



Date: April 10, 2026

Time: 10:00 – 11:30 a.m.

Location: Boyle Education Center Boardroom and Zoom

Attending	Absent	Guests
Breana Sylwester, Chair	Tom Barry	Sarah Fuller
Savannah Boyer	Lisa Merritt	Frank Payne
Tracy Crockett		Helen Wiersma-Koch
Scott Dove		Venus Nguyen
Galit Ruebush		Darren McCrea
Talia Stockwell		Angie Anderson-May
Marilyn Waller-Niewold		Michael LaLonde
Sara Henson		
Greg Pereira, President		
Kyle Matthews, Recorder		

Meeting called to order at 10:00 a.m.

1. Old Business

- a. Review Minutes from March 13, 2026 Meeting – Breana Sylwester
  - Motion to approve the meeting minutes.  
Motion made by Talia Stockwell, seconded by Galit Ruebush.
- b. Proposal for Anatomy and Psychology (A&P) Online Lab Fees, 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading – Sarah Fuller
  - Motion to approve the second reading of the proposed A&P online lab fees.  
Motion made by Tracy Crockett, seconded by Talia Stockwell.
  - Motion approved by all voting members present.
- b. Proposed Inclusive Access (IA) Course Fees for the Fall 2026 Term, 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading – Frank Payne
  - Crockett asked if any additional courses were added to this proposal.
    - Payne said that there was only one addition for Writing 227.
  - Motion to approve the second reading of proposed IA course fees for the Fall 2026 term.  
Motion made by Galit Ruebush, seconded by Savannah Boyer.
  - Motion approved by all voting members present.
- c. Proposed Construction Pre-Apprenticeship Program Fees, 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading – Helen Wiersma-Koch
  - Motion to approve the second reading of proposed Construction Pre-Apprenticeship fees.  
Motion made by Talia Stockwell, seconded by Scott Dove.
  - Motion approved by all voting members present.

3. New Business

- a. Proposed Art and Design Course Fees Adjustments, 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading – Venus Nguyen
  - Nguyen explained this this proposal is part of a pilot program for the new course fees approval process. It was determined that the art course fees were too complex for the pilot, so they are being presented to the College Affairs Committee (CAC) as part of the existing fee approval



process. The proposed adjustments are meant to cover instructional assistant compensation and lab fees.

- Ruebush asked if any further proposals for course fee adjustments would go through the CAC, or if they would go through the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) moving forward.
  - Anderson-May said that the policy has not yet been officially changed, so any course fee adjustments outside of the pilot would still need to go through the CAC.
  - Nguyen noted that all of the Ceramics course fee adjustments were able to go through the AAC as they were able to identify equipment costs by classroom space.
- Ruebush asked when these fees were last adjusted.
  - Nguyen said they were most recently adjusted in 2022.
- Henson asked if there were any concerns whether proposed fees, such as \$70 for Introduction to Animation, could impact enrollment.
  - Nguyen said that some of these classes, like the Introduction to Animation course, are already full and are only offered once per year. The current class is not using the technology needed for the course.
- Henson asked about the \$80 fee proposed for Art 265.
  - Nguyen explained that this course requires Adobe software, which COCC has not been charging students for licenses.
  - Henson asked if this software license fee is charged per year.
  - Nguyen said it is charged per term.
- Stockwell asked if bulk purchasing from COCC's Bookstore was taken into account when proposing these fees.
  - Nguyen said that the current fees already implement bulk purchasing for art kits and supplies sold by the Bookstore.
- Henson asked how these fees compare to competing institutions.
  - Nguyen said that COCC's fees are significantly lower.
  - Henson asked how these other institutions are funding their art programs.
  - Nguyen said they are also charging course fees to fund their programs.
- Henson asked whether the Art and Design instructional assistants are irregular wage or classified employees.
  - Nguyen said they are irregular wage employees.
  - Henson asked why they are irregular wage when COCC's science lab technicians are classified.
  - Nguyen explained that the Art and Design department had submitted a request for a facilities employee, but it was denied.
  - Henson asked if it was determined that using irregular wage employees is best practice.
  - Nguyen said the department has always advocated for a three-quarter position, but so far has not succeeded.
- Dove asked how many irregular wage instructional assistants are in the department.
  - Nguyen estimated 12-15 people.
  - Dove asked how many hours each employee works.



