



Date: November 17, 2023

10:00 – 11:30am

Location: Zoom call

Attending	Absent	Guest
Kara Rutherford, Chair	Tracey Crockett	Sharla Andresen
Allison Dickerson	Mal Sotelo	Frank Payne
Joshua Evans		Rachel Knox
Tim Peterson		Steve Broadbent
Nicholas Recktenwald		
Sara Henson		
Erin Foote Morgan		
Laurie Chesley, COCC President		
Kyle Matthews, Recorder		

Meeting called to order at 10:00 am.

1. Old Business/Information Items

a. Minutes from October 13, 2023 – Kara Rutherford

Motion to approve meeting minutes from the October 13, 2023 meeting with amendments.

Motion made by Joshua Evans.

Motion passed unanimously by all members present.

b. Proposal for Increase in Course Fee for HHPA Courses, 2nd Reading – Shannon Waller

- Peterson asked for clarification whether this fee is still collected by the Bend Rock Gym (BRG), or if COCC is now collecting this fee on their behalf. He also noticed that the language of the policy states that the fee would only cover gym access during the class period. He expressed concern that the increased fee could affect enrollment for the course. Is the increase purely a request from BRG or could COCC accommodate students for this increased cost? Since HHPA’s philosophy is to encourage students to be active not only during classes, but *outside* of classes, could they receive a Mazama pass for paying this fee? As someone who is intimately familiar with this course, Peterson suggested tabling the reading until he could have a chance to ask Waller (absent) for some clarifications.

- Henson asked for Peterson to clarify the difference between what the students would be paying for versus a regular monthly membership. Peterson explained that students paying this fee would only receive gym access during their class period. BRG *does* offer a student discount for full access, but students would still need to pay the proposed fee, which would make the total to be the same cost as a regular monthly membership during the term. The fact that COCC would be collecting the fees instead of BRG would also complicate changes to terms of payment.
- Henson asked if Peterson was suggesting a student who already has a monthly membership have their fee waived. While Peterson said he would support such an amendment, he was not confident BRG would support it as they have always been strict about their fees and student discounts. Henson referenced the minutes from the previous meeting



when Waller was asked about this. Waller said she did not know, but did not see a reason why COCC could not refund a student who paid this fee and already had a membership. Peterson explained that this is why students would pay the fee directly to BRG, rather than paying it through COCC. It is unlikely a student will buy a monthly membership right away as they are unsure whether they would enjoy rock climbing, but after a few weeks, they may decide to purchase a monthly membership.

- Chesley suggested Peterson and Waller submit a budget request through the FIAT process to address this issue. She said there is sometimes a fine line between a fee and an expense that COCC pays, so it would be worth discussing. She did not think this was a similar example, but a few years ago, the Veterinary Technician program needed rabies vaccines, which were very expensive (over \$1,000). They either had to receive funding through the budget process or the Foundation had to make a scholarship donation to help the students pay for the vaccines. She was doubtful the Foundation would be willing to provide a scholarship for gym fees as the cost was much lower by comparison.
 - Henson was comfortable with tabling the reading as the proposed fee increase would not go into effect until the next academic year. However, with the new Fall schedule, would this be creating additional work to correct the fees in COCC's Banner system?
 - Rutherford believed that, as long as the fees were finalized before registration opened, it should not be an issue.
 - Motion to table 2nd reading of Proposal for Increase in Course Fee for HHPA Courses.
Motion made by Tim Peterson, seconded by Josh Evans.
 - ☑ Motion passed unanimously by all members present.*
- c. Proposal for MA 120 Course Fee for Cost of CPR/First Aid, 2nd Reading – Shannon Waller
- Henson asked for clarification whether this fee was being moved from one course to another. Rutherford confirmed that this fee used to apply to MA 140, which is no longer taught at COCC, so the fee for CPR/First Aid certification is being transferred to MA 120.
 - Motion to approve 2nd reading of proposed MA 120 course fee, effective Winter 2024 term.
Motion made by Kara Rutherford, seconded by Josh Evans.
 - ☑ Motion passed unanimously by all members present.*
- d. Proposal to update G-2-2 Alcoholic Beverages, 2nd Reading – Sharla Andresen
- Motion to approve 2nd reading of G-2-2 Alcoholic Beverages.
Motion made by Tim Peterson, seconded by Josh Evans.
 - ☑ Motion passed unanimously by all members present.*
- e. Proposal for Copy Center Closure, 2nd Reading – Frank Payne
- After the tabling of this reading at the previous meeting, Payne and Rutherford discussed proposed amendments. They kept one policy that noted the former Copy Center and moved the remaining language to the proposed updates to the Bookstore's General Policy Manual (GPM) which would be discussed later in the meeting.



