Date: June 7, 2024
Time: 10:00 – 11:30am
Location: Zoom meeting

Attending	Absent	Guests
Josh Evans, Interim Chair	Kara Rutherford, Chair	Rachel Knox
Tracy Crockett	Tim Peterson	Tony Russell
Allison Dickerson	Ivy Sotelo	Laura Boehme
Nick Recktenwald		Annemarie Hamlin
Sara Henson		Becky Plassmann
Erin Foote Morgan		Kathy Smith
Laurie Chesley, COCC President		
Kyle Matthews, Recorder		

Meeting called to order at 10:01 am.

1. Old Business
a.   Minutes from May 10, 2024 – Josh Evans
   * No questions or comments regarding the minutes.
   * Motion to approve the minutes.
     Motion made by Nick Recktenwald, seconded by Tracy Crockett.
     ☑   Motion approved by all voting members present.

b.   Proposed Updates for Human Resources' Policies and Procedures, 2nd Reading – Rachel Knox
   * Knox had responded to the questions/comments that Henson had submitted prior to the previous meeting. She had since not heard any further feedback on the proposed changes.
   * Evans noted a small change in language that Knox had said she intended to correct.
   * Motion to approve the proposed changes.
     Motion made by Tracy Crockett, seconded by Nick Recktenwald.
     ☑   Motion approved by all voting members present.
   * Knox requested Matthews to use the new title of the Chief Human Resources Officer as it was planned to be changed in July 2024. Matthews confirmed.

2. New Business
a.   G-34-1.4 and G-34-3.3.1 Adjunct and Part-time Faculty Evaluation, 1st Reading – Tony Russell
   * Russell explained that a longstanding issue at COCC has been hiring and maintaining adjunct and part-time faculty members, partially due to an outdated faculty review system that the college still uses. The customary annual raises of part-time faculty salaries have been tracked in a large, color-coded spreadsheet, referred to as "The Rainbow Document." The problem with this system is that a part-time instructor must teach a minimum of three credits per term in order for said term to "count" toward their requirements to be evaluated and possibly become full-time instructors in the future. However, many part-time instructors at COCC only teach one or two credits in a term and take the winter or summer term off. The spreadsheet is so long because it is difficult to track when a person's teaching time "counts." A part-time instructor

that might be expecting a modest raise in the new academic year, but they will not receive it because one of terms they taught didn't "count" because they did not teach enough credits. This system works for full-time instructors, but not for part-time instructors. This creates a lot of confusion when it comes to part-time faculty evaluations. Russell's proposal is to move away from this system for part-time instructors. Instead, whenever someone teaches at COCC, no matter how many credits, it "counts," so they could be evaluated and compensated accordingly. The newly proposed system is much simpler to use and can better ensure that part-time faculty are compensated appropriately.

- Evans commented, as a department chair, that this would be a welcome change that has been needed for a long time.
- Henson asked whether there was any documentation on how to place newly hired adjunct and part-time on the salary scale. Do they all need to start from the bottom? Is this something that could be addressed in the future?
  - o Hamlin confirmed that newly hired part-time and adjunct faculty must start at the bottom of the salary scale. This has been COCC's practice for some time, but there has been discussion to change that policy.
- Recktenwald asked whether Evans or any other department chairs who had read the proposal felt that this new system would be an improvement over the existing one.
  - o Evans said he felt Russell's proposed new system was much clearer than the current system used by COCC's faculty.
  - o Recktenwald added that the new system would be easier for a new department chair to understand.
- Russel requested a second reading take place before the end of the 2023-24 academic year if possible.
- Motion to approve the proposed changes to the faculty policies.
  Motion made by Allison Dickerson, seconded by Josh Evans.
  - ☑ Motion approved by all members present.

