



Date: April 11, 2025

Time: 10:00 – 11:30 a.m.

Location: Zoom meeting

Attending	Absent	Guests
Tim Peterson, Chair	Allison Dickerson	Frank Payne
Tracy Crockett	Thomas Wrisley	Forrest Towne
Galit Ruebush		Rachel Knox
Breana Sylwester		Jen Chance
Marilyn Waller-Niewold		Steve Broadbent
Sara Henson		Annemarie Hamlin
Laurie Chesley, President		
Kyle Matthews, Recorder		

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

1. Old Business

- a. Review Minutes from March 14, 2025 Meeting – Tim Peterson
  - Motion to approve the meeting minutes.  
Motion made by Breana Sylwester, seconded by Marilyn Waller-Niewold.  
 Motion approved by all voting members present.
- b. Inclusive Access (IA) Course Fees for the Fall 2025 Term, 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading – Frank Payne
  - Payne noted that four courses had been added to this proposal since the first reading. He did not think it would be a problem as IA fees have not been a contentious issue for the College Affairs Committee (CAC). As tariffs come into play, more requests may come in as IA will be more affordable for students.
  - Motion to approve the second reading of this proposal.  
Motion made by Tracy Crockett, seconded by Galit Ruebush.  
 Motion approved by all voting members present.
- c. Professional Improvement Resource Team (PIRT) Award Deadlines, 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading – Forrest Towne
  - Ruebush asked if there was any concern that the PIRT would forget about the deadline for nominations if the language of the policy was changed from a specific date to the middle of the month.
    - Towne did not think it would be an issue as administering these awards is one of the PIRT’s main roles.
    - Peterson asked if the PIRT meets on a regular basis.
    - Towne said they meet every Friday.
    - Peterson suggested that weekly meetings would give the PIRT the flexibility they need in case they cannot meet on a certain Friday.
    - Towne added that the PIRT’s goal is to have nominations finalized before spring break, and their usual deadline of March 15 was on a Saturday this year.



- Peterson added that this deadline is regularly shared with the faculty.
- Motion to approve the second reading of this proposal.

Motion made by Galit Ruebush, seconded by Breana Sylwester.

Motion approved by all voting members present.

d. G-6-8.11 Insurance Committee Policy Revision, 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading – Rachel Knox

- Henson asked Sylwester if she had asked the Shared Governance Committee (SGC) about whether the standard two-year contract for adjunct faculty would conflict with the current policy that calls for a three-year adjunct faculty term on the Insurance Committee.
  - Sylwester said the SGC had not met since the previous CAC meeting, but it will be on the agenda for their next meeting. She did not think they would disagree with Henson's suggestion of a two-year term.
  - Henson said she was comfortable with the CAC approving the current proposal as long as her suggested revision would be considered at a future meeting.

- Motion to approve the second reading of this proposal.

Motion made by Tracy Crockett, seconded by Breana Sylwester.

Motion approved by all voting members present.

2. New Business

a. Proposed Updates to HR Policy G-32-18 and Procedure HR-12-0 New Employee Moving Allowance Policy and Procedure, 1<sup>st</sup> Reading – Rachel Knox

- Knox explained that changing the language from "reimbursement" to "allowance," as well as expanding eligibility for this benefit, would make the policy more equitable.
- Peterson asked why the change to "allowance" from "reimbursement" was being proposed.
  - Knox said that reimbursement always requires receipts, which makes the process more administratively challenging. Receipts might not be in the employee's name if they are moving with a significant other. An allowance would be a set amount of money. Moving costs are invariably greater than the allowance rate that is budgeted for by Human Resources.
  - Ruebush noted that reimbursements are not always taxable. Allowances are taxable as they are processed through the payroll department. The language in this proposal could help clear up some confusion.
  - Henson added that allowances are more clear in the amount that new employees will have available to them, whereas some new employees might expect to be reimbursed the full amount of their moving expenses.

- Motion to approve the first reading of this proposal.

Motion made by Galit Ruebush, seconded by Tracy Crockett.

Motion approved by all voting members present.

b. Proposed Revision to the College Community Development Committee (CCDC) Charge, 1<sup>st</sup> Reading – Jen Chance



- Peterson noted that this proposal had been reviewed by the SGC and they gave their feedback. He asked if the CCDC might change any of its work based on the proposed changes to their charge.
  - Chance said that the proposed changes would better align the CCDC's charge with the work they do. Language referring to "professional development" was replaced with "engagement" as the CCDC has not done much professional development work while it was included in their charge. Professional development has been facilitated mostly through Human Resources, along with each department and employee group. The proposed changes would also better reflect the CCDC's work and achievements, as well as emphasize COCC's commitment to community engagement and enrichment.
  - Sylwester asked if certain breakout sessions at the All-College Kickoff would qualify as professional development.
  - Knox explained that the Kickoff has coordinated by a separate planning team for the past several years, rather than the CCDC.
- Motion to approve the first reading of this proposal.  
Motion made by Breana Sylwester, seconded by Marilyn Waller-Niewold.  
 Motion approved by all voting members present.