- Rutherford also reached out to Andresen as some minutes from the previous meeting needed to be updated and added to this policy, which Andresen would then bring forward as a separate proposal.
- Motion to approve 2nd reading of G-31-8.4.1, Proposal for the Copy Center closure. Motion made by Kara Rutherford, seconded by Nick Recktenwald.
 - ☑ Motion passed unanimously by all members present.*

f. Inclusive Access Course Fees for Winter 2024 Quarter, 2nd Reading – Frank Payne

- Evans commented that this proposal would make his job as a professor, and potentially his students' education, less complicated, and encouraged his fellow committee members to approve the proposal. He had discussed it with some of his colleagues in the Spanish department and said they were happy with the materials they are currently using. The publisher has also been sensitive to their past requests and expressed desire to continue this relationship.
- Peterson asked for clarification on the two-year limit on access to digital materials.
 - Payne explained that if a student paid the fee and used the materials for only one class, and then came back 2.5 years later, would they still have access to those materials or would they need to pay another fee? Payne explained that the access code has a duration date. Upon activation of access, a student would have 720 days to access the materials for up to six terms, non-consecutively, without having to pay an additional access fee when entering their second-year cycle. If a student takes a year off from taking courses that require the material and decide to come back, they would need to pay an additional access fee. The same policy applies to students who opt to use a physical bundle of textbooks.
 - Evans has had cases in the past where a student could not afford to pay an additional fee and he asked the publisher to make an exception, and the publisher agreed to every request. The publisher has even agreed to waive fees for *initial* access for some of Evans' students who could not afford to pay the fee.
 - Payne also noted that a lot of the publishers involved deal mainly with colleges that run on a semester system, so a lot of the access limits are based on semesters, rather than quarters systems like COCC's. If they pass all of their classes, COCC students should still have enough time to take the summer term off and complete all of their classes by the end of their second academic year without purchasing extended access time.
- Motion to approve 2nd reading of Inclusive Access Course Fees for Winter 2024 Quarter. Motion made by Tim Peterson, seconded by seconded by Allison Dickerson.
 - ☑ Motion passed unanimously by all members present.*

2. New Business

a. Proposal to Update the Bookstore Section of the GPM, 1st Reading – Frank Payne

- This past spring, Payne decided to review the Bookstore's section of the GPM. He was surprised to find it had not been updated in over ten years while changes continued to take place.



- Some of the proposed adoptions came from Annemarie Hamlin, Vice President of Academic Affairs, and the Instructional Deans. Some changes were made for instructors who preferred to use their own textbooks for their classes.
- Other proposed changes included elimination of policies and activities that were no longer relevant to the Bookstore.
- Henson read from the proposal that these changes were reviewed by several committees and asked which committees specifically were involved. Payne did not have that information available and suggested asking Hamlin.
 - Evans said the proposal had not been presented to the Chairmoot and suggested it be reviewed by the Faculty Senate. Payne was told it needed to be presented to the College Affairs Committee (CAC) first, but was willing to present it to other committees if necessary.
 - Henson suggested it would be a good idea of have more committees review a policy change that impacts so many people, including faculty, department chairs, and administrative assistants who order textbooks. For example, the proposal eliminated course packs and supplies from the GPM, but there was no replacement language addressing where course packs and supplies could be requested.
 - Payne explained that the elimination of course packs was tied to the elimination of the Copy Center. If a department still wanted to generate and sell course packs to students, they were still allowed to do so, but they would not be produced or sold through the Bookstore anymore.
 - Recktenwald clarified that, while it was good that Hamlin and the Instructional Deans reviewed the proposal, other faculty committees should review it as well as the changes that would affect them differently. Payne concurred.
- Henson pointed out that the language in G-31-10, Item 1 references the Vice President of Instruction, which should be changed to “Vice President of Academic Affairs.” Payne concurred.
- As Chair of the Chairmoot, Evans offered to add this proposal to their next meeting, as well as a Chairmoot CTE council with all of the program directors and academic chairs, in order to speed up the approval process while still allowing everyone who would be affected by this proposal to review it and offer feedback. Payne concurred.
- Motion to table 1st reading of the Proposal to Update Bookstore Section of the GPM until after it has been presented at the next Chairmoot meeting.
Motion made by Kara Rutherford, seconded by Josh Evans.
 - Motion passed unanimously by all members present.*

