Date: April 12, 2024
Time: 10:00 – 11:30am
Location: Zoom meeting

Attending	Absent	Guests
Tim Peterson, Interim Chair	Kara Rutherford, Chair	Frank Payne
Nicholas Recktenwald	Tracey Crockett	Shannon Waller
Sara Henson	Allison Dickerson	Mindy Williams
Erin Foote Morgan	Josh Evans	Sharla Andresen
Laurie Chesley, COCC President	Ivy Sotelo	Jared Green
Kyle Matthews, Recorder		

Meeting called to order at 10:00 am.

1. Old Business
a. Minutes from March 8, 2024 – Tim Peterson
   • No questions or comments regarding the minutes.

b. Proposal to Increase HHPA Course Fees for Mt. Bachelor Access, 2nd Reading – Shannon Waller and Tony Russell
   • Due to lack of quorum, Peterson suggested tabling this matter until the next CAC meeting.

c. Proposal for Inclusive Course Fees for Fall 2024 Term, 2nd Reading – Frank Payne
   • Due to lack of quorum, Peterson suggested tabling this matter until the next CAC meeting.

d. Discussion Item: Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) in Higher Education – Tim Peterson and Ivy Sotelo
   • Peterson said he had not had a chance to communicate with Sotelo outside of a short email correspondence. His plan was to start recruiting members for the proposed taskforce in the coming week. He invited input and feedback from the other CAC members. He felt the taskforce did not need to be large, but should embody the entirety of the college's personnel. He suggested recruiting two members each from the faculty, administrators, classified staff and students, with Peterson and Sotelo co-chairing the taskforce. Peterson had received a lot of interest from individuals who wanted to be on the taskforce, but he did not feel comfortable choosing people on his own, and instead suggested each individual body appointment their own representatives. He planned to reach out to the Faculty Senate and the Classified Association, and to ask Sotelo to reach out to the ASCOCC. Peterson asked who would be most appropriate to contact from the administrators.
      o While COCC's administrators do not have organized leadership as other groups do, Chesley suggested contacting Andrew Davis, Director of Student/Campus Life, as he has organized meetings for administrators in the past.
      o Recktenwald suggested including Lindsey Buccafurni, Assistant Director of Student Life, in his correspondence with the ASCOCC as she serves as their advisor.
   • Once a taskforce is formed, Peterson's goal is to coordinate three meetings before the end of the academic year. There seemed to be a misunderstanding of Annemarie Hamlin's proposal as several individuals interested in the taskforce were under the impression that the taskforce

would be writing official college policies on GenAI. Peterson wanted to make it clear that the taskforce was not being charged to write policies, but to develop strategies to help foster effective policies and procedures for GenAI use in the future. Peterson wanted those interested in volunteering for the taskforce to understand that it would require extensive work, research and education on their part, particularly over the coming summer term.

- Foote Morgan suggested Peterson keep a list to all of the research he had compiled thus far.
  - o Peterson concurred and suggested that the taskforce could eventually evolve into an advisory committee. As GenAI becomes more pervasive across COCC, there may be a need for a dedicated group that can advise other college groups on GenAI policies and procedures.
- In terms of timelines, Peterson's goal was for the taskforce to complete their goals by the time of this meeting next year and present their findings to the CAC. He expected to have another update for the CAC during their final meeting for the academic year (June) and then following up during the coming Fall and Winter terms.
- Henson suggested Peterson establish meeting dates for the taskforce while recruiting as Spring term can be very busy. In her experience, it is easier to find volunteers who can make it to meetings if their dates are chosen in advance.
  - o Peterson concurred.
- Hanson asked if there was a clear charge for the taskforce.
  - o Peterson had drafted a charge that he would discuss with Sotelo and then the taskforce, but he was considering discussing it further with the taskforce during their first meeting. Based on what he read from Hamlin's proposal, he drafted a charge to develop a strategy that would foster effective policies and procedures toward an innovative, informed and responsible culture of GenAI at COCC. He expected the end product of the taskforce to be guidelines for how to work with GenAI across the college, so if a specific department wants to create their own policy on the matter, the taskforce would have created resources to help guide that policy.
  - o Recktenwald suggested creating a few goals or outcomes for the taskforce in order to help each group at COCC select appointees.
- Peterson planned to have an update for the CAC at their next meeting.

2. New Business
a. Discussion Item: Proposed Updates to the Review and Support Committee's (RSC's) General Procedure Manual (GPM) Description – Mindy Williams
- Williams had included a copy of the standing version of the GPM description of the RSC in the meeting packet as there were several changes included in the proposal. In their most recent negotiation, they revised the RSC's charge and description to match the collective bargaining agreement (CBA). Since this is a faculty related committee, it was presented to the Faculty Forum and the Chairmoot for feedback, and the Faculty Senate for review and approval. It was now being presented to the CAC for feedback before changes can be officially be made to the GPM. Their intention was to align their current practices with that of the CBA, which will always take precedent over the GPM, so any changes to the CBA article moving forward would also require changes to the GPM.

