



Date: November 14, 2025

Time: 10:00 – 11:30 a.m.

Location: Boyle Education Center Boardroom and Zoom

Attending	Absent	Guests
Breana Sylwester, Chair	Greg Pereira, President	Frank Payne
Savannah Boyer		Cathleen Knutson
Tracy Crockett		Angie Anderson-May
Scott Dove		Michael LaLonde
Lisa Merritt		Krista Leaders
Galit Ruebush		Julie Downing
Talia Stockwell		Annemarie Hamlin
Marilyn Waller-Niewold		Rachel Knox
Tom Barry		Alan Nunes
Sara Henson		Leslie Houston
Kyle Matthews, Recorder		Alicia Moore
		Ken Harmon

Meeting called to order at 10:03 a.m.

1. Old Business

a. Review Minutes from October 10, 2025 Meeting – Breana Sylwester

- Motion to approve the meeting minutes.
Motion made by Scott Dove, seconded by Galit Ruebush.

b. Inclusive Access (IA) Course Fees for the Winter 2026 Term, 2nd Reading – Frank Payne

- Payne noted a few courses were added to the list from the previous meeting, while other courses were removed.
- Motion to approve the second reading of proposed IA course fees for the 2026 Winter term.
Motion made by Galit Ruebush, seconded by Talia Stockwell.
 Motion approved by all voting members present.

c. Proposed Revisions to Spending Policies G-2-1 and G-31-7.1, 2nd Reading – Michael LaLonde, Cathleen Knutson and Angie Anderson-May

- Knutson reminded the College Affairs Committee (CAC) that the purpose of this proposal is to clarify COCC’s spending policies. Suggested revisions from the first reading were incorporated into this meeting’s packet.
- Ruebush asked if these policies should include instructions for gift card reporting.
 - Knutson said that detailed instructions are listed elsewhere in COCC’s policies and are not needed in G-31-7.1. However, the last sentence of the policy *does* call for any gift cards that are issued to employees to be reported to Payroll as taxable income.
- Henson asked who is responsible for reporting to Payroll.
 - Knutson said the person who pays for or issues a gift card to an employee is responsible.
- Motion to approve the second reading of proposed revisions to policies G-2-1 and G-31-7.1.
Motion made by Tracy Crockett, seconded by Marilyn Waller-Niewold.



- ☑ Motion approved by all voting members present.

2. New Business

a. Proposed Course Fees Process Restructure, 1st Reading – Michael LaLonde, Cathleen Knutson, Julie Downing, Angie Anderson-May, and Krista Leaders

- Anderson-May explained that this proposal is in response to some long overdue increases to course fees that are used to pay for required materials. During the Spring 2025 term, the Manufacturing department requested an increase of course fees from \$50 to \$300, and President Laurie Chesley said it was unreasonable to expect students to pay that increased amount. She asked LaLonde to examine why this happened and how it can be resolved.
 - LaLonde added that it had become unclear how course fees are determined at COCC. He formed a workgroup and they learned that the process was most recently revised in 2017, but College personnel have largely not been following the procedure. This would lead to incorrect amounts being charged to students. The workgroup aimed to create a process that could easily be repeated and reviewed annually.
 - Anderson-May showed that College staff have not been annually reviewing course fees as written in COCC's policies, but rather on an ad hoc basis. This has led to confusion among administrators, faculty and administrative assistants. The CAC meets monthly, which makes it difficult for faculty to update course fees in a timely manner. Different departments are determining their fees in different ways.
- Henson asked if failures in communication are related to staff turnover.
 - Downing said her department's administrative assistant has had to set reminders for herself to manually update fees each year.
 - Leaders said she audits course fees after they are approved by the CAC, which sometimes are not approved until after Fall term registration, so they can't be changed until the following academic year. Since the COVID-19 pandemic, departments have been sending their proposed changes to course fees to the CAC without the knowledge of the Vice President of Academic Affairs or their respective instructional dean or program director.
- Anderson-May asked if the CAC was aware of the fee approval process within the Academic Affairs department.
 - Sylwester said that, when the CAC receives a proposal for fees, the assumption has been that it has been properly vetted.
- Henson asked who has been part of the workgroup that is proposing these changes.
 - Anderson-May said that she has been working with LaLonde, Knutson, Leaders, Downing, Cindy Lenhart, Helen Wiersma-Koch, and Ryan Powell. The Dean Team and faculty members were also consulted for this project.
 - Downing added that a faculty member was also invited to be part of the workgroup, but some confusion with scheduling prevented him from participating.
- Dove asked what input the workgroup has received from Instructional Deans and faculty members.
 - Leaders said that she audits proposed changes to fees and contacts the respective department's administrative assistant if fees are not aligned. One of the goals for this



workgroup is to transfer this responsibility to instructional specialists so they can communicate directly with administrative assistants that they are normally in contact with.

