



**College Affairs Committee**

Friday, February 9, 2024

10:00 – 11:30am

**Virtual Zoom Meeting**

Click the following link to attend via Zoom:

<https://cocc.zoom.us/j/99550135827>

Dial up: 669-444-9171 | Meeting ID: 995 5013 5827

**1. Old Business**

- a. Review minutes from December 8, 2023 meeting – Kara Rutherford
- b. Proposal to increase LMT 100 level course fees starting Fall 2024, 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading – Alan Nunes

**2. New Business**

- a. Discussion Item: Student Evaluations: Inappropriate Comments – Sara Henson
- b. Discussion Item: New Project Proposal – Annemarie Hamlin

Next Meeting: Friday, March 8, 2024, 10:00 – 11:30 a.m. via Zoom



Date: December 8, 2023

10:00 – 11:30am

Location: Zoom meeting

Attending	Absent	Guest
Kara Rutherford, Chair	Mal Sotelo	Breana Sylwester
Tracey Crockett		
Allison Dickerson		
Joshua Evans		
Tim Peterson		
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 November 11, 2023 – Kara Rutherford

Motion to approve meeting minutes from the November 11, 2023 meeting.

Motion passed unanimously by all members present.

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

- Waller did not attend the meeting, but she met with Peterson prior to discuss. Waller’s clarifications satisfied Peterson’s concerns. They agreed to add a Mazama Gymnasium access sticker to the course fee as Bend Rock Gym (BRG) would not grant full access to their facilities without students paying for a regular membership.
- Evans recalled Peterson’s concern with the increased fee from \$35 to \$50 being a hardship on students and asked if he still felt that way.
  - Peterson clarified that his issue with increased fees is that COCC seems to always place the burden on students when costs are increased. One reason he wanted to meet with Waller was because he felt that the requested fee increase from BRG did not have enough impact on the Health and Human Performance department’s budget to require asking the students to pay the difference. He was concerned the increased course fee would impact enrollment. In his experience teaching this class, the \$35 fee has been a source of strain on his students. He felt adding the Mazama sticker was a nice gesture to give them access to something they might not already have.
- In regards to the Mazama sticker, Rutherford asked if the class ever meets in the Mazama gym.
  - Peterson said they do not.
  - Rutherford asked if the students would need to bring their payment to Admissions and Records to receive their stickers, or if they would receive them from somewhere else.
  - Peterson said the instructor would give the students their stickers at BRG. It would be like any other activity class.



- Evans expressed his support for Peterson’s suggested changes, noting that the proposal would affect Peterson’s department more than anyone else’s.
  - Motion to approve 2<sup>nd</sup> reading of Proposal for Increase in Course Fee for HHPA Courses.  
Motion made by Josh Evans, seconded by Kara Rutherford.
    - ☑ Motion passed unanimously by all members present.
- c. Proposal to increase LMT 100 level course fees starting Fall 2024, 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading – Alan Nunes
- Nunes was unable to attend the meeting and Rutherford could not find a substitute. Nunes was able to add language for the 20% cap for increased fees that Rutherford had suggested. Rutherford was unsure if the College Affairs Committee (CAC) would be able to approve a second reading without having a chance to ask Nunes any questions and asked for the CAC’s opinion.
  - Peterson noted the language stating “the Allied Health department requests the ability to automatically adjust up to 20% increase of course fees each year without CAC approval.” He asked why Nunes could not increase the fees by 10% every year.
    - Rutherford explained that it has been standard for any course fees increased beyond 20% to require approval from CAC. However, that was more in line with fees that are increased by a third party. The fees referenced in this proposal were licensure costs that spread out over several courses.
    - Peterson expressed concern that fees for Licensed Massage Therapy (LMT) courses could continue to increase without much oversight. Was there any expectation of the licensure costs to decrease? And if so, would the course fee decrease accordingly? He was not in favor of this clause and felt that any increased fee should be approved by the CAC.
    - Recktenwald concurred. He felt that, even if the increase is less than 20%, it should still be brought before the CAC to explain what is causing said fees to increase. He also felt it was unclear whether this clause is specific to the courses identified in the proposal.
    - Rutherford appreciated the feedback and explained that Nunes is using language from other proposals that had been approved by the CAC in the past. She said that the intent of the 20% cap was to avoid having to bring the proposal back to the CAC if a vendor has a \$1.00 or \$2.00 fee increase, but she understood their concerns. She offered to discuss this further with Nunes and invite him to a future meeting.
  - Henson said she was hearing two different discussions; one on the specific LMT courses in the proposal, and one on COCC’s general policy on course fee increases and when they should be brought before the CAC for approval. Were they tied together? Was the 20% cap in the General Policy Manual (GPM)?
    - Dickerson said this was discussed last year by the CAC because they were seeing \$1.00 - \$2.00 increases in course fees due to natural increases of inflation. The CAC agreed that 20% would be the amount that would require approval from CAC.
    - Rutherford added that the percentage could be relative to the size of the fee. She was open to reexamining this rule as the CAC roster will inevitably change over time.