b. Commencement Speaker Selection Committee (CSSC) Proposal, 1st Reading – Laurie Chesley
- Chesley reminded the College Affairs Committee (CAC) that this charge had been presented to them for their feedback earlier in the academic year. The CSSC had met during the current academic year and recommended they remain a standing committee.
- Dickerson noted that the proposal was for the CSSC to recommend one or more keynote speakers for a Commencement ceremony to the COCC President. What happens if the President rejects their recommendation(s)?
  - o Chesley clarified that the President could not select a speaker that was not recommended by the CSSC. If all recommended speakers turned down an invitation, the President would ask the CSSC for additional recommendations.
- Evans recalled that the CSSC had recommended that the President *not* invite a keynote speaker for the 2024 Commencement ceremony. Chesley confirmed this and said it would still be an option in the future.

- Motion to approve the permanent adoption of the Commencement Speaker Selection Committee.
  Motion made by Josh Evans, seconded by Nick Recktenwald.
  - ☑ Motion approved by all members present.

c. Artificial Intelligence Taskforce Update – Josh Evans
  - Evans received an email from Peterson who could not attend the meeting but wanted to update everyone on the progress of the taskforce. The taskforce is comprised of nine people: Tim Peterson (Chair), Eric Magidson, Christopher Hazlett, Kirsten Hostetler, Andrew Davis, Kaylin Landry, Scott Dove, Richard Partridge and Ivy Sotelo. They had met twice and were still in the "education phase" of their work, learning about AI and how it is used across COCC. They planned to move into an "organizing phase" in the coming fall, where they would highlight/evaluate pertinent concepts of AI. Next, they planned to go into a "development phase," where they would put together a recommended philosophy and guidelines for the college. They were *not* working on said guidelines at that time and were focusing on their education on the subject. They planned to host a breakout session at the All-College Kickoff in September and were working out the details.
  - Recktenwald commended the selection of taskforce members appointed.

ci. Proposed Updates to Faculty GPM, 1st Reading – Becky Plassmann, Annemarie Hamlin, Sara Henson
  - Faculty Promotions and Service Requests
    - Plassmann explained that the Faculty Senate formed a taskforce in September to consider combining the categories of college and community service for the purposes of tenure and promotions. This was motivated by difficulties for faculty members to find community service opportunities outside of the college while also having time for college service, both of which are required to qualify for tenure. The taskforce had met several times during the academic year, as well as with the Faculty Senate and other parties to negotiate terms. A proposed change was service to the college and community as one category for the purpose of promotions and tenure. Some language was also added to address a concern that such a change would lead to faculty spending more time serving in the community and less time in shared governance. The intended purposed of these changes was to allow for flexibility in service without requiring every-one to do the same things, recognizing that different people do different things well.
      - Hamlin acknowledged the taskforce and Faculty Senate for their hard work and their shared appreciation for both shared governance and flexibility in service options.
      - Henson added that information on these discussions was shared widely, not only with faculty, but with administration as well.
      - Evans added that this proposal had been shared with the Chairmoot for their feedback as well.
    - Foote Morgan asked what sorts of community volunteer activities are normally available for COCC's faculty.

- Evans used personal examples of translating webpages for COCC's website and judging bilingual student presentations for the Bend-La Pine School district. Typically, faculty members volunteer in areas that involve their fields of expertise.
        - Plassmann added that Career and Technical Education (CTE) instructors often work with people in the community to do the jobs they are training their students to do. Faculty members could also serve on local governing boards or national committees for their respective fields.
    - Recktenwald asked whether CTE instructors serving on advisory boards would be considered community or college service.
        - Plassmann said that Recktenwald's question speaks directly to the problem that the faculty faces when qualifying their required acts of service. This would be considered a "murky border."
        - Hamlin added there are additional service opportunities beyond advisory boards, such as building business partnerships and volunteering within their organizations.
    - Recktenwald asked whether an instructor could choose what category their service would be listed as if it were unclear.
        - Hamlin said that the Academic Affairs department typically does not dispute whether a faculty member's service would be considered community or college service.
    - Hamlin added that they were trying to better reflect what happens in the Faculty Promotions Committee. They are looking for evidence over a span of four years of doing service in both categories, but not necessarily concerned with how it is categorized and more about how it is related to their expertise.
    - Plassmann added that the Faculty Senate planned to reexamine how load units are used to measure service in the coming academic year.
- Tenure Procedures
    - Plassmann said that the Tenure Committee recently informed the Faculty Senate that they came to a deadlock due to having six voting members, so they requested the policy be updated to require seven voting members in order to prevent future deadlocks. In the proposed language, there was an addition of a voting faculty member and passing of motions with a four to three vote. The title of Vice President of Instruction had been adjusted to Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA). Some timelines were updated in order to give the VPAA more time to finish writing letters of recommendation. There was also some clarification about who receives letters once the Tenure Committee makes their decisions.
    - Recktenwald asked Plassmann to confirm if the proposed vote would be by majority, which she confirmed. She noted that there was discussion about whether a super-majority vote was more appropriate, but the Faculty Senate decided on a majority vote.