- Dove asked, when a fee is updated, does it need to be updated for every course section and every student enrolled in those courses?
 - Leaders said COCC currently doesn't do fees at the course/catalogue level. Instead, the College applies fees to each section. Administrative assistants have been responsible for manually updating each section's fees. When staff turnover happens, there is a risk of this process getting lost in the shuffle.
- Dove asked if this process could be moved to the course level.
 - Leaders confirmed this and said that she has been discussing this with Melissa Monette how this could be accomplished within Banner.
- Anderson-May shared a flowchart to explain the proposed new process. The two most significant changes would be moving the responsibility of approving changes in fees from the CAC to the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) and to establish a master fee list that can be annually reviewed against any proposed changes to fees. These changes are intended to increase transparency for students and to increase oversight from vice presidents, instructional deans and program directors for fees that are being submitted for approval.
- Reubush asked why changes in course fees have historically been approved by the CAC rather than the AAC.
 - Henson said it was viewed as a fiscal issue, rather than academic, as well as concerns for oversight for total costs for students.
- Henson noted that the general policy manual (GPM) says that only the Board of Directors can approve changes in fees and that the flowchart in this presentation stops at the Office of the President.
 - Knutson explained that the Board will continue to have final say for universal student fees, such as technology, activities and sustainability. The fees that are reviewed by the CAC are not approved by the Board. The proposal is to transfer responsibility for the latter from the CAC to the AAC.
- Henson suggested that another reason the CAC has reviewed course fees is because the CAC has had student voting members, while the AAC has not.
 - Downing said this has been discussed with Hamlin and there may be a student position added to the AAC in the future.
 - Hamlin added that, in the past, students have voted to not have a representative on the AAC, but this could be revisited.
- Sylwester asked how IA fees might factor into this conversation.
 - Anderson-May said the workgroup has not discussed IA fees yet. Their assumption has been that they would remain with the CAC for approval until the course fees process has been revised, then the workgroup would then discuss possible revisions to the IA fees process.
- Anderson-May said that this proposal has gone through a first reading with the AAC and will return for a second, and it will also be reviewed by the CTE Committee.



- Ruebush asked, if a faculty or staff member misses a deadline for changes in fees to be approved, will they need to wait a whole year for another chance?
 - Knutson said that is the current practice. This is part of the process that the workgroup is trying to revise.
- Ruebush asked how costs are covered when fees are not updated accordingly.
 - Hamlin and LaLonde explained that uncovered costs are paid for by COCC's general fund.
- Downing explained that this new process would only cover five programs as a pilot.
- Sylwester asked whether any "pass through" fees generate revenue for the College.
 - LaLonde said that about 70% of course fees are pass through, while the remaining 30% are "recovery costs."
- Sylwester asked what the process would look like to gradually increase costs for programs that are far below what they need to be, such as Manufacturing.
 - Downing said the process is still being considered. One of the workgroup's goals is to determine a cap for course fees that wouldn't deter students from enrolling.
- Henson asked if there has been any discussion about considering student fees, course fees and IA fees holistically as overall costs for students.
 - Anderson-May said this has been discussed with Pereira and the vice presidents. Another goal for the workgroup is to reduce the number of fees that students are charged while keeping the rates appropriate.
- Ruebush asked if all fees would eventually be transferred to the responsibility of one committee.
 - Anderson-May suggested IA fees could eventually be transitioned to the AAC, along with course fees, while student fees would remain with the CAC.
- Henson asked whether transferring responsibility for course fees from the CAC to the AAC would resolve issues of oversight and transparency for fees.
 - Stockwell added that it has been historically difficult for students to consistently participate on College committees and asked how that could be resolved.
 - Anderson-May and Downing said that adding a student role to the AAC has been under consideration.
 - Leaders added that the AAC meets twice per month, while the CAC only meets once per month, so transitioning this process to the AAC could create a faster approval process. The CAC's current schedule requires faculty to have their proposals ready sooner than some of them can manage.
- Hamlin asked if this proposal calls for changes in fees to be presented to the CAC after they are approved by the AAC.
 - Anderson-May suggested that changes in fees could be presented to the CAC as information items.
 - Downing noted that the CAC was formed with the intention of discussing big picture issues and suggested that transitioning this responsibility to the AAC would allow the CAC to spend more time focusing on said issues. Barry concurred.



- Ruebush suggested that the CAC has not been overwhelmed by its responsibility for approving course fees, but agreed it might make sense to transition the responsibility to the AAC as long as students are still involved in the process.
- Motion to approve the first reading for the proposed restructure of the course fees review process.
Motion made by Galit Ruebush, seconded by Savannah Boyer.
 Motion approved by all voting members present.

- b. Proposed Revision to G-32-12.7 Paid Leave Oregon, 1st and 2nd Reading – Rachel Knox
 - Sylwester noted that this proposal is being considered for a first and second reading as it is intended to meet compliance with current State laws.
 - Motion to approve the first and second reading of proposed revisions to policy G-32.12.7.
Motion made by Marilyn Waller-Niewold, seconded by Talia Stockwell.
 Motion approved by all voting members present.