- Henson clarified that she understood the CAC's process was to not make changes to someone's proposal without hearing their input, but was there a need to publish what the fees would be for the coming academic year? The course catalogue would typically be published in March. Would it be more efficient to know what the fees would be before then?
- Recktenwald believed that Nunes would have until mid to late March to update the course fees for the course catalogue, so there was some time before a final decision needed to be made.
- Rutherford concurred and suggested, if Nunes was able to attend the next CAC meeting, there should be enough time to update the course fees before publishing them in the course catalogue. Did the CAC not want to see a cap?
- Dickerson said she was hearing a desire to discuss the cap further.
- Rutherford concurred but wanted to give Nunes specific feedback. For the fees in this proposal, did the CAC not want to see a cap at all?
- Peterson confirmed he did not. Recktenwald suggested a "time cap," clarifying 20% fee increases would be in perpetuity or over a certain number of years.
- Rutherford also suggested discussing this matter with everyone's colleagues further before doing another reading.
- Motion to table 2<sup>nd</sup> reading of Proposal to increase LMT 100 level course fees starting Fall 2024. Motion made by Tim Peterson, seconded by Josh Evans.
  - ☑ Motion passed unanimously by all members present.

## 2. New Business

### a. Discussion Item: Search Committee Models and Practices – Laurie Chesley

- Chesley explained that last year she conducted searches for two Vice President positions that would report directly to her. She used a different method than what COCC's search committees normally used. She believed the only other time this method was used was when Annemarie Hamlin hired Jessica Giglio as a dean. Some employees asked Chesley how she found this search method and if it would become the new required method of the college or was it only for specific positions. Chesley said she used this method at her previous institution and did not plan to require anyone else to use it. She understood that there may be some concern from COCC employees. Summaries of the commonly used method from COCC and the method that Chesley used were included in the CAC's meeting packet. Chesley offered to explain the differences between these methods and why she used the method she used.
- Dickerson asked what were the benefits of one method versus another.
  - Chesley said one reason was because she believed her method gave freedom of autonomy to the search committee that they might not have if she were present for any deliberation or selection of candidates. She was committed to not requiring the committee to interview a specific person from their list of potential candidates. She would have no control of determining finalists. She did not want to influence this part of the process, whether her influence was intentional or not. Once the finalists were selected, the committee could voice their opinion on any finalist they believed would not be a good fit for the position. Chesley would still make the final decision on who



would receive an offer. Members of the search committee would have certain criteria they are looking for and Chesley would have unique criteria to look for since the person who was hired would report directly to her. She liked to appoint two co-chairs to the committee so her direct report would be a leader for the college and a leader for the people they oversee. The two co-chairs would come from departments the hired person would oversee. Chesley also liked to have a final choice because she always conducted reference checks for her direct reports. She preferred a choice, but was open to having just one candidate if that was what the committee recommended. She would use HR's knowledge to know who to contact and ask the hard questions. In her experience, doing her own reference checks has made a difference in selecting a direct report. Other than expressing her own concerns, she did not think it was her obligation to publish what was said in a search committee meeting with interest to the candidate's privacy.