- o Recktenwald asked whether the Tenure Committee would send a letter of recommendation in favor of a candidate, or could they give an informal recommendation?
    - Plassmann explained that the proposal clarifies that the Committee would draft letters that specify their reasoning for recommendations and send them to the VPAA and the college President by the first Friday of March. Copies of those letters would also be sent to faculty members who were recommended and would be kept in their faculty files. If there is a minority on the Committee who wishes to submit a differing letter, they would be allowed to do so.
- Allowing Faculty to Remove Offensive Language from Student Comments in Faculty Files
    - o Evans reminded the CAC that this had been discussed earlier in the current academic year after it was approved by the Faculty Senate in 2021 and then was forgotten. While it was informally approved by the CAC in February 2024, believing that it had already passed a first and second reading, that belief was later discovered to be incorrect.
    - o Henson added that this proposal has since been reviewed again by the Faculty Senate. Human Resources also added language that they would prefer to be used, which they pulled directly from an Oregon State policy. She reminded the CAC that faculty members had been receiving outright discriminatory statements in their student evaluations, which discouraged some faculty from reading their evaluations anymore. This proposal was intended to allow faculty members to remove offensive comments that have no relevance to their ability to perform their duties. One change from the 2019 proposal was a removal of a deadline of 2-3 weeks after end of term for when a faculty member can request to remove a comment. The intention of the deadline was to not overwhelm HR with requests to remove comments. The new proposal has no deadline as faculty members do not always read their student evaluations right away, and while the policy was widely advertised to faculty after it had been passed in the Faculty Senate, HR did not receive a massive number of requests. Henson also clarified that a student's entire evaluation would not be removed, only language that was found to be offensive.
- Motion to approve all proposed changes to the faculty GPM.
  Motion made by Josh Evans, seconded by Tracy Crockett.
    - ☑ Motion approved by all voting members present.

e. Discussion Item: Early Retirement Committee (ERC) Proposal – Laura Boehme
- Boehme acknowledged the ERC members: Mike Beaulieu, Stacy Donahue, Jenna Fromme, Derwyn Hanney, Michael LaLonde and Kathy Smith. This workgroup was established by Chesley in February 2024. They were charged with exploring the possibility of an early retirement incentive (ERI). This was an item that the Faculty Forum had expressed interest in during their most recent negotiations and agreed to discuss this with the ERC. One idea was to present to the CAC. The workgroup gathered data and information from other community colleges and recommended an option for an ERI. The proposed requirements would be for an ERI candidate to be age 58 years or older, to have ten or more benefited years of service as a COCC employee, to give a three months' notice of retirement, and to submit a request to retire from COCC within the time period of July 1, 2024 to June 30, 2025 (requiring only a one month's notice for this

pilot program). Oregon's Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) recognizes your retirement to begin the day *after* you retire from your public position. The monetary incentive for full-time employees, not matter how many months were in their contract, would be $1,000 per month per benefited year of service at COCC with no cap on the amount of payout. Part-time employees would have that $1,000 prorated based on their FTE status. Any employee who is approved for early retirement would receive all of the other benefits of retiring from COCC. They must also file for retirement with PERS and would not be eligible for post-retirement agreements or any continued employment with COCC for three years in their prior position of employment. Instructors would be eligible for part-time, non-benefited faculty teaching, but not adjunct positions. Employees opting for early retirement must sign an early retirement agreement that outlines the payouts and other details of their retirement.

