



Date: June 13, 2024

Time: 4:00 – 5:00 p.m.

Location: Zoom meeting

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

Meeting called to order at 4:02 p.m.

1. Old Business

a. Minutes from June 7, 2024 – Josh Evans

- LaLonde noticed an error regarding monetary incentives for early retirement for full-time employees should be “\$1,000 per benefited year of service,” not “per month per year.”
- Motion to approve the minutes with this correction.
Motion made by Allison Dickerson, seconded by Tracy Crockett.
- Motion approved 4 to 0. Peterson abstained for not being present at the previous meeting.

b. G-34-1.4 and G-34-3.3.1 Adjunct and Part-time Faculty Evaluation, 2nd Reading – Tony Russell

- Evans reminded the College Affairs Committee (CAC) that these proposed changes would make it easier to track the services of part-time and adjunct instructors and pay them accordingly.
- Motion to approve the second reading of proposed changes to G-34-1.4 and G-34-3.3.1.
Motion made by Nick Recktenwald, seconded by Tim Peterson.
- Motion approved by all voting members present.

c. Proposed Updates to Faculty GPM Regarding Tenure, Promotions, and Student Evaluations, 2nd Reading – Becky Plassmann, Annemarie Hamlin, Sara Henson

- Dickerson asked for clarification on some language regarding faculty serving in the community.
 - Plassmann explained that the intention of the language was to allow for more flexibility of categories for areas of service where a faculty member might complete their requirements for promotion.
- Recktenwald asked whether a faculty member who has requested offensive comments in an evaluation would be able to have their request retroactively approved in light of the confusion over whether this change had already been approved by the CAC.
 - Plassmann and Henson understood this to be correct.
 - Evans recalled that there was a three-week deadline to submit such a request in the original policy.
 - Plassmann confirmed this, adding that Hamlin did not feel the deadline was necessary.



- Motion to approve the second reading of proposed changes to the faculty GPM.
Motion made by Josh Evans, seconded by Allison Dickerson.
 Motion approved by all voting members present
- d. Commencement Speaker Selection Committee (CSSC) Proposal, 2nd Reading – Laurie Chesley
 - Chesley reminded the CAC that this proposal was for the CSSC to remain a standing committee after a successful pilot year.
 - Evans noted the CSSC’s roster and saw that the Director of Marketing and Public Relations and the Director of Diversity and Inclusion were listed as permanent members. However, the roster also listed two faculty members and two classified staff, but there was no language regarding term limits.
 - Chesley did not have a strong opinion on this, but asked the representatives from the Classified Association and Faculty Senate for their opinions.
 - Dickerson suggested two-year terms might be appropriate as long as they are staggered.
 - Plassmann concurred that official language on term limits would further legitimize the CSSC. She asked Finney, who served during the pilot year, if she felt the makeup of the CSSC well represented. Finney confirmed this.
 - Motion to approve the second reading of the permanent adoption of the Commencement Speaker Selection Committee with the recommended term limits.
Motion made by Nick Recktenwald, seconded by Tracy Crockett.
 Motion approved by all voting members present
- e. Discussion Item: Early Retirement Incentives Committee Proposal – Laura Boehme
 - Evans noted a letter from the Faculty Forum was included in the meeting packet. The letter was written in order for the Forum to express their position on the proposal.
 - Henson explained that the Forum recommended starting with a pilot year and for each employee group to be treated differently, as there are significant differences for each group, such as work schedules and the nature of said work. Dickerson concurred.
 - Recktenwald asked Henson what her concerns might be if different employee groups were not treated differently.
 - Henson explained that faculty often plan to retire at the end of an academic year and give advance notice to help the college hire their replacements, but that can cause problems with insurance in the summer. This is why the faculty are concerned about health insurance coverage when it comes to early retirement. Does the benefit expire when an employee reaches age 65?
 - Smith noted that ten other community colleges in Oregon include early retirement incentives in their collective bargaining agreements. She did not recall any of them not having a limit at age 65, which is when employees become eligible for Medicare. A one-time payment causes a different kind of tax burden for the person who chooses to retire before they are eligible for government benefits.
 - Donohue added that replacement costs for faculty are much lower than that of administrators and some classified positions. This is why other college faculties have collective bargaining agreements that include early retirement incentives, and other employee groups at other colleges might have similar agreements.