- Evans was on the search committee that lead to hiring Giglio. Their committee had one chair and three faculty members, including Evans, who interviewed four candidates. They then gave their recommendations to Hamlin who made the final decision on who to hire. Evans appreciated the autonomy of not having a high-ranking college employee in the room with the committee as their presence could have changed the dynamic. However, he felt it would be necessary for said person to be involved as, if they were the person who is working most closely with the person who is hired and making the final decision, they should be involved in the entire process. Their lack of presence during the committee's meetings could undermine their work. He also preferred the final decision to be democratic as he has been on search committees where the hiring manager did not use their recommendations.
  - Chesley said that when had she conducted searches and received feedback from committees, she would call every committee member and ask for their individual input. She would also review feedback from all open forums to receive a thorough view of what had transpired. She felt that, in her preferred method of search, the decision *was* democratic about who the committee wanted her to hire. They were not necessarily presenting ranked preferences. Sometimes committees had wanted her to know their preferences, in which case she normally preferred they be presented verbally, rather than in writing. She felt she could deduce a committee's preferences based on all of the reports she read and conversations she had with each committee member, and she took all of the information heavily into consideration. The reason she did not like to know preferences was because the candidate who received the offer might decline or accept a job somewhere else, and then the second-choice candidate might find out they were not the first choice and feel insulted.
- Foote Morgan asked why a search committee might not want the input of Chesley or another senior staff member throughout the hiring process. It might be helpful for their busy schedules to delegate to search committees and remain involved when possible. What other benefits were there for senior staff members to not be in the room?
  - Chesley said that in searches that she personally oversaw, the only positions who reported directly to her (besides Cory Darling's and Kyle Matthews') were the Senior Leadership Team (SLT), and there was always a SLT member co-chairing a search



committee. She was always involved in the position description's writing, methods used in a search, and meeting with a committee before they started their process to discuss the position. This was not because she did not want to be involved.

- Evans expressed concerns that this method would create a mechanism where a search committee's work could be ignored by the hiring supervisor.
  - Chesley clarified that, in this method, the hiring supervisor could ignore the committee's *preference*, but they would still receive the committee's feedback. She acknowledged that it would require the committee to trust the hiring supervisor to not force them to interview a specific person and not choose a candidate they strongly disliked.
  - Rutherford added that having the hiring supervisor in the room would have its own risk.
- Henson was concerned that not all hiring supervisors shared Chesley's ability to assess a committee's preferences. She also wanted to know how this method was introduced in the first place as it was not part of the COCC's standard practice. To her, it felt like it was suggesting any SLT member could limit their search discussions to a small group of people, rather than opening it up to anyone at the college who wanted to be involved. SLT meetings were also not open to any COCC personnel. She understood why Chesley preferred this method, but thought that it should involve the rest of the college during the process, rather than after the fact.
  - Chesley said she did not expect using this method would cause controversy among COCC faculty and staff. She had used it several times before it ever became an issue. It was not her intention to upset anyone. She did not see this method as reducing participation, but would have been open to discussing it sooner if anyone had expressed concern. In her opinion, hiring is a management responsibility, and she was not taking away the concept of a group search with a large amount of input. This method did not give her the *whole* say, only the *final* say on candidates who had been vetted and recommended by the search committee.
- Sylwester, on behalf of the Shared Governance Committee (SGC), appreciated everyone's candor and contributions to the conversation. One of the SGC's values is transparency and, in hearing this discussion, she learned about hiring practices at COCC that she was unaware of. She was reading COCC's policies on hiring practices that were available online, as well as what was available on the college's Human Resources webpages. She wondered, regardless of what decisions were made, how policies might be made known to all COCC personnel before they are brought into practice.
- Recktenwald asked if COCC participated in any sort of search advocate program for hiring. These were becoming more common in American higher education search committees. A search advocate is trained in inclusive hiring practices and participate in all hiring committee meetings as a non-voting member. Their role is to serve as a neutral party and ensure committee conversations do not steer toward personal issues that should not be discussed. Use of this practice at COCC may be worth exploring. Recktenwald had personally served on search committees that included a search advocate whose presence proved helpful.
  - Chesley was not aware of this practice's use at COCC, but noted that her previous institution used a similar practice, particularly with the intention of eliminating un-



