



**College Affairs Committee  
Emergency Meeting**  
Thursday, June 13, 2024  
4:00 – 5:00 p.m.

**Virtual Zoom Meeting**

Click the following link to attend via Zoom:

<https://cocc.zoom.us/j/98072514506>

Dial up: 669-900-6833 | Meeting ID: 980 7251 4506

**1. Old Business**

- a. Review minutes from June 7, 2024 meeting – Josh Evans
- b. G-34-1.4 and G-34-3.3.1 Adjunct and Part-time Faculty Evaluation, 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading – Tony Russell
- c. Proposed Updates to Faculty GPM, 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading – Becky Plassman, Sara Henson and Annemarie Hamlin
- d. Commencement Speaker Selection Committee Proposal, 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading – Laurie Chesley
- e. Discussion Item: Early Retirement Committee Proposal – Laura Boehme

Next Meeting: Friday, October 11, 2024, 10:00 – 11:30 a.m. via Zoom



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 Plassman
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, 2<sup>nd</sup> 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, 1<sup>st</sup> 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a longstanding issue at COCC has been hiring and maintaining adjunct and part-time faculty members, partially due to an outdated faculty review system that the college still uses.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?
  - 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.
  - Evans said he felt Russell's proposed new system was much clearer than the current system used by COCC's faculty.
  - 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, 1<sup>st</sup> 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)?
    - 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.
  
- d. Proposed Updates to Faculty GPM, 1<sup>st</sup> Reading – Becky Plassman, Annemarie Hamlin, Sara Henson
  - Faculty Promotions and Service Requests
    - Plassman 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.
- Plassman 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.
  - Plassman 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.
- Plassman added that the Faculty Senate planned to reexamine how load units are used to measure service in the coming academic year.
- Tenure Procedures
  - Plassman 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 Plassman 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.



- Recktenwald asked whether the Tenure Committee would send a letter of recommendation in favor of a candidate, or could they give an informal recommendation?
  - Plassman 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
  - 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.
  - 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.
  - 40 people out of COCC's 50 eligible employees responded to the survey.
  - 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.
  - 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.
  - 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?
  - 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.



- Smith added that the younger an age that a person is allowed to retire, the more savings they could lose upon retirement.
- Plassman asked what the ERC's intended goal was for an ERI.
  - 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.
  - 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.
  - 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.
  - 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.
  - 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.
  - 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.
  - Boehme confirmed that it was a total estimate, rather than per retiree.
  - 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?
  - Boehme reiterated that the potential of savings was not the intention for this workgroup, 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.
  - 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.





- 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.
    - 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.
    - 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.
    - Boehme said, based on the survey results, they estimated 15-19 people would opt for early retirement within the pilot year.
    - Foote Morgan asked what percentage of COCC's faculty was included in that estimation.
    - 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.
    - 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.
    - 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/BDbd0OECICEBBEJinfMhEu3mn-xr4ybItcN6DIt\\_PyhCt2vqca7w4EWOHLuu\\_PPKE4gZ9r2ARAHcc0oe.YWPIIB9wx8NisNw](https://cocc.zoom.us/rec/play/BDbd0OECICEBBEJinfMhEu3mn-xr4ybItcN6DIt_PyhCt2vqca7w4EWOHLuu_PPKE4gZ9r2ARAHcc0oe.YWPIIB9wx8NisNw)



## Presentation/Proposal Form

Name:

Date:

Department:

Contact Information:

- ❖ Complete Items 1–9 to the best of your ability (see [Instructions](#) form for reference).
- ❖ If an item is not relevant to your specific presentation/proposal, please mark it *N/A*.
- ❖ E-mail the completed Presentation/Proposal Form to the College Affairs chair and committee support specialist no later than 5 pm the Friday prior to the scheduled College Affairs meeting.

### 1. PRESENTATION/PROPOSAL ABSTRACT (no more than 250 words)

### 2. TYPE OF PRESENTATION/PROPOSAL

Information Item and/or Committee Feedback (requires approval of CA Chair)

Action Item:

Procedure/Policy — *typographical correction and/or federal/state mandate update* (Attach current procedure/policy with proposed changes highlighted using track changes.)

Procedure/Policy — *revision* (Attach current procedure/policy with proposed changes highlighted using track changes.)

Procedure/Policy — *new* (Attach proposed procedure/policy separately.)