- b. Proposal to increase LMT 100 level course fees starting Fall 2024, 1st Reading – Alan Nunes
- Nunes was unable to attend this meeting. Rutherford asked the CAC if they would prefer to place a vote and give her questions to send to Nunes, or would they prefer to table to proposal for a later date?
 - Rutherford noted language in the proposal stating that it would not return to the CAC unless the fee increases. She recommended using the more standard language of a 20% cap in increased



fees, so if the fee increased by more than 20%, the policy would then need to be presented to the CAC for revision.

- Peterson wanted to know why COCC would collect this fee if it is meant for a national license exam. Rutherford believed it was so Financial Aid can pay the fee for a student if necessary, and if a student using financial aid paid the fee out-of-pocket, COCC could reverse that fee.
- Recktenwald asked which specific courses this fee would apply to. Henson cited page 4 of the proposal for a list of said courses.
- Motion to approve 1st reading of Proposal to Increase LMT 100 Level Course Fees Starting Fall 2024, with an amendment to cap the increase at 20% before returning it to the CAC for further revisions.

Motion made by Kara Rutherford, seconded by Allison Dickerson.

- Motion passed unanimously by all members present.*

c. Proposal for New Religious Accommodation Policy and Procedure, 1st Reading – Rachel Knox

- Rutherford understood that the proposed policy is not required by law, but COCC is required to provide accommodations that this policy would clarify, which Knox confirmed.
- Knox explained that this proposed policy codifies common practice. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) has recently expanded their guidance on providing accommodations for religious needs that conflict with employment obligations. This proposal is addressing some case law outcomes that are recent to 2023.
- Peterson asked whether an employee's direct supervisor would be responsible for approving or denying an employee's request for religious accommodation.
 - Knox explained that this proposal is very similar to an ADA accommodation. For example, when an employees make an ADA accommodation request, it usually starts with their direct supervisor, then the supervisor contacts human resources. Unless the request is very easy to accommodate (e.g.: not impacting normal work hours; a one-time request). If this an ongoing accommodation, it would be good for human resources to be involved.
- Foote Morgan asked about COCC's policy on disclosure of religious practices.
 - Knox explained that COCC generally follows guidance from the EEOC. Human resources needs enough information to understand what the accommodation is and evidence from the employee of a sincerely held religious belief. However, since the range of accommodations is so broad, an employee will not be required to disclose the issue unless human resources cannot understand what they are providing an accommodation for. COCC is not required to provide blanket accommodation; we need some information in order to judge whether we can move forward without any intrusive fact-finding.
- Foote Morgan asked if supervisors received training on supporting their employees' religious accommodations.
 - Knox said COCC offers ongoing supervisor training, but the college's culture is to not to require it, only to strongly recommend it. Human resources also offers individual guidance for different issues. Most recently, Knox conducted a workplace fairness



training after it was ratified by the CAC in the previous academic year. This training covers reasonable accommodation for ADA needs. Now that religious accommodation is broadening for all employers in the world at-large, it's being more openly discussed. (This is similar to the pregnancy accommodations the CAC approved in their previous meeting.) Human resources is making itself available to help employees through the accommodation process.