- c. Proposed Increase to Dental Assisting (DA) Course Fees, 1st Reading – Alan Nunes and Leslie Houston
 - Nunes explained that the DA program has historically included these course fees to enable students to pay for practice exams.
 - Houston added that the foundation that administers these practice exams is now requiring each student to purchase their own exams for \$39.00 each. These practice exams have proven to be important for preparing students for certification exams. They have contributed to higher exam scores and overall passing of exams.
 - Ruebush asked if these practice exams are required for DA students to take.
 - Houston said they are not required.
 - Ruebush asked how often students have chosen to purchase practice exams and if students who opt out would still be required to pay the fee.
 - Houston said the DA program is currently paying for the exams instead of the students. It is up to the students whether they will use a practice exam, but they are encouraged to use any means available to prepare for their certification exams. She offered to gather data on this question and follow-up at the next CAC meeting.
 - Nunes noted that students have been taking advantage of the opportunity to take practice exams while they have not been part of their course fees. Houston confirmed this.
 - Henson asked if the proposed \$39.00 fee would cover one practice exam for a specific DA course. Houston confirmed this.
 - Dove asked if the foundation that is providing these practice exams is the only organization that provides practice exams of this quality.
 - Houston confirmed this and clarified that this foundation is directly related to the foundation that administers the DA certification exam.
 - Henson asked if discounts for bulk purchases of practice exams are available.
 - Houston said she would look into whether bulk discounts are possible and would follow-up at the next CAC meeting.



- Nunes noted that the fees listed in the proposal in this meeting's packet were incorrectly listed and would send the corrected version to Matthews to include in the next CAC meeting's packet.
 - Henson asked if the proposed \$39.00 fee was expected to remain consistent for a significant amount of time.
 - Houston said the cost has always been \$39.00 per practice exam, but it is still possible for the cost to increase in the future.
 - Motion to approve the first reading of proposed increases to DA course fees with the appropriate corrections.
Motion made by Galit Ruebush, seconded by Savannah Boyer.
 Motion approved by all voting members present.
- e. Proposed Revisions to Title IX Policies, 1st Reading – Alicia Moore
- Moore explained that about 75% of the proposed changes are language clean-up or moving certain policies to different sections of Title IX policy. These changes are now being proposed because the Trump administration has made changes to the national Title IX policy. While most of the proposed changes are required by law, some proposed changes will be specific to COCC.
 - Henson asked how any changes made to COCC's Title IX policy will be communicated to the College's students, faculty and staff.
 - Moore said that the training videos that had been sent out to COCC personnel earlier in the current term are in compliance with the law. After the proposed changes have been approved and implemented into the GPM, COCC personnel will be notified through COCC Headlines and possibly a mass email to students.
 - Henson asked if these proposed changes would also be presented to the AAC. Moore confirmed this.
 - Motion to approve the first reading of proposed changes to Title IX policies.
Motion made by Scott Dove, seconded by Talia Stockwell.
 Motion approved by all voting members present.
- f. Proposal to Establish G-22-1 Data Governance Policy, 1st Reading – Ken Harmon
- Harmon explained that the proposed policy would establish a strategic framework that directs and reinforces the procedures, protocol, standards and guidelines for managing data risks and ensuring the security and resilience of COCC's environment.
 - Sylwester asked if the policy includes specific guidelines on behavior for COCC personnel.
 - Harmon said it is about how people manage data.
 - Ruebush asked if the College has an existing policy on this matter.
 - Harmon said it does not. COCC's Data Governance Committee only has a methodology that they follow to establish guidelines.
 - Henson noted the proposed policy references Center for Internet Security (CIS) Critical Security Controls version 8.1. The proposal includes a link to a website that only allows users to see a certain amount of information without creating an account.
 - Harmon said the CIS controls are a framework that need to remain somewhat protected.



- Ruebush suggested that whoever owns the link to the website that was included in this proposal could change the level of access or content within the link at any time.
 - Harmon concurred and said the link within the proposed policy could be updated as needed.
 - Sylwester suggested the proposed policy could be re-worded to say that the College will follow the CIS frameworks as written, and if any changes occur, they would be vetted and the College's policy would be revised accordingly.
 - Harmon clarified that COCC personnel would be responsible for the data governance portion of the CIS framework, rather than the whole framework.
- Motion to approve the first reading of the proposal to establish G-22-1 with proposed revisions from the CAC.
Motion made by Scott Dove, seconded by Savannah Boyer.
 Motion approved by all voting members present.

- g. Discussion Item: College Affairs Committee Meeting Frequency – Breana Sylwester
- In the interest of time, this item was tabled for the next meeting.

Motion to adjourn the meeting.

Motion made by Galit Ruebush, seconded by Savannah Boyer.

Meeting adjourned at 11:46 a.m.

NEXT MEETING: Friday, December 12, 2025 at 10:00 a.m. in the Boyle Education Center Boardroom and via Zoom