - Peterson said that COCC taskforces in the past drafted their own charges. They had been designed as non-formal groups to review or investigate a specific topic outside of regular committee work. He concurred with Recktenwald's point that a CAC member should be part of the taskforce while other COCC personnel could also be involved.
- Evans nominated Peterson as a member of this taskforce.
  - Peterson accepted Evans' nomination.
  - Sotelo offered to participate in the taskforce as well. Hamlin concurred and said it would be important to include a student voice in the group.
- Evans asked whether a motion was needed to form a taskforce.
  - Henson suggested it would be more about developing an institutional framework, strategy or philosophy on GenAI. Rather than developing institutional practices, what are the principles behind such policies or actions?
  - Sotelo reiterated that it would be important to also conduct further research (not necessarily in depth) about GenAI to be sure everyone is on the same page before coordinating a public forum. They suggested creating a pamphlet.
- Motion for the College Affairs Committee to form a taskforce to investigate generative artificial intelligence policies and practices at COCC.  
Motion made by Mal Sotelo, seconded by Tracey Crockett.



Motion passed unanimously by all members present.

- Peterson and Sotelo agreed to meet in the coming weeks to discuss recruitment for the taskforce. Hamlin agreed to make herself available to assist with taskforce matters when possible. Evans suggested they would spend the remainder of the 2023-24 academic year forming the committee and begin meeting during the 2024-25 academic year.

## 2. New Business

### a. Proposal to Increase HHPA Course Fees for Mt. Bachelor Access, 1<sup>st</sup> Reading – Shannon Waller and Tony Russell

- Henson asked if equipment rental fees, chairlift tickets and other course expenses only applied to class time, or could they also apply to required activity time spent outside of class.
  - Waller understood them as only being applicable during class time, but students could keep using their rented equipment until the end of the day.
- Peterson asked whether these classes were full-term classes.
  - Waller said they are only eight weeks long.
  - Sotelo asked if that meant that students would attend class once per week for eight weeks, which Waller confirmed.
- Evans pointed out that several of the courses listed in the proposal were not HHPA courses and noted that many of them were identical to the courses in Payne’s proposal.
  - Matthews suggested it was a PDF error that he would need to correct.
- Motion to approve first reading for the proposal to increase fees for HHPA 170, 171, 172, 178 and 179 courses upon correction of the PDF errors.  
Motion made by Tim Peterson, seconded by Nick Recktenwald.  
 Motion passed unanimously by all members present.

### b. Proposal for Inclusive Course Fees – 1<sup>st</sup> Reading, Frank Payne

- Payne explained for any CAC members who were unfamiliar with inclusive course fees that their purpose is to aid students who might not be able to afford expensive physical course materials like textbooks and digital alternatives are unavailable. Payne would research publishers, compare prices, inform the instructors and get their approval to bring them to the CAC.
  - Payne clarified that two of the three books for HST 201, 202 and 203 recently became available in a digital format. When he reached out to the faculty, it was decided that it would be best to make all three books for those courses available for inclusive access. He also clarified that two books for ES 211 were currently unavailable in digital format due to publisher restrictions.
  - Payne also pointed out that CIS 120, 125A and 131 had a \$129.99 course fee for a four-month subscription to Cengage Unlimited. If a student took one of these courses and paid for the subscription, they would not need to pay for any additional Cengage products for any other CIS courses during the term.
- Motion to approve first reading of inclusive course fees for BA 177 and 178; CIS 120, 125A and 131; ES 211; HST 201, 202, 203 and 206; HS 260; and PSY 215, 228 and 233.  
Motion made by Tim Peterson, seconded by Tracey Crockett.



- Motion passed unanimously by all members present.

### 3. Confidential Business

#### a. Discussion Item: Bart Queary Lifetime Achievement Award Nominations – Josh Evans

- The CAC members were sent the nomination letters prior to this meeting. There were lengthy discussions on how the award should be given.
  - Committees that have decided other faculty and staff awards in the past had asked HR to review the nominees' personnel files, but only to confirm that the nominees were eligible based on the longevity requirements of the awards.
- The CAC ultimately decided to table this decision and further examine the nomination letters before meeting again in April.
  - Chesley also suggested the CAC should consider revising section G-25-0 of the GPM in order to have more clear criteria and procedure for deciding how this award should be given in the future.

Motion to adjourn the meeting.

Motion made by Mal Sotelo, seconded by Nick Recktenwald.

- Motion passed unanimously by all members present.

NEXT MEETING: Friday, April 12, 2024 at 10:00 a.m. via Zoom