Identify suggested location in manual:

Course Fee — If applicable, identify a suggested cap for the course fee (for example, a percentage or "increase to not exceed \$X"):

Other:

### **3. BUDGET IMPACT**

### **4. IMPACTED DEPARTMENTS AND/OR PROGRAMS**

*List impacted departments/programs, describe the impact, and identify steps taken to communicate the impact(s)*

### **5. INSTRUCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS/IMPACTS**

### **6. OPERATIONAL IMPACT**

**7. STUDENT IMPACT**

**8. ANTICIPATED IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE**

**9. MOTION TO BE RECOMMENDED**

## G-34-1.4 ADJUNCT AND PART-TIME FACULTY COMPENSATION AT COCC

### Proposed Revision

Current language	Proposed language	Notes
<p><b>Process:</b> All salaries are determined in the Fall quarter contract or, in the case of someone who does not teach Fall quarter, the first contract in the academic year. No adjustments are made at any other time than the preparation of the first teaching contract of the academic year-counting Fall as the first quarter of the academic year.</p> <p>Department chairs recommend advancement on the salary schedule based on the number of quarters with successful evaluations taught in the preceding academic year. <del>For purposes of counting quarters, a contract of three load units or more counts as a quarter. Contracts of less than three load units over several quarters may be aggregated to count as a quarter.</del> In practice, all part-time faculty, are paid at this rate, although the President may approve placing a part-time faculty member at a different pay level. Under exceptional circumstances, a department chair may recommend to the Vice President for Instruction to place a part-time faculty member at a different pay level. (Load units are defined in the Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement.)</p> <p>Information regarding pay periods and options for receiving pay for part-time faculty may be obtained by contacting the Office of Fiscal Services.</p>	<p><b>Process:</b> In practice, all part-time faculty members are paid at the standard rate, unless the President approves placing a part-time faculty member at a different pay level. In exceptional circumstances, a department chair may recommend a different pay level to the <b>Vice President for Academic Affairs</b>.</p> <p><b>Salary increases occur at the beginning of the academic year. If a faculty member starts later in the academic year, the increase will be reflected in their contract.</b></p> <p>Adjustments to salaries only occur when preparing the first teaching contract of the academic year, with Fall being considered the initial quarter.</p> <p>Department chairs <b>endorse</b> part-time and adjunct faculty members for advancement on the salary schedule by (1.) <b>verifying that the faculty member has taught at least one for-credit course in the previous academic year and (2.) confirming the faculty member's peer and student evaluations are satisfactory.</b></p> <p>For information regarding pay periods and options for receiving pay, part-time faculty members can contact <b>Payroll in Human Resources</b>. Detailed guidelines on load units, which define work expectations, can be found in the Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement. These measures ensure transparency and fairness in the determination of part-time faculty salaries.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Updates nomenclature (e.g., VPI to VPAA)</li> <li>• Re-groups processes thematically:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Pay level placement</li> <li>○ Contract</li> <li>○ Evaluation and pay increase</li> <li>○ Additional information</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Removes 3-credit minimum so that a class is a class (i.e., someone taught)</li> <li>• Removes <i>countable quarter</i> concept so that a quarter is a quarter</li> </ul>