- Peterson asked whether these changes were only in relation to the faculty CBA, rather than the processes of the FSC.
  - Williams explained that the processes of the FSC are dictated by the CBA, so the CBA was intentionally revised to reflect this. Since the FSC is dictated by a contract, it should not be relying on the GPM to establish its procedures. The language in the GPM is meant to be an abbreviated version of the CBA.
- Williams added that one change they made was for the RSC to have co-chairs. The Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA) would be an automatic co-chair and a member of the faculty would serve as the other co-chair. The reason is because, if the VPAA chooses to bypass the RSC process as allowed by the CBA, adding a co-chair could help avoid any potential conflicts within the RSC.

b. G.21.8.4.1 Proceeds from Sale of Surplus Property – 1st Reading, Sharla Andresen
   - This procedure had been presented last year by Payne in order to discontinue the Copy Center. However, it was recently discovered that this procedure had not been followed by COCC personnel as written, so it was bring presented to the CAC to be revised accordingly. COCC no longer has a Vice President of Administration, so the language was changed to Vice President of Finance and Operations (VPFO). Certain thresholds of dollars also do not need to be approved by the VPFO. Since Andresen oversees purchasing for COCC, it made sense for her position, Director of Risk Management, to oversee minimal surplusage of property that has no value and cannot be sold, donated or recycled. Andresen had been approving any property that was valued less than $5,000, so part of the proposal was to grant the Director of Risk Management the responsibility to continue to do so.
     - Peterson asked why $5,000 was the threshold.
     - Andresen explained that $5,000 was considered de minimis (too trivial or minor to merit consideration) and suggested it could even be raised to $10,000. She noted that similar policies at other institutions use either amount as their thresholds.
   - Henson asked whether Andresen or any other COCC personnel consults with the Sustainability Committee regarding surplus property.
     - Andresen said the Sustainability Committee had been reviewing COCC's policies regarding surplus property. Andresen was also working with Tina Hovekamp, Director of Library Services, to ensure the library was following these procedures. The college makes every effort possible to avoid sending any surplus property to the landfill. Andresen has also taken more sustainable approaches to new purchases, such as not buying new furniture if it is not necessary.
   - Peterson asked how COCC defines surplus property.
     - Andresen explained that any physical property that a faculty or staff member no longer wants, such as office furniture, is declared "surplus" and made available for other faculty or staff members to claim. If the property goes unclaimed or is declared no longer of use to the college, Andresen offers it to local schools to claim. If no schools are interested, Andresen determines whether the property has any value. Even if it is valued at $1.00, Andresen would try to sell it. If the value is found to be higher (example: $200),

Andresen would try to sell it to a local nonprofit organization or business that COCC regularly partners with. If that does not work, Andresen will try online resources like Craigslist or Facebook Marketplace to try to sell the property. Only as a last resort would the unwanted property be dismantled and either sold for scrap metal and/or sent to the landfill. The Campus Services department can also save any surplus wood if possible.

- Peterson asked how much surplus property Andresen deals with at one time.
  - o Andresen said it depends on the day. Most of this work happens at the end of an academic year when many faculty members move out of their offices, as well as the beginning of a new academic year when faculty move in and decide they do not want something in their office. It also depends on what new classes might be coming into a classroom and what changes might need to be made to the room's inventory.
- In reading the proposal, Peterson noted that this policy would not apply to the motor pool, Bookstore, dining hall or residence hall.
  - o Andresen confirmed this and explained that property from those departments is considered enterprise funds as they have different rules on what they can purchase. However, some of these departments have still opted to follow COCC's procedures. For example, when students prepare to move out of the residence hall at the end of the academic year and the residence hall coordinates a rummage swap, approval from Risk Management is not required.
- Due to lack of quorum, Peterson suggested tabling this matter until the next CAC meeting where it could have a first and second reading.

c. Proposal to Increase Fees for Automotive Technology Courses – 1st Reading, Jared Green
- Green explained that the Automotive Technology programs switched to a digital textbook, which has proven to work well for both students and faculty. However, the program also uses "course packs," which are printed workbooks that contain exercises for students to complete during their laboratory classes. This has proven difficult to do in a digital format and students have preferred having something to physically write on during these classes. The instructors have also found that students tend to test better when writing things down, therefore giving the program better retention. (This observation was purely anecdotal as no supporting data was available.) In the past, the course packs were printed through COCC's now discontinued Copy Center and sold at the Bookstore. The course packs are now printed through OfficeMax. Green noted that the copies printed by OfficeMax have a better quality than that of the Copy Center. Course pack booklets ranged from $20.00 - $30.00 in price from the Bookstore. They are currently being printed for $12.00 - $13.00 per copy from OfficeMax with an instructor picking them up from their location in Bend. Accounting for inflation and variation in costs, as well as the possibility of having the booklets shipped if no one can pick them up and deliver them to Madras or Prineville, the proposal was for a $20.00 flat fee. This is still less than what a student would pay out-of-pocket to purchase course packs from the Bookstore.
- Peterson asked whether each automotive course includes one course packet.
  - o Green confirmed.

- o Peterson went on to summarize that the cost was not necessarily changing for the students, but rather they were paying an additional fee to take the course and receive their course packs from their instructors.
    - o Green confirmed that this is a net zero change in terms of cost to students. He added that the program had tried offering a PDF for students to print on their own, but it turned out to not be an equitable procedure as not all students have easy or free access to printers.
  - • Recktenwald noted that the Automotive department's assessment of their students' test scores being affected by how they complete assignments may warrant a more formal assessment.
    - o Green concurred that it would be a good project to pursue when time allows.
  - • Due to lack of quorum, Peterson suggested tabling this matter until the next CAC meeting where it could have a first and second reading.

d. Reschedule June 14 College Affairs Meeting? – Kyle Matthews
  - • Due to lack of quorum, Peterson suggested tabling this matter until the next CAC meeting.

3. Confidential Business
a. Discussion Item: Bart Queary Lifetime Achievement Award Nominations – Tim Peterson
  - • While there was a lack of quorum for this meeting, a decision needed to be made in order for Human Resources to have enough time to order the award plaque(s) with the winner(s)' names engraved. Some members of the committee who were unable to attend sent in their votes via email before the meeting. Using these emailed votes, along with those from voting members who were present, two winners were selected.

Motion to adjourn the meeting.
  Motion made by Tim Peterson, seconded by Nick Recktenwald.
  ☑ Motion approved by all members present.

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