- Smith reminded the CAC that a survey was recently sent out to all COCC employees to ask whether those who were considering retiring within the next three years if they would consider early retirement as proposed. The survey gave a general overview of the Committee's proposal and explained that this would be a pilot program with the proposed retirement time period being July 1, 2024 to June 30, 2025.
    - o 40 people out of COCC's 50 eligible employees responded to the survey.
    - o 24 of those 40 people said they were considering retirement in the next three years.
        - ▪ 4 of 11 administrators.
        - ▪ 15 of 23 faculty members.
        - ▪ 5 of 5 administrators.
    - o The survey had no comments section, but those who participated were encouraged to email the ERC. A primary concern was maintaining healthcare during retirement.
- Boehme said that other community colleges that the ERC examined varied in terms of ERIs. Some offered ERIs, others did not, and others tried it and decided not to continue. Only one or two of the institutions examined offered early retirement as soon as age 58 when employees become eligible for Medicare. The estimated savings to COCC if 25% of eligible employees opted for early retirement within the proposed time period would be approximately $25,000.
    - o Smith clarified that the estimated savings were based on replacement costs per employee group, current salaries for eligible employees, as well as other factors.
- Boehme said the proposal also included potential impacts to departments and programs. The largest potential savings found in the survey was from the faculty as the replacement cost for a longtime faculty member would be higher than that of an administrator or classified employee. She reiterated that the proposal was for a pilot year for early retirement incentives for July 1, 2024 through June 30, 2025. ERI would also be examined for each employee group separately in light of the differences in amounts of savings for the college.
- Evans asked why age 58 years or older was the proposed minimum age for ERI. Was it based on State law?
    - o Boehme said it was based on what other community colleges have done with ERI programs. PERS requires tier-one retirees to be at least 55 years old. Based on the monetary incentive, age 58 was seen to be a common number. This was not based on any existing laws.

- o   Smith added that the younger an age that a person is allowed to retire, the more savings they could lose upon retirement.
- Plassmann asked what the ERC's intended goal was for an ERI.
  - o   Boehme said the goal was to address a request from the Faculty Forum to explore the topic. The ERC would also consider conducting further research and sending additional surveys to COCC personnel in the future.
- Dickerson asked whether the full terms of early retirement were included in the survey, including the lack of option of benefitted reemployment.
  - o   Boehme said the full terms were not included. The survey focused on the monetary portion of the proposal.
- Henson asked whether the workgroup discussed a possible healthcare benefit or incentive, rather than a monetary benefit.
  - o   Boehme said that, according to today's laws, you must be 55 to retire with eligibility for retiree health benefits. These benefits are self-paid and you can stay on the same insurance plan you were on before you retired, which could cost less than buying a new insurance policy on your own.
  - o   Smith added that this had been discussed, but the option in the proposal was found to be more favorable for the one-year pilot program.
  - o   Henson noted that comments from the survey included questions about keeping current co-payments and whether the college could continue to cover a large portion of their insurance policies, as opposed to a cash payout.
  - o   Smith said that the most common offering from Oregon's community colleges is a monthly stipend or continued college paid health insurance, and community colleges cap the age for early retirement at 65. The ERC did not want to do that, so it is an ongoing discussion. Many of the workgroup members did not want to focus on health benefits and preferred a more generalized benefit.
- Evans asked for clarification whether the estimated $25,000 in savings would be for all early retirees in the pilot program, rather than per retiree.
  - o   Boehme confirmed that it was a total estimate, rather than per retiree.
  - o   Evans went on to suggest that this could impact the student body if too many faculty members opt for early retirement in the same year, as well as how the college could be impacted if too many non-faculty employees opt in. Would the amount of money saved be worth the potential impact to the college?
  - o   Boehme reiterated that the potential of savings was not the intention for this work-group, but rather to satisfy an agreement with the Faculty Forum. Generally, COCC wants to do what is both most beneficial for its employees while remaining fiscally prudent for the college.
  - o   Smith pointed out that the savings would grow as they are projected out over a number of years because of a differential between the replacement salary and the faculty member. COCC would save money every year that an early retiree could otherwise be working.