## G-34-3.3.1 EVALUATION OF PART-TIME AND ADJUNCT FACULTY

### Proposed Revision

Current language	Proposed language	Justification
<p>It is the departmental Chair's responsibility to evaluate their department's part-time and adjunct faculty utilizing the following:</p> <p><b>A. First Year at COCC</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Student evaluations, all sections, every quarter.</li> <li>2. Peer Evaluation: minimum one class visit, pre and post conference, review of materials with written report to Designated Evaluator.</li> <li>3. Designated Evaluator review: written summary.</li> </ol> <p><b>B. Second Year at COCC (up to sixth quarter)</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Student evaluations, all sections, every quarter.</li> <li>2. Peer Evaluation: minimum one class visit, pre and post conference, review of materials, with written report to Designated Evaluator (Individual departments may wish to use forms for this purpose, such as provided within the Peer Evaluation Handbook. However, written commentary should be added to the checklists).</li> <li>3. Designated Evaluator review: written summary.</li> </ol> <p><b>C. After Two Years, or Six Quarters</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Student evaluations: Part-time and adjunct faculty who have taught more than 2 years (6 terms for part-time faculty; need not be consecutive) choose which term(s) they want printed and sent to their HR file. Adjunct faculty will make their choice by the 2nd week of fall term for the academic year. Part-time faculty will make their choice prior to the first term they are teaching for an academic year unless otherwise determined by the department chair.</li> <li>2. Peer evaluation/DE Review: After the probationary period described above, the next Peer Evaluation and Designated Evaluator written review will be scheduled no more than three years later. This schedule can be adjusted to allow for more frequent reviews should the Designated Evaluator deem this desirable at any time.</li> <li>3. Written feedback should be received for the instructor's personnel file in either Winter or Spring quarter, but not later than May 15, unless the department chair notifies the instructor that it will be late.</li> <li>4. Part-time and adjunct faculty have the option of submitting a statement of explanation or comment on such evaluations. Written evaluations and any faculty response will be filed in the instructor's personnel file.</li> </ol> <p><b>D. Lapses in Service</b></p> <p>In cases of absences of a year or more, returning faculty may be returned to the same position in the evaluation cycle.</p>	<p>The <b>department chair or their designee</b> evaluates department part-time and adjunct faculty <b>members</b> using the following <b>processes and practices</b>:</p> <p><b>A. First Academic Year at COCC</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Student evaluations, all sections <b>taught</b>, every quarter <b>taught</b>.</li> <li>2. Peer Evaluation: minimum one class visit, pre and post conference, review of materials with written report to Designated Evaluator.</li> <li>3. Designated Evaluator review: written summary.</li> </ol> <p><b>B. Second Academic Year at COCC</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Student evaluations, all sections taught, every quarter <b>taught</b>.</li> <li>2. Peer Evaluation: minimum one class visit, pre and post conference, review of materials, with written report to Designated Evaluator (Individual departments may wish to use forms for this purpose, such as provided within the Peer Evaluation Handbook. However, written commentary should be added to the checklists).</li> <li>3. Designated Evaluator review: written summary.</li> </ol> <p><b>C. After Academic Two Years</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Student evaluations: Part-time and adjunct faculty who have taught more than 2 years (<del>6 terms for part-time faculty; need not be consecutive</del>) choose which term(s) they want printed and sent to their HR file. Adjunct faculty will make their choice by the 2nd week of fall term for the academic year. Part-time faculty will make their choice prior to the first term they are teaching for an academic year unless otherwise determined by the department chair. <b>If for any reason no term is selected, evaluations from the earliest term taught in the academic year will be sent to HR.</b></li> <li>2. Peer evaluation/DE Review: After the probationary period described above, the next Peer Evaluation and Designated Evaluator written review will be scheduled no more than three years later. This schedule can be adjusted to allow for more frequent reviews should the Designated Evaluator deem this desirable at any time.</li> <li>3. Written feedback should be received for the instructor's personnel file in either Winter or Spring quarter, but not later than May 15, unless the department chair notifies the instructor that it will be late.</li> <li>4. Part-time and adjunct faculty have the option of submitting a statement of explanation or comment on such evaluations. Written evaluations and any faculty response will be filed in the instructor's personnel file.</li> </ol> <p><b>D. Lapses in Service</b></p> <p>In cases of absences of a year or more, returning faculty may be returned to the same position in the evaluation cycle.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Redefines <i>years teaching</i> as “academic years,” disregarding the number of terms taught</li> <li>• Accounts for situations when a term is not selected for evaluations to go into the faculty member’s personnel file (so that a term is <i>always</i> selected)</li> </ul>



## Presentation/Proposal Form

### Updates to Faculty GPM

Name: Sara Henson

Date: 6/6/2024

Department: Social Sciences, Human Development

**Contact Information:**

- ❖ Complete Items 1–9 to the best of your ability (see [Instructions](#) form for reference).
- ❖ If an item is not relevant to your specific presentation/proposal, please mark it *N/A*.
- ❖ E-mail the completed Presentation/Proposal Form to the College Affairs chair and committee support specialist no later than 5 pm the Friday prior to the scheduled College Affairs meeting.

#### 1. PRESENTATION/PROPOSAL ABSTRACT (no more than 250 words)

1. Faculty Senate change in language to GPM regarding Faculty Promotions and Service requirements
2. Faculty Senate updates in language to GPM regarding Tenure procedures
3. Faculty Senate re-approval of policy to allow faculty to request removal of offensive language in student evaluations from HR files

#### 2. TYPE OF PRESENTATION/PROPOSAL

Information Item and/or Committee Feedback (requires approval of CA Chair)

Action Item:

Procedure/Policy — *typographical correction and/or federal/state mandate update* (Attach current procedure/policy with proposed changes highlighted using track changes.)

Procedure/Policy — *revision* (Attach current procedure/policy with proposed changes highlighted using track changes.)

Procedure/Policy — *new* (Attach proposed procedure/policy separately.)

Identify suggested location in manual:

Course Fee — If applicable, identify a suggested cap for the course fee (for example, a percentage or "increase to not exceed \$X"):

Other:



**3. BUDGET IMPACT**

none

**4. IMPACTED DEPARTMENTS AND/OR PROGRAMS**

*List impacted departments/programs, describe the impact, and identify steps taken to communicate the impact(s)*

HR?

**5. INSTRUCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS/IMPACTS**

Impact on FT-tenure track faculty

**6. OPERATIONAL IMPACT**

**7. STUDENT IMPACT**

**8. ANTICIPATED IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE**

Fall 2024

**9. MOTION TO BE RECOMMENDED**

Approval of faculty senate recommendations

**Clean copy of revised GPM service language,  
as passed for 1st reading at Faculty Senate, June 3, 2024**

G-34-3.1.2 Description of rank and criteria for promotion

The College expects that all faculty members will satisfactorily perform their primary assignment and will maintain competency in their field (competency implies that one keeps current in one's field). The College also expects that all faculty members will act professionally and ethically. In addition to these assumptions, the College expects tenure-track and tenured faculty to satisfy other criteria specific to rank.