- intentional biases. She was open to exploring this practice and asked the CAC if anyone had experience with it.
- Henson said that there was a period when this practice was required, but did not know if it was still required or strongly recommended.
  - Rutherford clarified that it is strongly recommended and did not think it was required.
  - Henson said that COCC faculty had required their search committee members to receive inclusive hiring practices training.
  - Chesley added that, while she was not aware of a college-wide requirement, she has required it on every search committee she has overseen.
  - Recktenwald clarified that he felt this was a “side issue” to the conversation, but it was worth bringing up as it could have a net positive impact, though he acknowledged it would require additional labor on the part of the search committees.
- Rutherford and Dickerson asked if COCC had an existing hiring committee process policy, especially for senior positions, or was it merely a business practice? And was it readily available to everyone at COCC?
    - Chesley said there were expectations for search committee membership but was unsure whether they were in practice or policy. She assumed they were readily available through Human Resources or on their website. Committee membership requires a variety of people from the open position’s department, as well as members of both faculty and classified employees. She noted that she was part of the search committee that hired Kyle Matthews, which was different from her usual method. She recalled that she had a confidential employee on the committee, but Human Resources explained that a *classified* employee should be involved.
    - Henson was reading the GPM during the discussion and could not find clear language on the matter. She recalled seeing specific HR policies on the COCC intranet, but they were not publicly available on the college’s website.
      - Peterson said he was looking through the intranet and could not find any information on search committees.
    - Rutherford suggested, for transparency purposes, there should be a published practice. She noted a document that Crockett shared in the Zoom meeting chat that outlined search committee practices and policies. What should be done to form a committee? And at what point does the hiring supervisor have the discretion to hire an individual?
    - Foote Morgan shared a document in the Zoom meeting chat that stated COCC’s diversity plan goals, which included language requiring every hiring committee to include at least one person who has been trained in diverse hiring practices and to make diverse hiring workshops available. In her opinion, diverse hiring practices are one of the central planks of COCC’s DEI strategy, but she was unsure how that could be properly carried out.
    - Henson shared in the Zoom meeting chat a link to COCC’s intranet where the college’s HR policies were housed. On this webpage was a guideline for recruitment and hiring committees, but it seemed incomplete. She asked what the definition of a “hiring supervisor” was. In regards to a faculty position, was the hiring supervisor the



department chair, the instructional dean or the Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA)?

- Chesley suggested asking VPAA Annemarie Hamlin as she was unsure how this matter was conducted within the faculty. In her view, the hiring supervisor was the person whom the hired employee would report to and who would write the employee's evaluations, but this may not be as clear within the faculty.
  - Henson said, based on Chesley's definition, the hiring supervisor would be the department chair, but the chair is a rotating position that changes every four years.
  - Peterson added that Henson's point would make the search committee process that was being discussed a problem for faculty search committees.
  - Chesley clarified that she used this particular search method for positions that report to her directly and felt it could be valuable for senior-level searches. She had recommended the method to Hamlin, though Hamlin felt this method did not work for faculty positions either. Chesley also clarified that she was not recommending this search method as the *only* way to conduct a search committee and agreed there were positions that would not be compatible with the method. She also did not perceive SLT to automatically adopt this method, but she was proposing it as an option for them.
- In the interest of transparency, Chesley asked where the CAC felt hiring committee policies and procedures should be housed.
    - In Henson's opinion, as a former department chair, it would be important for hiring committee procedures to be readily available for hiring supervisors. They should know what their options are and what the benefits of each process might be. If that information is readily available in one place, but not available to everyone, it can appear to be gatekeeping. There are issues of trust and accountability to consider as well. Members of an institution should know whether a procedure is being used appropriately.
    - Evans suggested this information should be available in the GPM, the HR website, Bobcat Community, as well as anywhere else that hiring committees may be discussed.
      - Henson and Dickerson concurred.
    - Chesley added that, for executive-level searches, key principles include broad input from stakeholders who would be impacted. She would always emphasize reference checks, especially with a candidate's most recent supervisor. As she understood from the CAC's comments, they were looking for more clarity on what search models would be used and when, which she was comfortable discussing further, but she felt the broad principles were more important. She wanted hiring supervisors to have a choice in what method they used in their hiring searches, but it did not need to be that way. She appreciated the CAC's comments about trust as she shares that value. However, the responsibility for any new employee rests with their hiring supervisor, and that supervisor could violate a search committee's trust. She did not think one method presented





greater opportunity to violate trust than another. This could be why it had never occurred to her that anyone might object to the method she used.