- Chesley thanked Knox for all her work on this issue in light of recent conversations and requests on religious accommodations. She expressed concern about a supervisor judging an employee's sincerity of belief. She agreed that it was reasonable for an employee to explain their situation to their supervisor or human resources, but it's difficult to judge someone's devotion to their respective faith. During the recent pandemic, when vaccinations were being discussed, COCC allowed employees and students to make a religious exception and did not judge their sincerity of belief under advisement of legal counsel. Chesley did not want to put COCC in that difficult position, and sincerity can not necessarily be proven.
 - Knox explained that "sincerely held religious belief" is very common language used for this sort of issue, which is why it is included in the proposal. It is used by institutions like the federal government. Any time human resources writes or revises a policy, they look at what other employers are using, especially other community colleges. This is why the proposal uses language like "engaging in the interactive process" or "is this having an adverse impact on the business?". What concerns Knox is not proof on sincerity, but asking an employee to *express* their sincerely held belief. This may require fine tuning the language of the proposal. She believed this was a requirement for providing religious exemption for COVID vaccines. Rather than simply stating they wanted an exemption, employees and students had to submit in writing why they were requesting one. She also brought up a likely concern: What if someone is constantly asking for religious accommodations to the point of suspicion? What if they are taking excessive leaves of absence as a religious accommodation? Human resources would then need to look further into the matter. Someone "gaining the system" is a different problem. Chesley asked if Knox had any insight on this issue or if it would be worth discussing with her colleagues in human resources
 - Chesley understood and clarified that human resources never asked anyone for the sincerity of their beliefs when it came to vaccine exemptions, but she was concerned about whether it was appropriate for someone to determine another person's sincerity. She appreciated that human resources benchmarked policies and followed best practices, and she did not want to discourage that. She suggested that the language of "assessing sincerity" should be revised to "explain their belief," or perhaps consulting COCC's legal counsel for more suitable language. If a student insists they deserve a better grade because they "tried really hard," how could you assess that?
 - Knox agreed to forward this proposal to COCC's legal counsel for their advisement and to explain to them why religious accommodations are important for the college. In her reading of the policy, Knox understood that a supervisor's evaluation of a request is less



- about the accommodation and more about the reasoning behind it. The proposal could potentially be revised to emphasize the evaluation of the impact of a request.
- Chesley concurred that language addressing the impact of a request is a good idea as it would be easier to measure than someone's sincerity.
 - Evans asked if it is standard practice federally and locally for employees to receive paid time off when they request a religious holiday, because some faculty in his department have asked about this in the past and he did not know the answer. Knox confirmed this to be the case, and Evans was grateful for the clarification.
 - Knox explained further that the federal government defines "reasonable accommodation" as something that can be supported broadly by an employer. How that breaks down can become a slippery slope and sets a precedent, so some accommodation under protected leave, rather than religious accommodation. Generally, someone requesting religious accommodation will need to use paid time off to be out of the office.
 - Peterson appreciated the proposal linked to other parts of the GPM that were referenced. However, in the Procedure section of the proposal, he noted language addressing "COCC's policy and practice on dress and appearance," and asked if COCC has such an established procedure.
 - Knox said COCC only has a general policy on dress, asking for "professionalism," which is not specific to apparel. She offered to look into this further and believed that "practice" is what the college would rely on in regards to this issue. She believed Peterson brought up a good point that needs more attention and that there are some good resources available on campus about proper language for this issue.
 - Recktenwald asked if it would be worth adding to the Procedure section of the proposal that "a reasonable accommodation may not exist." He believed it was implied, but in previous experiences, misunderstandings have happened when someone asked for an accommodation and did not receive one. This could save COCC some trouble in the future.
 - Knox said that this was a great suggestion and that she can add it to her proposed discussion with legal counsel.
 - Henson echoed everyone's appreciation for Knox's work on this issue. She asked who had vetted this proposal before bringing it to the CAC. Have different employee groups looked at it?
 - Knox said this proposal has not been vetted by other committees. Every proposed policy or revision from human resources is vetted by Laura Boehme, Chief Information/Human Resources Officer. However, Knox was unsure what the criteria is for whether a policy needs to be vetted by a certain party. She welcomed any guidance on proper procedure.
 - Henson suggested running this proposal by the bargaining units of employees who would be affected by this policy. Dickerson added that this is why she is on the CAC as a representative of the COCC Classified Association, and that other employee groups should be able to review this proposal. Peterson cited GPM G-6.1.3 Policies and Procedures, stating that there is an established process in place, so it makes sense to receive insight from other employee committees.
 - Henson read the EEOC guidance and it recommends that "managers and supervisors should be trained to consider available accommodations" and how to assess them. She expressed concern