Assistant Professor II, Associate Professor and Professor each carry expectations for performance in **these** criteria:

- Primary Assignment
- Professional Improvement
- Service to the **College and Community** (service to the community not required at rank of Assistant Professor I)

Faculty members employed at Central Oregon Community College, regardless of the rank they initially occupy and whatever qualifications they possess on initial employment, are expected to mature as professionals and progress through the ranks to become outstanding faculty members **by working with and contributing to the college community.**

G-34-3.1.3 Definition of Criteria

**Definition of Primary Assignment:** A faculty member's primary assignment includes teaching requirements, advising, assessment, and curriculum development. It may also include administrative duties such as program director and may change over time with other administrative duties as assigned, such as becoming a department chair. Anything for which a faculty member receives load units is considered part of their primary assignment.

**Definition of Professional Improvement:** Professional improvement consists of activities designed to improve faculty members' effectiveness in their College assignments and in their professions.

**Definition of Service:**

Service to the College includes all activities at the College not included in the primary assignment. Service to College includes participation in shared governance, and involvement in standing committees, hiring committees and task force groups. However, College service is not exclusive to committee work. Of equal importance are individual efforts to improve the operation, systems, faculty/staff and student

performance. Some examples would include peer teams, significant accreditation efforts, or special projects/task forces as assigned. Service to the community includes volunteer activities both inside our district and beyond (including state and national service), **as an expert resource**.

**The college recognizes and affirms that representation of faculty is critical to effective shared governance. College service provides faculty with an opportunity to learn about the college beyond their department.**

**Faculty may focus on either category within an academic year, but should make contributions in both service categories over the time until their next promotion.**

### Proposed Service Criteria Changes to G-34-3.1.4 Rank with Associated Criteria

#### **Assistant Professor I:**

This is the rank at which most faculty are hired. Faculty members at this rank are expected to focus on establishing their expertise in their primary assignment. In addition to this, faculty should regularly attend department meetings, mandatory College wide meetings, and a selection of campus activities that will help them understand the workings and culture of the College. During the first year, a faculty member will develop their professional improvement plan (PIP). At the beginning of their second year and every year to follow, faculty members will submit their annual report of activities (ARA). Beyond the first year, faculty members should be **gradually** expanding their engagement with the larger College community. This may include serving on peer teams or other College committees and exploring options for further professional development and service.

In most circumstances a faculty member should be in their third year of service at the rank of Assistant Professor I at the time they are first considered for promotion to Assistant Professor II.

The following provides a guideline for promotion to Assistant II with respect to each criterion:

**Primary Assignment:** Evidence of improvement and refinement of teaching ability or, in the case of non-teaching faculty, evidence of improvement of performance in one's assignment. The individual shows regular, significant improvement in the quality of teaching or performance in non-teaching assignment. The individual contributes to maintenance and development in their curricular or program area.

**Professional Improvement:** The faculty member should have an approved PIP on file and have demonstrated progress toward completing PIP goals as noted in the ARA.

**Service:** The faculty member demonstrates that they are finding meaningful ways to contribute to the work of the College. Prior to achieving the rank of Assistant II, faculty are not discouraged from taking on leadership roles or positions depending on experience; however, this is not an expectation.

### **Assistant Professor II:**

Faculty members at this rank must continue to focus on developing their expertise in their primary assignment. They should also seek out ways to contribute to the success of their department and begin to reach beyond the department by, for example, serving on a variety of College committees, task forces, **and/or** peer teams. They are now reaching out to the community to share their expertise through various activities. Once faculty have achieved this rank, they should begin exploring more engagement with leadership roles at the College.

A faculty member is usually in their fourth year of service at the rank of Assistant Professor II at the time they are first considered for promotion to Associate Professor. The following provides a guideline for promotion to Associate Professor with respect to each criterion:

**Primary Assignment:** The individual demonstrates significant competence while striving for excellence in teaching ability and performance in the primary assignment. The individual contributes to **maintaining** and developing the existing curriculum or program area.

**Professional Improvement:** In most circumstances, the individual preparing for the rank of Associate Professor should have a final PIP report on file for the first PIP cycle and, in most cases, documented progress toward completion of the second PIP cycle.

**Service:** Service at the Assistant Professor II level includes engagement within the College and community, and active pursuit of leadership roles. College service should move beyond the department level. Community service expands **the faculty member's role** in the community **as an expert resource** by accepting local, statewide, or national roles.

**Faculty may focus on either category within an academic year, but should make contributions in both service categories over the time until their next promotion.**

### **Associate Professor:**

At the rank of Associate Professor, a faculty member should demonstrate significant competence while striving for excellence in the primary assignment, and contribute to

the success of their department. They should also demonstrate reaching beyond the department level to take on leadership roles within the College. This person has now contributed their expertise in the community beyond the College and participated in leadership roles within and beyond the department level.

A faculty member is usually in their fifth year of service at the rank of Associate Professor at the time they are first considered for promotion to Professor. The following provides a guideline for promotion to Professor with respect to each criterion.