- Henson looked through the document on hiring guidelines that was shared earlier and noted that it stated that *only one* candidate would be recommended for hire, which seemed to be the main difference between the two search methods being discussed. What would happen in Chesley's method if the committee only made one recommendation? Would it be considered a failed search? Would the committee present a list of pros and cons or areas for growth?
  - Chesley said she would ask for areas for growth and unique strengths for each candidate, as candidates almost never have the same traits.
  - Rutherford added that, through the standard search method, she would often find two or three qualified candidates, then she would conduct reference checks. It was her impression that HR's use of the term "hiring supervisor" was in reference to the person who makes the final notification to HR, recommending *one person* to a position, pending a background check, after the candidate has accepted an offer. The procedure may not have been written correctly in the existing document.
  - Henson said she had this experience as well, but she was wondering what would happen if a committee using Chesley's method only recommended one candidate.
  - Chesley said it is an acceptable response for a committee to give. It would then be on the hiring supervisor to decide whether they agree with the committee's recommendation. She would still conduct reference checks for any position that would report directly to her. She did not necessarily need two or more candidates to choose from, but she would prefer to have a choice, and it would still be her choice whether to ultimately hire a candidate that would report to her.
- Chesley summarized that the CAC was expressing a desire for more visible search committee procedures and policies. She was comfortable with asking HR to include both models on their website, as well as the GPM. Was there anything else that could be done to satisfy the CAC's concerns?
  - Rutherford echoed other CAC members' desire for more transparency and outlines of the different search methods for HR and hiring supervisors to use. She did not think a policy was necessary.
  - Chesley reiterated that she preferred hiring supervisors to have a certain amount of discretion, but understood if the CAC preferred having search committees specified instead.
  - To Dickerson's understanding, before a search committee begins, especially for higher-level positions, a process is to be established and announced, allowing for individuals to speak out if they have concerns.
  - Peterson suggested a policy and procedure should be added to the GPM in order to avoid repeating this conversation with the next college president.
  - Rutherford was of the opinion that some discretion is helpful and was open to a broadly worded policy, but if a policy in the GPM affected all employee groups, there could be elements of the policy that could be impacted with bargaining. She felt there was merit in Peterson's points but did not agree that a policy was necessary.



- Peterson said it would be worth at least establishing a procedure, which would normally have an according policy that outlines the procedure. He felt it would be beneficial for future hiring committees to have an established procedure they could follow in order to deter the need for further discussions from the CAC. He also noted that, when a policy or procedure is published, it can still be changed at a later date.
  - Rutherford and Dickerson concurred.
- Chesley offered to ask HR to draft a procedure for the CAC to review and acknowledged that there would be a different conversation when the next college president is hired.
  - While Peterson did not disagree, he asked Chesley whether she thought it would have been easier to have a policy or procedure to refer to.
  - Chesley understood that a lot of people might feel that way.
  - Rutherford felt this was the point of having discussions like this and thanked everyone for their input.
- Rutherford asked Chesley whether she felt she had received enough feedback.
  - Chesley felt she received enough feedback and suggested the next step would be for HR to draft a procedures document for the CAC to review and make public.

Motion to adjourn the meeting.

Motion made by Tim Peterson, seconded by Nick Recktenwald.

Motion passed unanimously by all members present.

NEXT MEETING: Friday, February 9, 2024 at 10:00 a.m. via Zoom

(The January 12 meeting was cancelled due to lack items submitted for discussion and the first week of winter term.)



## **Presentation/Proposal Form**

Course Fee for MA 120

**Name:** Alan Nunes

**Date:** 10/25/23

**Department:** Massage Therapy

**Contact Information:** [anunes@cocc.edu](mailto:anunes@cocc.edu)

- ❖ Complete Items 1–9 to the best of your ability (see Instructions form for reference).
- ❖ If an item listed is not relevant to your specific presentation to College Affairs, please mark it *N/A*.
- ❖ E-mail the completed checklist to the College Affairs committee support specialist by the specified deadline. Include a copy of your proposal in either a PDF Editable or MS Word document.