about establishing a procedure where supervisors can make these decisions without proper training. She also looked at policies from other institutions, most of which have religious accommodation request forms, so it is not an open-ended narrative. This makes it clear what employees and students are expected to disclose. Those forms are processed by human resources, who works with the parties involved. If we do not have mandatory training, how are we assessing those responsible for assessing requests are doing so appropriately? Henson also noted that many of the other institutional policies she looked at have an appeal mechanism that can be used if a request has been denied. Reiterating Recktenwald's point, many of these policies use language making statements like "the college is not required by law or policy to accommodate religious beliefs when such accommodation would violate other laws or security of our campus." There is also EEOC guidance around providing temporary accommodation if negotiating longer-term accommodations would take more time. "If the request cannot be implemented immediately, employees should offer alternative accommodations on a temporary basis." There is no timeline in the proposed policy, which should be considered. Is there a reason COCC asked for an email rather than a form? Many of the schools Henson researched used similar guidance for students, although a separate committee deals with student policies at COCC.

- Knox said that student policy is outside of her area of expertise, but she could certainly inform her supervisor that the CAC is interested in looking at a policy for students and ask the supervisor to follow the proper procedures to move that forward. She acknowledged that many colleges have religious student policies.
- In summary, Knox acknowledged desire for an appeal process, a procedure that includes a form, language stating that some requests can not be accommodated, and differentiations between temporary and long-term accommodations, including a potential timeline. Once this proposal is revised, it will be sent to COCC's legal counsel for review. Knox suggested she also personally re-examine G-6-1.3.10 as she was unsure she had the same understanding as others did.
- Dickerson asked if there is a plan for supervisor training. Knox said she would need additional guidance as COCC generally doesn't give mandatory trainings for supervisors. There are a lot of federally required trainings, and human resources offers supervisors ongoing opportunities for training every term, and attendance has been limited. It would be a great topic for consideration.
- Foote Morgan commented that the adoption of such a policy should be celebrated, as it should make people more comfortable being a part of COCC, even if they do not have their own religious beliefs. She suggested that, once the policy has been finalized, it should be promoted as a way to show that everyone is welcome at COCC. She understood that getting staff trained could prove difficult, but it would be worth the effort.
 - Knox expressed appreciating for Foote Morgan's comments of gratitude. She clarified that, while she is unable to make these trainings mandatory, they will be offered once the policy is finalized.
- Circling back to the question of sincerity, Evans suggested that supervisors and human resources should always assume sincerity of intent, unless they have a good reason to think otherwise. He was doubtful that anyone would go through this process of their beliefs were not sincere.



- Recktenwald expressed curiosity for what COCC's legal counsel would advise, as the phrase "sincerely held" sounded statutory to him. While unsure whether COCC should evaluate someone's sincerity, he said he would have written a policy with the same language, of course with comparison to other institutions' policies.
- Henson said she researched several policies, and while the EEOC is in the language that defines what an accommodation is, none of them identified the EEOC as a factor of consideration. Anyone who submits a request would need to consider potential costs toward the college. Would it be safe? Would it affect the efficiency of work? It is in the proposal from human resources, but it doesn't seem to be discussed in other examples.
- Motion to table 1st reading of Proposal for a New Religious Accommodation Policy and Procedure until the policy has been reviewed by COCC's legal counsel.
Motion made by Joshua Evans, seconded by Tim Peterson.
 - ☑ Motion passed unanimously by all members present.*
- Rutherford asked for clarification regarding COCC's policy of various committees reviewing a proposed policy or revision, which was her understanding of why there is a first and second reading. Dickerson confirmed that after first reading, she can bring it to the Classified Association to receive their feedback, which she would then bring to the second reading.
 - Rutherford noted that the standard CAC form does not ask whether the person presenting the proposal has brought it before any relevant committees.
 - Peterson explained that this policy was in place so the person making the proposal can receive feedback from other committees *before* presenting it to the CAC. We would like to think that everyone is regularly checking the CAC webpage, but it is unlikely. This policy is meant to provide a more comprehensive process that, not only gets feedback for the person giving the proposal, but makes other relevant committees aware of the proposal. Without this policy, the proposed new religious accommodations policy could easily be implemented without most of the COCC staff and students knowing. This particular policy is written rather broadly and Peterson hopes the CAC has encouraged Knox to receive good feedback from other parties. And while he concurred this policy be presented before the Classified Association, he suggested Knox be the one to make the presentation to ensure accuracy of intent. Dickerson concurred.
 - Henson added that this also speaks to a culture of shared governance that COCC has held for a long time. This is a value of COCC; seeking feedback from stakeholders. For example, had this proposal been presented to other committees *before* bringing it before the CAC, the first and second reading may have gone differently, potentially making the approval process go by faster.
 - Rutherford suggested making it more obvious for the person filling out the form that they are encouraged to bring their proposal before other relevant committees before presenting it to the CAC. Should presenters be *required* to do this, or merely *requested*?
 - In Peterson's opinion, Rutherford has every right as CAC Chair to ask presenters to run their proposals by other committees before presenting to the CAC, and to ask presenters what other parties have reviewed their proposal.