**Primary Assignment:** The individual demonstrates regular and significant improvement and refinement in maintaining excellence in teaching ability and performance in all areas of the primary assignment. The individual demonstrates leadership in curricular or program development.

**Professional Improvement:** The individual has a long-term documented record of broad commitment to professional growth.

**Service:** Faculty applying for the rank of Professor should demonstrate service by taking on leadership roles within and beyond the department level and serving the community as an expert resource by accepting local, statewide, or national roles.

Faculty may focus on either category within an academic year, but should make contributions in both service categories over the time until their next promotion.

### **Professor:**

At the rank of Professor, a faculty member should demonstrate consistent excellence in the performance of their primary assignment. The individual demonstrates an ongoing commitment to sharing their expertise and knowledge by regularly accepting leadership roles on campus committees or task forces that help to create meaningful change for the College and engaging in consistent and meaningful contributions of their professional expertise at the local, regional, or national level.

Faculty may focus on either category within an academic year, but should make contributions in both service categories over time.

## **Recommended Revision & Additions 3.0 (As approved for 1<sup>st</sup> reading at Faculty Senate on June 3, 2024)**

### **G-6-8.5 COLLEGE TENURE COMMITTEE**

**CHARGE:** The College Tenure Committee considers eligible faculty members for elevation to tenured status and submits recommendations to the College President **and Board of Trustees**.

#### **Membership, Voting Status and Terms**

Faculty (4)\* Elected by the Faculty Senate Voting Three years

Faculty At-Large (2)\* Elected by the Faculty Senate Voting Three years

Instructional Administrator (1) Appointed by the President Voting Three years

\* **Six** faculty members (all of whom are tenured and elected by the Faculty Senate), serve staggered three-year terms so that at all times, at least two faculty members will continue on the committee. Faculty membership would represent a balance, with no more than **two** faculty members from any one department, with **at least two members** from Transfer and two from Career and Technical Education (CTE), and **two** at-large.

In the event that a committee member leaves or notifies the chairperson of their intent to resign the position, another tenured faculty member shall be elected as soon as possible to fill the unexpired portion of the term.

#### **Chair Election**

As the last order of business in any given year, the Tenure Committee shall elect a chairperson for the subsequent year.

### **G-34-3.2.1 AWARDING OF TENURE**

(Formerly HR-9-1.2.1)

Tenure is awarded to those faculty members who have, during their probationary years, demonstrated the promise of the overall excellence in instruction (and other primary assignment activities) and commitment to the College and the community expected of COCC professional staff. Faculty members must have a complete personnel file in the Human Resources (HR) office to be considered for tenure.

Completion of five probationary years while maintaining a complete file does not automatically result in the awarding of tenure.

Employment while on the Notice of Appointment, or contract other than regular probationary contract, does not accrue time toward tenure unless specified in writing.

### **G-34-3.2.2 PROCEDURE FOR TENURE CONSIDERATION**

**Prior to October 15 of each year**, the Vice President **of Academic Affairs** will advise the immediate supervisors with personnel responsibilities, in writing, of individuals in the department who will have met the length of service criteria at the end of the academic year.

Prior to **the third Friday of Winter Term**, all evaluation instruments and proposed actions in relation to faculty members' eligibility for consideration of tenure shall be forwarded to the appropriate Instructional Dean, who will then forward it to the Vice President **of Academic Affairs**. Candidates should then review and sign off on their files before **the third Friday of Winter Term** to determine if all forwarded materials have been received (with the exception of the **VPAA** letter, which has a later deadline).

The Tenure Committee needs a complete file with required documentation to be able to conduct a thorough review. The faculty member is responsible for ensuring required items are submitted by the established deadlines. However, the faculty member shall be held harmless for items missing from the file as long as the faculty member has documented proof that the original submission deadlines (such as October 15 for ARA and PIP Final Reports) have been met for any items required to be in the file. Faculty should allow two to three weeks for documentation to go through the appropriate channels before checking their file in HR. The faculty member is still responsible for reviewing the file for any missing documents and either taking appropriate action to submit documentation or providing rationale on the Missing Documents form for extenuating circumstances in advance of the deadline for file closure in January.

Prior to **February 1 of each year**, the Vice President **of Academic Affairs** will provide a written evaluation with recommended action. This document will be sent to the College President, copied to the candidate, and placed in the file. The candidate will then have five working days to respond to the letter (if they choose) by sending a response to the Vice President **of Academic Affairs** for inclusion in the file. Candidates who write a letter in response to the **VPAA** letter must also sign off on their file within those five days, to affirm receipt of their response letter into their file. This process must be completed prior to **when the** Tenure Committee reviews the file.

After the file closing date (**the third Friday of Winter Term**) and before the **first Friday in March**, the Tenure Committee will review tenure candidates' files, hold deliberations, and vote on whether to recommend individual candidates for tenured status. It would be ideal for all tenure candidates to review their files, ascertain they are complete, and acknowledge that completeness with a signature; however, the Tenure Committee will review files of tenure candidates regardless of whether they provide their signature.