- o Evans said he understood their position and clarified that hiring faculty members can be difficult, so he was unsure about this proposal.
- Henson asked what the next steps would be for the ERC.
  - o Chesley explained that she asked for the ERC to meet with the CAC as part of a response to a conversation that she had a few years ago regarding giving more responsibilities to the CAC. She proposed that, if the President forms a taskforce for a college-wide issue, their recommendations would be brought before the CAC for feedback. In her opinion, the CAC could either provide feedback and allow the ERC continue their work, or the CAC could choose to vote on whether to support the ERC's proposal. Chesley included a timeline in the ERC's charge in order to ensure it does not continue indefinitely. This could be discussed again if the CAC elects to have an additional meeting in June 2024. She preferred not extending this discussion into the Fall term and instead address the Faculty Forum's request in a timely manner.
  - o Boehme added that, even if this proposal was not adopted as written into COCC's policies, the data from the survey suggested that there were COCC employees who were waiting to hear what decisions were made on early retirement in light of their futures. She concurred with the concern for potential impacts to the student body and the college as a whole, but whether COCC offered this incentive did not change the fact that employees can opt to retire. However, this proposal could allow them for a more comfortable exit if they chose to do so.
- Foote Morgan asked how many people were anticipated to opt for early retirement if given the opportunity.
  - o Boehme said, based on the survey results, they estimated 15-19 people would opt for early retirement within the pilot year.
  - o Foote Morgan asked what percentage of COCC's faculty was included in that estimation.
  - o Boehme suggested it could be a maximum of 5% of the faculty. She acknowledged that hiring faculty can be difficult, but reiterated that nothing can prevent an individual from retiring when they choose to do so.
  - o Smith suggested delaying this pilot program could cause other problems now that the idea has been presented to COCC personnel. It is technically the college President's decision whether such a proposal would be brought before COCC's Board of Directors for final approval. It is not required to be implemented by vote from any of COCC's committees.

f. Election of a New College Affairs Committee Chair – Josh Evans
  - Evans noted that, in the previous meeting, Recktenwald had been nominated by Crockett to serve as CAC Chair for the 2024-25 academic year, and Recktenwald had accepted.
  - Motion to approve Nick Recktenwald as the CAC Chair for the 2024-25 academic year. Motion made by Josh Evans, seconded by Allison Dickerson.
    - ☑ Motion approved by all voting members present.

g. Discussion Item: Possible Emergency Meeting – Josh Evans
    •   Evans explained that members of the faculty had requested the GPM updates receive a second reading before the end of the academic year. He asked if the CAC members would be available for a shorter meeting the following week.
        o   After checking their calendars, the CAC members who attended the meeting agreed to meet on Thursday, June 13 at 4:00 – 5:00 p.m.

Motion to adjourn the meeting.
    Motion made by Allison Dickerson, seconded by Josh Evans.
    Meeting adjourned at 11:36 a.m.

NEXT MEETING: Thursday, June 13, 2024 at 4:00 p.m. via Zoom

Temporary link to meeting recording:
https://cocc.zoom.us/rec/play/BDbd0OEClCEBBEJinfMhEu3mn-xr4ybItcN6DIt_PyhCt2vqca7w4EW0HLuu_PPKE4gZ9r2ARAHCc0oe._YWPlIB9wx8NisNw