- Rutherford clarified that this question *is* on the CAC request form, but perhaps more feedback is needed on whether it should be a requirement.
- d. Discussion Item: General Review of the GPM for non-substantive corrections and clean-up – Kara Rutherford
- Rutherford suggested, after discussions with various parties, that the GPM could use a general review; non-substantive corrections, clean-ups, updates in titles. Broadbent agreed to assist in this matter if the CAC concurred. He would of course track and potential changes and present them to the CAC before they were implemented.
 - Peterson said this task should be given to the Shared Governance Committee (SGC). They work on a five-year cycle, reviewing and updating one section per year. Dickerson concurred.
 - When Chesley began her position as President of COCC, she was informed that the GPM was very out of date and full of errors, so she knew that college personnel were frustrated with it. The CAC does not need to agree to this proposal. There is the possibility of mistakes being made and we do not want to wait for the GPM to be fixed, but she left it to the CAC to decide. She confirmed that there *is* a regular review cycle overseen by the SGC, but the entire GPM may need immediate attention.
 - Evans asked if there was a particular section of the GPM that motivated a general review.
 - Chesley said one example is the Investment Policy referencing the Associate CFO, a position that has not been occupied for some time. This would be a non-substantive change as it seemed clear that the role should be fulfilled by the new Vice President of Finance and Operations (VPFO), Michael LaLonde. This is the sort of work that Broadbent would be doing.
 - Rutherford added that this is not about doing another committee's job, but adding an additional set of eyes on the GPM. The CAC can find where changes are needed and present them to the SGC.
 - Chesley said Tom Barry came to her office recently to discuss the SGC's role and how Matthews can assist them in making sure they stay on track with their review cycle. The SGC does not do the initial review. It is done by the departments who oversee the sections of the GPM that are up for routine review.
 - Broadbent said that, when he met with the Student Affairs Committee last year, he saw some disconnects and conflicting language between different policies.
 - Rutherford explained that Broadbent would make an initial review and highlight areas where change would be needed, then members of the CAC could then review certain portions of Broadbent's recommendations to determine whether his suggested changes are substantive and need a more in-depth review.
 - Evans and Dickerson suggested the CAC inform the SGC that they are taking on this project, giving them a chance to object if they see fit.
- f. Discussion Item: Investment Policy and Internal Controls – Laurie Chesley
- Chesley said the new VPFO has been looking over COCC's financial policies for any possible improvements. One area where he sees potential for improvement is COCC's Investment Policy



G-31-8.5. There are policies overseen by various departments, one of which is the Board of Directors. In discussion with Chesley and the Board, LaLonde asked why the Investment Policy is listed as a College Affairs policy when the Board has fiduciary responsibility. In fact, their first duty to COCC is fiduciary as mandated by the State of Oregon. For example, the Board set's COCC's Reserve Policy. They do not make individual purchases, but if a purchase is over a certain threshold, they must approve the purchase. They also approve tuition and fees. The Investment Policy is very out of date, and they now need to be approved by the State, and the State has a template for investment policies. It is the opinions of Chesley and the Board that COCC's Investment Policy should be revised as a Board policy, which they would regularly review, rather than a College Affairs policy. The Board is working to revise this policy from one page to 14 pages. Chesley was certain that the Board would welcome any feedback. When boards change their own policies, it starts in a committee and then is openly discussed and voted on in a public meeting. Chesley also reviewed other Fiscal Services policies (G-31), which includes internal grant applications, departmental signing authority, reimbursements, and insurance for personally owned vehicles. In Chesley's opinion, investments do not fit into this group of policies as they have a higher degree of magnitude. Chesley welcomed the CAC's feedback and offered to share the Board's draft of revisions to the policy. Whenever the CAC makes a recommendation, it comes across Chesley's desk, and she has never disagreed with their recommendations during her time as COCC President. She would not approve an investment policy without the Board's approval as it is far beyond her area of expertise.