By the **first Friday in March**, the Chair **of the Tenure Committee** shall submit **to the Office of the Vice President of Academic Affairs and to the Office of the President formal letters for** all faculty members considered by the Committee. **These letters** shall outline **the committee's** recommendations for each individual considered and shall state the basis for such recommendations.

Any member of the Committee may submit an individual report on any matter voted on by the Committee. The individual report may support the majority or may present a minority view. Copies of the individual report shall only go to the Chair of the Tenure Committee, to the **Vice President of Academic Affairs, to the** appropriate Dean, and to the President.

The Tenure Committee may take the following actions:

1. Recommend granting of tenure,
2. Recommend not granting tenure,



3. Recommend an additional year as a probationary period\*. (This option may include recommendations for specific conditions to be met or actions to be taken, as determined by the committee.)

\* Tenure candidates who do not have a complete personnel file and have not submitted a "missing document" form by **the third Friday of Winter Term** shall be notified by the Tenure Committee Chair, and subsequently allowed 5 working days from the date of notification by the Committee Chair to either: (a) submit missing documents or (b) submit a completed "Missing Document" form to HR. If the personnel file is still incomplete after that time, the Tenure Committee shall recommend an additional year as a probationary period for any tenure candidate who does not have a complete personnel file and has not pursued the steps described above.

### **Committee Process During Deliberations**

The Tenure Committee reviews all content in the candidate's personnel file. During candidate deliberations, only items contained in the file can be used as part of the discussion. Discussion of personal knowledge of a candidate or special circumstances not contained in the file are not part of the deliberations. Although it would be ideal for the Committee to reach a unanimous decision during deliberations, a faculty member will be recommended for tenure when **four of the seven** members of the Committee affirm the recommendation. Discussions contained during deliberations, as well as actual voting results, are to remain confidential; they are not made public beyond the Committee.

### **After Deliberations:**

The Tenure Committee should be prepared to provide the reasons for their recommendation in all of the above cases. The President shall forward the recommendations **of the Tenure Committee** for granting tenure to the Board of Directors for action as soon as possible after the completion of the Tenure Committee's work. Appeals of aspects of the tenure procedure are to the Board of Directors, and the grounds for such appeal should be procedural (due process).

## **POLICY:**

An effective evaluation program is essential to a quality educational program. As such, the College encourages open and honest feedback from students when they are asked to complete a faculty course evaluation. While students are afforded the opportunity to respond truthfully to all questions and request for comments, students must provide their responses in a respectful manner. The College will not tolerate any offensive, discriminatory, harassing and or otherwise abusive language. The purpose of this policy is to provide a mechanism under which faculty members may review and request the removal of statement(s) made by students that are in violation of this policy.

## **Definitions:**

The following definitions will be used when reviewing student evaluations for offensive language and/or statements.

**Offensive statements** – Statements that are discriminatory, harassing, and/or abusive and are directed at faculty members based on race, color, national origin, religion, sex (including pregnancy and gender identity), age, marital and parental status, disability, sexual orientation, or genetic information.

**Discrimination** -The differential treatment of an individual or group of people based on their race, color, national origin, religion, sex (including pregnancy and gender identity), age, marital and parental status, disability, sexual orientation, or genetic information.

**Harassing Conduct** -Unwelcome conduct, verbal or physical, including intimidation, ridicule, insult, comments, or physical conduct, that is based on an individual's protected status or protected activities when the behavior can reasonably be considered to adversely affect the work environment, or an employment decision affecting the employee is based upon the employee's acceptance or rejection of such conduct.

**Abusive language** - Harsh, violent, profane, or derogatory language which would demean the dignity of an individual and which shall also include profanity and racial, ethnic, or sexist slurs.

**Protected status** - Defined as an individual's race, color, religion, sex (including pregnancy and gender identity), sexual orientation, national origin, age, disability, family medical history (including genetic information), status as a parent, marital status, or political affiliation.

**PROCEDURE:** This procedure is available only for review of allegedly offensive statements in student evaluations of faculty members, and not for review or judgment of a student's constructive feedback in assessing the quality of a faculty member's work nor for setting the standards of performance for a course. The outcome of this review is either removal of the statement(s) or denial of the request.

1. A faculty member may submit a written request to the Department Chair to review the student evaluation which the faculty member believes contains offensive language and/or statements as defined above. The written request must specify the exact language and/or statements the faculty member believes are offensive, and request that the specific language be removed from the student evaluation.

2. Upon receipt of the faculty member's written request, the Department Chair will meet with the faculty member to review the alleged offensive language and/or statements. The Department Chair

will issue a written decision regarding whether the requested language and/or statements will be removed. A copy of this written decision will be shared with the requesting faculty member, their Instructional Dean, and the Director of Human Resources.