### **1. PRESENTATION/PROPOSAL ABSTRACT (150–250 words)**

LMT has built in fees terms 2-4 in students 100 level certificate courses to cover the cost of licensure and exam fees. That fee has been stable at \$17 per credit for the last several years. Fees have increased for both licensure and national exam; an increase to \$21 per credit would cover the cost. Current fees total \$527, increased fee cost would total \$651.

### **2. TYPE OF PRESENTATION/PROPOSAL**

- Information Item (requires approval of CA Chair)
- Action Item **X**
  - Information and committee feedback
  - Procedure—*revision* (Attach current procedure with proposed changes highlighted using track changes.)
  - Procedure—*new* (Attach proposed procedure separately.)
    - Identify suggested location in *General Procedures Manual*: \_\_\_\_\_

Policy—*revision* (Attach current policy with proposed changes illustrated with track changes.)

Policy—*new* (Attach proposed policy separately.)

Identify suggested location in *General Policy Manual*: \_\_\_\_\_

Other: Course fee \_\_\_\_\_

### 3. BUDGET IMPACT

LMT 100 level courses terms 2-4 would increase from \$17 per credit to \$21.

### 4. IMPACTED DEPARTMENTS AND/OR PROGRAMS

List the impacted departments and/or programs and describe the impact. Identify the steps you have taken to communicate the impacts on those departments and programs.

No other departments of programs will be impacted. N/A

## 5. INSTRUCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS/IMPACTS

N/A

## 6. OPERATIONAL IMPACT

N/A

## 7. STUDENT IMPACT

The increased fee would allow the entire cost of the licensure process to be paid for upon completion. Students can take the national exam immediately after graduation, increasing their pass rate and have the money in place to license immediately.

## **8. ANTICIPATED IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE**

Fall 2024

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

Recommend an increase of course fees in LMT 118, 124, 135, 140, 145, 150, 160, 175 and 180 from \$17 per credit to \$21 per credit. The Allied Health Department additionally requests ability to automatically adjust up to 20% increase to course fees each year without CAC approval.



Date: June 3, 2022  
10:00 – 11:00am  
Location: Zoom call

Attending	Absent	Guest
Stephanie André, Chair		Rachel Knox
Seana Barry		Jacquie Coe
Lori Benefiel		
Laurie Chesley		
Allison Dickerson		
Jeff Fortenberry		
Amy Harper		
Kirsten Hostetler		
Alan Unger		
Darcy Hays, ASCOCC President		
Jennifer Peters, Recorder		

Meeting called to order at 10:00 am.

1. Old Business/Information Items

a. Minutes from May 27, 2022 – Stephanie André

Motion to approve meeting minutes from May 27, 2022 with no suggested edits.

Motion made by Allison Dickerson, seconded by Seana Barry.

Motion passed unanimously by all members present.

b. Edits to B-2-0 (Public Records), 2<sup>nd</sup> reading - Sharla Andresen

c. Edits to A-7-0 (Advising), 2<sup>nd</sup> reading – Diane Pritchard

Motion to approve at 2<sup>nd</sup> reading suggested changes to the GPM as submitted by Sharla Andresen and Diane Pritchard with no suggested edits.

There was a consensus vote of approval on all two items by all committee members.

Motion passed unanimously by all members present.

d. Edits to G-6-3 (Academic Affairs Committee), 2<sup>nd</sup> reading – Jacquie Coe

Motion to approve at 2<sup>nd</sup> reading the proposed changes to the Academic Affairs Committee structure to include changing the term for the classified representative from three (3) years to two (2) years and changing the title from the Vice President of Instruction to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Motion made by Seana Barry, seconded by Allison Dickerson.

Motion passed unanimously by all members present.

e. GP Edits to Policies: Review and Approval, 2<sup>nd</sup> reading – Rachel Knox

Motion to approve at 2<sup>nd</sup> reading the proposed changes or additions to the GP manual with suggested edits from the College Affairs Committee.

Motion made by Seana Barry, seconded by Lori Benefiel.



Motion passed unanimously by all members present.

2. New Business

a. Shared Governance Overview of GPM Edits – Tom Barry

- i. GP edits to HR-13-3 (Granting Emeritus Status to Classified), 1<sup>st</sup> reading – Allison Dickerson
- Suggest making the due date January 15 for recommendations to the Classified Association Executive Team, this will be consistent with the date that is currently listed in the GPM, with their decision for recommendations due by February 1.