- Foote Morgan had nothing to add, but reiterated Chesley's position that financial matters are clearly meant to be overseen by the Board, rather than the CAC.
- Peterson thought it made a lot of sense. He asked whether an individual would still have the day-to-day responsibility of overseeing COCC's investments portfolio. Chesley confirmed this and reminded the CAC that this role will now be fulfilled by the VPFO, rather than the Associate CFO as in the existing version of the policy.
 - Henson said she had read the Board's revision draft and listened to their discussion from their most recent public meeting. She was unclear in what their proposed changes are but expresses confidence in their knowledge.
 - Chesley said COCC's current Investments Policy is very conservative and limited. The Board's proposed revision, which is much more detailed, is still very conservative and limited, but gives COCC a few more options for investing. It will also add safeguards and reporting to the Board, which the State now requires. It is LaLonde's and Chesley's opinion that some of COCC's resources are being left unused, and this revised policy would not put the college at risk.
- Henson was impressed by the Board's recent public discussion on the policy. During her years as a college student, student-led social investment policies were popular. Students who wanted to invest money in causes that supported people in South Africa or certain corporations. If COCC's Investment Policy moves under the supervision of the Board, is there still room for social justice investment values, and would they be listed as a Board policy or a fiscal policy?
 - Chesley said it would be a Board policy. Foote Morgan mentioned that the Board has been discussing the creation of an Investment Committee and asked Chesley if she could



- explain further. This committee would advise the Board on investment decisions. Needs of the community in regard to investments could be discussed in this committee and built into the Board's fiscal strategies.
- Chesley said all of the Board's decisions are made in a public setting. If an Investment Committee were established, similar to any Board committee, their meeting agendas will be published and the public are welcome to attend (which they rarely do).
 - Foote Morgan believed the majority of new investments proposed were municipal and T-bonds, which should be safe investments. Even if the stock market crashes, it should not affect COCC's financials very much.
 - Recktenwald concurred with Chesley's position. In light of discussions on supervisor training earlier in the meeting, he asked whether the Board receives training in investment responsibilities.
 - Foote Morgan said the Board is currently developing a policy on Board training, which Chesley confirmed and added LaLonde also has relevant experience as a former CEO and CFO in both the private and public sector. The proposed Investment Committee does not necessarily need to consist solely of Board members. It could include community members who are knowledgeable in this field, and one of LaLonde's goals is to recruit such individuals. Chesley also said that every Board member can meet with LaLonde to discuss COCC's budget.
 - Foote Morgan thanked Recktenwald for his question. She mentioned that she is a member of the Board Policy Committee and they would be meeting soon. She offered to receive any additional feedback or concerns from the CAC that she can bring to this meeting. While no one was able to name anything in the moment, Matthews added Foote Morgan's email to the Zoom meeting chat for them to use. Chesley encouraged the CAC to visit the Board's Policy webpage to review in their spare time.
 - Recktenwald asked if the matter could be discussed again in the next CAC meeting so the members could have time to think about it.
 - Peterson asked Chesley to clarify if she is only asking for the Investment Policy to be moved from the oversight of the CAC to the Board.
 - Chesley clarified that she is asking for the CAC's feedback on the position.
 - Recktenwald also clarified that his question was regarding Foote Morgan's offer to bring their insights to the next Board Policy Committee Meeting. He and Dickerson concurred that the Investment Policy should be moved to the oversight of the Board.
 - Rutherford summarized that the CAC agreed to move the Investment Policy from the oversight of the CAC to the Board.

Motion to adjourn the meeting.

Motion made by Josh Evans, seconded by Allison Dickerson.

Motion passed unanimously by all members present at 11:38 a.m.*

NEXT MEETING: Friday, December 8, 2023 at 10:00 a.m. via Zoom

*Votes were confirmed via email as they were not taken during the meeting.