3. If the faculty member is dissatisfied with the Department Chair's decision, they may submit a written appeal to their Instructional Dean. The Instructional Dean will consult with both the evaluated faculty member and the Director of Human Resources and will issue a written decision. A copy of this written decision will be shared with the requesting faculty member, the Department Chair, and the Director of Human Resources.

4. The outcome of this review is either removal of the statement(s) or denial of the request. The decision from this last meeting is final

## **COMMENCEMENT SPEAKER SELECTION COMMITTEE**

### **Charge**

The charge for this committee is to recommend speakers for COCC's Commencement.

### **Timeline**

The Committee will begin its work in the fall and make its recommendations by the end of the fall quarter to ensure potential speakers are solicited early, thereby creating a greater likelihood they can accept. This timeline also allows for another recommended speaker to be invited, if the initial selection declines.

### **Membership of the Committee**

Chair of Commencement Committee – also serves as Chair of this speaker selection committee

Director of Marketing and Public Relations

Director of Diversity and Inclusion

Two Faculty Members selected by the Faculty Senate

Two Classified Staff selected by the Classified Association (CACOCC)

Two Current COCC Students jointly selected by Student Government (ASCOCC) and the Office of Student Life

### **Process and Recommendations**

The Committee will recommend three to five potential speakers for Commencement. The Committee may choose to prioritize or rank their recommended speakers, and the Committee may decide not to recommend that there be any invited speaker for Commencement. (Note: Commencement speakers do not receive an honorarium, nor are their travel expenses, if any, reimbursed.)

The Committee makes its recommendations to the President. The President will not select a candidate that is not recommended by the Committee. In the unlikely event that all invited candidates decline the invitation, the President will request additional recommendations. The final decision on a Commencement speaker rests with the President.



## **Presentation/Proposal Form**

### **Early Retirement Incentive (ERI) - Work Group Recommendation**

**Name:** Laura Boehme, ERI Workgroup Co-chair

**Date:** May 31, 2024

**Department:** Workgroup – Early Retirement Incentive

**Contact Information:** Lboehme@cocc.edu; x7219

- ❖ Complete Items 1–9 to the best of your ability (see [Instructions](#) form for reference).
- ❖ If an item is not relevant to your specific presentation/proposal, please mark it *N/A*.
- ❖ E-mail the completed Presentation/Proposal Form to the College Affairs chair and committee support specialist no later than 5 pm the Friday prior to the scheduled College Affairs meeting.

#### **PRESENTATION/PROPOSAL ABSTRACT** (no more than 250 words)

**Workgroup Charge** per Dr. Laurie Chesley email February 6, 2024:

The charge for this Work Group is to explore whether or not the College should offer an early retirement incentive to its employees and, if so, what that incentive should be.

Information Item re: Early Retirement Initiative (per L. Chesley Headlines Post dated 2/6/2024) –

The Work Group will conduct its exploration within the following parameters:

- Any recommended incentives should be considered through multiple lenses, including: financial prudence, legality, operational implementation, and institutional culture;
- Any recommended incentives will be time-limited (not offered on an ongoing, permanent basis). Recommended incentives may be re-evaluated and/or offered periodically at the discretion of the College; and, therefore,
- Any recommended incentives accepted by the President will not become part of any employment contract or the Administrator Handbook.

#### **Recommendations Process (per the charge)**

This Work Group will make its recommendations to the President for her consideration.

Before sending them to the President, the Group will share their recommendations with the College Affairs Committee for their feedback. The feedback from College Affairs may or may not result in changes to the Work Group recommendations. The College Affairs Committee may choose to send their feedback to the President as well.

#### **Work Group Recommendations**

Criteria to be considered eligible for the Early Retirement Incentive (ERI) Program is as follows.

Employee must:

- Be: 58 years or older
- Have: 10 or more benefited years of service/employment with COCC
- Request the incentive program and retire from COCC within the time period of: July 1, 2024 to June 30, 2025 (July 1, 2025 for PERS)
- Provide 3-months' notice of retirement, except for those employees who desire to retire between July

1-Sep 30, 2024 - those individuals are required to provide at least 1 months' notice.

Monetary Incentive for eligible employees:

- Full-time employees (1.0 FTE) will be paid = \$1,000 per benefited year of service/employment with COCC with no cap on the payout amount.
- Employees whose FTE is .50 to .99 will have the payout amount pro-rated based on their FTE.

Terms/Conditions:

- All other retiree benefits/payout options like retiree benefits, vacation accrual payouts, PERS, etc. are still in effect provided the employee complies with COCC policies/procedures.
- Employees opting for the ERI must also retire from PERS.
- Any employee taking the ERI will not be eligible for a post-retire agreement or any continued employment with the College for 3 years in their prior position of employment.
- Employees are eligible for part-time (non-benefited) faculty teaching.
- Employees opting for ERI will be required to sign an ERI agreement outlining the benefits and payout for their situation, which will also follow Oregon Pay Equity requirements.