Motion to approve at 1<sup>st</sup> reading GP edits to HR-13-3 (Granting Emeritus Status to Classified) with suggested changes pending approval of changes by Allison Dickerson and the CACOCC.

Motion made by Jeff Fortenberry, seconded by Seana Barry.

Motion passed unanimously by all members present.

- ii. GP edits to G-6-8.1 – G-6-8.1.2, G-6-8.9, G-23-0 – G-24-0, G-27-0, and G-29-0, (Multiple HR edits) 1<sup>st</sup> reading – Laura Boehme

- Suggest changing the word “winner” out of the Administrator of the Year award and replacing it with “award recipient”

Motion to approve at 1<sup>st</sup> reading changes to G-6-8.1 – G-6-8.1.2, G-6-8.9, G-23-0 – G-24-0, G-27-0, and G-29-0 with suggested edits.

Motion made by Lori Benefiel, seconded by Kirsten Hostetler.

Motion passed unanimously by all members present.

- iii. GP edits to HR-1-0 – 6-1 and HR-11-1, 11-2, HR-13-2 – 16-2 and HR-18-0 – 18-3, 1<sup>st</sup> reading – Rachel Knox

- Suggested minor grammatical changes
- Change the reference from VP for Instruction to VP for Academic Affairs
- Change “he/she” to “their” where appropriate
- Identify LWOP as Leave Without Pay

Motion to approve at 1<sup>st</sup> reading GP edits to HR-1-0 – 6-1 and HR-11-1, 11-2, HR-13-2 – 16-2 and HR-18-0 – 18-3 .

Motion made by Seana Barry, seconded by Kirsten Hostetler.

Motion passed unanimously by all members present.

- iv. GP edits to G-32-11, G-32-16 - G-32-16.3, G-32-17 – G-32-17.3.3, G-32-18 – G-32-19.2, G-32-21 – G-32.21.3 and addendum to G-32-0, 1<sup>st</sup> reading – Rachel Knox

- G-32-4 – Recommend changing “....24=- hour-a-day, 8 day-a-week.....” to 7 day-a-week
- G-32-4 – Committee agreed to keep it as a policy and not change it to a procedure
- Suggest changing PAT (President’s Advisory Team) to SLT (Senior Leadership Team)
- Recommend removing the last sentence of G-32-9.1 Outside Commitments as it’s more of an Instructional policy and not an HR policy

Motion to approve at 1<sup>st</sup> reading edits to G-32-11, G-32-16 – G-32-16.3, G-32-17 – G-32-17.3.3, G-32-18 – G-32-19.2, G-32-21 – G-32.21.3 and addendum to G-32-0 with suggested edits.





Motion made by Lori Benefiel, seconded by Seana Barry.

Motion passed unanimously by all members present.

Seana Barry motioned to adjourn the meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 11:00 am.

NEXT MEETING: June 10, 2022, Zoom, 10am – 11am

Meeting Recording:

[https://cocc.zoom.us/rec/share/YQrE6T7X2SY7\\_g-6sBpDaelH0ttoO9\\_iv67i4\\_Ol1rbz\\_okTWtq4\\_ZPVnP0wMXPo.7p-5H5tv5JMpywwM](https://cocc.zoom.us/rec/share/YQrE6T7X2SY7_g-6sBpDaelH0ttoO9_iv67i4_Ol1rbz_okTWtq4_ZPVnP0wMXPo.7p-5H5tv5JMpywwM)

## **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. The request for review must be within the first three working (3) weeks of the quarter (Fall, Winter, Spring) immediately following the quarter in which the student course evaluation was completed.

1. After receiving a finalized student evaluation of the faculty member, which the evaluated faculty member believes contains offensive language and/or statements, as defined above, the faculty member may submit a written request to the Department Chair to review the student evaluation.

The written request must specify the exact language and/or statements the faculty member believes are offensive, and as such, are requested to be removed from the student evaluation.

2. Within five working days after 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. Within an additional five working days, 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 within five working days of receiving the written appeal. 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.

DRAFT