- Chesley clarified that the CAC may vote on whether to support this proposal and keep an official record of that vote, or they may simply provide their feedback.
- Boehme said that, after today's meeting, a memorandum on this proposal would be sent to Chesley for her approval. Once approved, it would be emailed to all COCC employees.
 - Evans asked if any of the Faculty Forum's feedback had been incorporated into Boehme's latest draft of the memo.
 - Boehme confirmed this and added that COCC employees would be encouraged to continue to offer feedback in response to the memo.
 - Finney asked what would happen after that.
 - Chesley said she would consider all feedback she had received, including feedback to the memo, and she would announce her final decision to all COCC employees, most likely via COCC Headlines.
 - Evans asked when that announcement might be sent.
 - Chesley estimated she would make an announcement in about two or three weeks.
 - Evans asked if there would be notice time in the memo.
 - Boehme said it was slated for July 1, 2024 – June 30, 2025. There would be a three months' notice required, except for employees who want to retire between July 1 and September 30, in which case they would need to give one month's notice.
- Dickerson had discussed this proposal with some members of the Classified Association. Their consensus was that the lump sum payment would not be significant enough. They also had a similar sentiment as the Faculty Forum toward healthcare concerns. Since the feedback she received was limited, she offered to try to gather additional feedback for future discussions.
- In speaking to faculty members about this proposal, Henson heard concerns regarding the number of faculty members who expressed interest in early retirement through a survey and how difficult it might be to replace that many people. Even without an incentive, several faculty members could choose to retire simultaneously. There is also some perception that one lump sum payment is a sign that the college is trying to force employees out instead of trying to support them.
 - Donohue suggested that Henson's points supported the idea of treating employee groups differently from one another.
 - Smith added that search times for faculty replacements might be different than other employee groups. A faculty member may need to give a six months' notice in order to give the college enough time to hire their replacement.
 - Donohue pointed out that the fact that this proposal could expire after one year might cause several faculty members to choose early retirement out of fear that they would not have another opportunity. She suggested that a pilot year should not be indicative of future years. If they knew it was an ongoing opportunity, could they apply for early retirement? Could they teach part-time after retiring?
- Crockett asked how many employees were currently eligible for early retirement.
 - Smith said that the Early Retirement Incentives Committee projected that about 25% of COCC employees were eligible for early retirement, but that included employees who were in their 70s as there was no maximum age for this incentive.



- Smith shared the results from a survey that was sent out to all COCC employees via Bobcat Community. Of the eligible employees who were within three years of retirement, four administrators, 15 faculty members and five classified employees said they would accept an incentive to retire on or before June 30, 2025.
- Recktenwald asked whether there was anything the CAC needed to vote on. He concurred with the Faculty Forum’s letter proposing a pilot year and considering each employee group separately.
 - Evans concurred and suggested that a vote was not necessary.
 - Smith pointed out that the details of the recommendation memo were not known.
 - Plassmann said she would like to see a clearer aim for examining and awarding early retirement incentives beyond satisfying a requirement of the faculty’s collective bargaining agreement.
 - Boehme explained that everything in the memo was taken from the recommendation portion of the proposal. Based on the comments made during today’s meeting, she did not think any revisions to the memo were necessary.
- Henson reminded everyone that faculty members are off contract during the summer. If a final decision is made and announced during that time, she requested that it be repeated when the faculty return in September.

Motion to adjourn the meeting.

Motion made by Tracy Crockett, seconded by Tim Peterson.

Meeting adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

NEXT MEETING: Friday, October 11, 2024 at 10:00 a.m. via Zoom