***FEEDBACK from Employee Survey on Early Retirement will be shared at the College Affairs meeting***

#### **TYPE OF PRESENTATION/PROPOSAL**

- Information Item and/or Committee Feedback (requires approval of CA Chair)
  - Action Item:
    - Procedure/Policy — *typographical correction and/or federal/state mandate update* (Attach current procedure/policy with proposed changes highlighted using track changes.)
    - Procedure/Policy — *revision* (Attach current procedure/policy with proposed changes highlighted using track changes.)
    - Procedure/Policy — *new* (Attach proposed procedure/policy separately.)
      - Identify suggested location in manual:
    - Course Fee — If applicable, identify a suggested cap for the course fee (for example, a percentage or "increase to not exceed \$X"):
    - Other:
-

## **BUDGET IMPACT**

The recommended ERI program for the period of July 1, 2024 to June 30, 2025 is anticipated have a cost savings estimated at approximately \$25,000 for the period identified. The savings is projected based on estimates of 25% of eligible employees opting into the program and reduced replacement salaries by employee group.

Beyond the first year, there are anticipated to be more cost savings to the college based on hiring new employees in place of more senior employees and possibly not filling all vacant positions and/or restructuring as applicable.

## **4. IMPACTED DEPARTMENTS AND/OR PROGRAMS**

*List impacted departments/programs, describe the impact, and identify steps taken to communicate the impact(s)*

The ERI program could impact any/all departments or programs across the College, depending on who desires to retire and the timing of those retirements. The monetary element for the time period identified is positive in terms of budget impact. The impact will need to be addressed by department and college leaders and a plan would need to be developed should particular departments have a heavier retirement impact.

## **5. INSTRUCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS/IMPACTS**

Depending on how many faculty and/or instructional employees opt in for the ERI, there could be a significant impact to teaching. The timing is important due to the academic calendar and what it involves to recruit faculty.

## **6. OPERATIONAL IMPACT**

Depending on how many overall employees opt in for the ERI, there could be a significant impact to operations. Ensuring continuous operations in all areas of the college is a factor.

## **7. STUDENT IMPACT**

Depending on how many employees opt in for the ERI, there could be a significant impact to teaching, learning, and student life. The timing is important due to the academic calendar and what it involves to ensure continuity for our students.

## **8. ANTICIPATED IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE**

Timeline for the program is for eligible employees to request and retire sometime during the period of July 1, 2024 and June 30, 2025. Note there are notification requirements for employees. Feedback received from employees and represented employee groups and provided to the work group to share is as follows:

- 1) The first year of ERI to be a pilot evaluation year; consider the ERI program as an ongoing program beyond the first year.
- 2) Early retirement should be examined for each employee group separately, especially considering the greater financial savings for the college when long time faculty retire earlier vs other groups.

## **9. MOTION TO BE RECOMMENDED**

This is an information item for College Affairs; no motion is requested, rather, per the work group charge please provide feedback to the ERI Workgroup during College Affairs to inform the work group's final recommendation to the President.

June 10, 2024

Dear College Affairs Committee,

We are writing to share the perspective of the Faculty Forum as it relates to the Early Retirement Incentive (ERI) workgroup's recommendations presented at the College Affairs committee meeting on Friday, June 7, 2024.

To provide some context, during the Faculty Collective Bargaining negotiation in 2023, the forum asked the college to consider early retirement incentives for faculty. Administration responded that they would only do so as part of a discussion that included all employee groups. Thus, in April of 2023, the Faculty Forum signed a Letter of Agreement with the College where both parties agreed to, "begin to explore early retirement incentives across all employee groups. At the College's sole discretion, an incentive program may be implemented in the future."

We are grateful to Dr. Chesley for establishing the workgroup this year and for the work they did to collaborate and compromise on a proposal to support retiring employees. However, the forum did not stipulate that the only options could be one-time or lump sum options nor did we insist that something be implemented this year. While the current proposal would benefit some forum members and provide a cost savings to the institution, which would make adopting it a wise decision for the college, the forum is interested in a deeper conversation which could explore other options such as assistance with health insurance or incentives only for employees who are not yet 65.

The forum would also like to highlight feedback received by the work group and shared in their proposal to the College Affairs Committee:

- 1) The first year of ERI to be a pilot evaluation year; consider the ERI program as an ongoing program beyond the first year.
- 2) Early retirement should be examined for each employee group separately, especially considering the greater financial savings for the college when long time faculty retire earlier vs other groups

We are hopeful that the college will follow through with these recommendations and seek to continue this discussion next year, evaluating (if necessary) the effectiveness of any incentives adopted this year, exploring other options and ideally, examining each employee group separately. There are significant differences between employee groups in terms of the type of work they perform, the contracts under which they work, search and hiring processes, etc. which makes a single option equal, but perhaps not equitable.

Thank you,

Faculty Forum Executive Team