- Nguyen said each works 10-19 hours per week, the latter being a combination with their other positions with Community Education.
- Henson asked whether the open studio/lab fee could be funded as tutoring.
  - Nguyen explained that that only CTE programs can receive funding for tutoring.
  - Henson noted that transfer programs can receive funding for tutoring.
  - Nguyen concurred and noted that the Art and Design instructional assistants are not necessarily providing the kind of support that could be considered tutoring, but rather ensuring safety.
- Pereira asked what fees could be covered by financial aid.
  - Sylwester explained that all of these proposed fees would qualify for financial aid because they are associated with a COCC course.
- Sylwester noted that this proposal, and any further proposals for changes to course fees, will be presented to the CAC for a first and second reading in order to ensure the course catalogue is updated in a timely manner.
- Motion to approve the first and second reading of proposed Art and Design course fee adjustments.

Motion made by Galit Ruebush, seconded by Talia Stockwell.

Motion approved by all voting members present.

b. Proposal to Establish G-23-3 Data Security Policy, 1<sup>st</sup> Reading – Darren McCrea

- McCrea explained that COCC currently has a Banner security agreement that all employees are required to sign before being granted access to the system. The amount of time it takes for new employees to gain access to Banner has gotten longer over the past few years. The Oregon School Boards Association and their insurer, PACE, have recommended forming a policy to replace the agreement in order to expedite this process. ITS has worked with Human Resources to develop this policy.
- Ruebush asked if new employees would be expected to read the proposed policy during their onboarding process.
  - McCrea confirmed this and noted that, when an employee asks for access for a new section of Banner, they will be reminded of the policy.
- Pereira asked if “knowingly expunge or modify any data entry...” requires to word “knowingly,” as it could add a burden of proof when acceptable use is already explained in the policy.
  - McCrea said that word could be removed.
- Henson asked what “College information, records and files” refers to.
  - McCrea said it refers to any document or record that obtains information about a student or staff member.
  - Henson asked if this could be further defined in the policy. Does it include emails, digital files, etc.? She noted that faculty members have intellectual properties, which they have the right to determine whether COCC is allowed to use. She also acknowledged that those rights may not be protected in matters of security.
  - Waller-Niewold suggested changing the language to “College records and data files.”



- Henson asked why this section was necessary for the policy when COCC already has policies on protecting data.
- McCrea explained that there were concerns for ensuring that data was safeguarded, rather than withheld.
- Henson suggested the first sentence of that paragraph could be removed. McCrea concurred and offered to follow-up on with PACE on this matter.
- Henson noted the paragraph stating “each employee is responsible for understanding the confidentiality requirements of the data to which they have access...” and suggested adding a link to policies that describe where that information can be found.
  - McCrea noted that a link is included later in the proposal.
  - Pereira suggested including an additional link could be helpful.
- Motion to approve the first reading of the proposal to establish G-23-3 with proposed revisions from the CAC.

Motion made by Galit Ruebush, seconded by Scott Dove.

Motion approved by all voting members present.

c. Proposed Revisions to G-30-20 Policy Statement on General Student Fees and A-30-2 Approval Process for General Student Fees, 1st Reading – Angie Anderson-May and Michael LaLonde

- Anderson-May explained that these policies are being proposed for revision in order to align with the new procedure of the Academic Affairs Committee approving any changes to course fees.
- Henson clarified that any Academic policy changes would need to go through the CAC, so this can be a first reading for both G-30-20 and A-30-2. Anderson-May concurred.
- Henson suggested that the language referring to the Senior Leadership Team could be revised to say “College leadership” in order to ensure more people from COCC could be involved in the course fees review process. She also expressed concern about whether two vice presidents from the College might undermine the Academic Affairs Committee’s (AAC’s) role in reviewing fee proposals by “pre-approving” any fee proposals before they are presented to the AAC.
  - Ruebush asked where the policy calls for two vice presidents to review course fees before the AAC.
  - Henson noted that the proposed language calls for “recommended fees changes and additions” from the Vice President of Academic Affairs and the Vice President of Finance and Operations to the AAC.
  - Ruebush asked if Henson’s concern is that that any proposed fees that the vice presidents do not recommend will not be presented to the AAC. Henson confirmed this.
  - Dove asked if language could be added to call for the vice presidents to explain to the AAC why they might have rejected any fee proposals.
  - Henson suggested it would ultimately be for the CAC to decide and said that her concerns were more philosophical.
  - Pereira concurred that including explanations to changes in policy could be helpful.
  - Anderson-May offered to revise the language in A-30-2 to say “Following administrator review, the Vice President of Academic Affairs will present *all* requested fee changes to the AAC.”



- LaLonde also suggested adding “in addition to their recommendations” in order to give the vice presidents a chance to voice their concerns.
- Henson suggested that this process could be reviewed again in one or two years.
- Motion to approve the first reading of proposed changes to G-30-20 and A-30-2 with the proposed changes from the CAC.  
Motion made by Galit Ruebush, seconded by Talia Stockwell.
- Motion approved by all voting members present.

d. Discussion Item: Academic Affairs Course Fees Approval Pilot Process – Angie Anderson-May and Michael LaLonde

- Anderson-May explained that the new course fees approval pilot process included Nursing, Ceramics (Nguyen explained earlier in this meeting why the other Art and Design courses needed to go through the CAC), Manufacturing, Culinary Arts, and Science lab fees. The pilot was successful and revealed how convoluted the approval process can be. Moving forward, the CAC will be informed when fees are changed. She asked the CAC to consider what format they would prefer to receive this information in, such as spreadsheets, PDFs, etc.
- Ruebush noted some information on the forms presented in this meeting’s packet that appeared to be repetitive and asked if it was necessary.
  - Anderson-May suggested it could have been a matter of how an individual completed the form, and that those two sections normally would not repeat. She offered to follow-up on this.
- Stockwell asked if these forms are only filled out by people who are making a request to change a fee, or is there a section where additional information could be added during the approval process?
  - Anderson-May said that would be added to the form in the future. The pilot process did not require it.
- Dove asked if the estimated revenue from proposed fees would be included in future proposals.
  - Anderson-May said that will be added to the form and it was not used during the pilot process.
- Dove asked if there is an institutional philosophy on how much of a course’s cost of materials should be covered by fees.
  - Anderson-May said that one of the objectives of this project is to develop this philosophy. A specific percentage was not determined. It will vary by program and students will be expected to bare a share of the cost. LaLonde is working on those benchmarks of this philosophy.
  - Dove suggested it could be helpful to know the total cost of a course and see comparative costs.
- Ruebush asked if the CAC would be receiving proposed changes to course fees as information items after they have already been approved. Sylwester confirmed this.
- Stockwell noted that the Culinary Arts fees did not change and asked whether this is how every department will go through this process, even if they are not requesting changes to fees.



- Anderson-May said that would not be the case and explained that the Culinary Arts department participated in the pilot and determined that they did not need to change their fees.
  - Henson asked if every academic program would be asked to go through this process on a routine basis, such as every three years.
    - Anderson-May confirmed this. It would most likely not be an annual process.
  - Stockwell asked if multiple fields were necessary for the request form if most of the requests would involve multiple courses.
    - Anderson-May said that some fees only apply to certain courses. The form will ask users to confirm whether they are asking for changes to a single course or multiple courses.
  - Henson asked if the same formula would be used for program fees.
    - Anderson-May said that program fees are currently not being treated any differently from course fees. She was unsure whether that would change in the future.
- e. Discussion Item: Next Year's CAC Chair
- Sylwester asked all CAC members to consider their interested in volunteering themselves or nominating a voting member as next year's Chair. The CAC will vote on next year's Chair during their next meeting on May 8.

Motion to adjourn the meeting.

Motion made by Talia Stockwell, seconded by Marilyn Waller-Niewold.

Meeting adjourned at 11:16 a.m.

NEXT MEETING: Friday, May 8, 2026 at 10:00 a.m. in the Boyle Education Center Boardroom and via Zoom