c. Discussion Item: Recommendations from the Artificial Intelligence Taskforce – Tim Peterson

- Peterson acknowledged the members of the taskforce for their work, as well as students who volunteered to participate. While this document is comprehensive, it is not complete.
- Henson asked for context on a few items.
  - Page 7, under "Procuring AI Tools/Software," does it only refer to downloading AI tools, or does it include web-based tools? Would a COCC employee need to notify ITS if they are using a web-based platform?
    - Peterson said the taskforce intended to follow the acceptable use policy while acknowledging there are variations to it. He suggested it would be helpful for COCC's policies to state which forms of AI are suitable and which are not. Approved versions should first be vetted for safety.
    - Broadbent added that employees can gain access to certain AI programs through ITS' enterprise-wide licensing. ITS is developing a list of AI tools that are considered safe or unsafe. An example of the latter is DeepSeek because it is owned and developed by a Chinese company. ITS is also working on their own guidelines for acceptable AI use.
    - Henson suggested more clarity would be helpful. Does "procure" mean getting a license or creating an account?
  - Page 9, under "Specific Guidelines for Students," could the language be changed from "students can use AI to assist with research" to "students *may* use" in order to better align with the previous paragraph that says students should understand and follow the AI use guidelines of each individual course?
    - Peterson concurred.
  - Page 10, under "Faculty Guidelines for the Integration of AI in Pedagogy," does "Design Resilient Assignments" refer to AI-proofing?



- Peterson said it is a recommendation for how an assignment might be utilized by AI or if students will not be allowed to use AI.
  - Henson said it would be helpful to clarify this for distance learning instructors who are applying for major overhaul grants.
  - Peterson concurred and offered to change the language to “AI proof,” “AI resistant,” or something similar.
- Page 14 says faculty can submit a report if they suspect a student has violated an AI policy. Henson said she has heard from colleagues that there is a lack of clarity on what happens after a report is submitted. Could these recommendations address when student intervention or outreach is necessary?
  - Peterson said that Andrew Davis was on the taskforce and his office normally deals with these reports. The taskforce did not include this detail in their recommendations.
  - Henson suggested it would be helpful to know that submitting an incident report does not automatically lead to a student getting called into Davis’ office, and that a hierarchy of possible responses would make more sense.
  - Peterson said the taskforce did not feel it was within their purview to determine how to review a report of academic misconduct when such a process is already in place. It may be a point of discussion for an AI committee, which the taskforce has proposed for the College to establish.
  - Henson had a similar suggestion for page 17 under the “Academic Honesty Statement.”
- Page 16 has a recommendation to form an AI committee. The proposed charge includes “consult on cases of academic dishonesty where AI is involved, as requested by Student Services.” Could the committee also consult on cases as requested by faculty?
  - Peterson confirmed this and said that the tone of the committee is intended to be an open source for all COCC personnel.
- For the two faculty representatives on the proposed committee, as determined by the Faculty Forum, Henson suggested they could also be appointed by the Faculty Senate.
  - Peterson concurred that appointment from the Faculty Senate might make more sense.
- Hamlin asked about “AI for Academics” on pages 9 and 10. In regards to creating and training AI models, data privacy, bias and fairness, the language specifically applied to students. Would this include CIS students who are learning how to use AI in this way?
  - Peterson said that some CIS students participated on the taskforce and they are learning to use AI in their classes. He expected this to become more pervasive among COCC’s students, whether they are studying CIS or not. Setting guidelines for creating and training AI models would help students consider the ethics behind that.
  - Hamlin suggested adding a transitional statement as the first three points seemed to be for students in general, while the remaining points were for students who are creating and training AI models.
  - Peterson concurred.



- From page 9, under “Transparency and Academic Integrity,” Hamlin asked if the taskforce determined that AI use without attribution is generally considered plagiarism.
  - Peterson said that was not the taskforce’s precise position on plagiarism. He noted that conversations in the greater AI community have been suggesting that content generated by AI is owned by AI, depending on the AI program itself and the sources it uses. That may not be the case right now, but the technology is rapidly advancing. The guideline from the taskforce is that, when in doubt, whether it involves a student or a staff member, any use of AI should be attributed.
- From page 9, under “Specific Guidelines for Students,” Hamlin asked, if an instructor says their students cannot use AI in their course, the language of this section should protect the instructor’s right to say so.
  - Peterson concurred.
- On page 8, Hamlin noted references to semesters. Since COCC operates on a quarterly system, the language should be updated to reflect that.
  - Peterson concurred.
- Peterson said that COCC’s AI taskforce has been dissolved and relieved of their duties, with the intention of a standing AI committee being established in its place. He also highlighted their concerns for the environmental impacts of AI use, the importance of digital and AI literacy and ethics for COCC’s students, and the need for students to be able to learn how to properly use AI outside of technology-focused courses. The taskforce is also recommending COCC’s academic honesty statement be revised to include AI explicitly as a form of academic dishonesty in alignment with instructors’ classroom policies.
  - Hamlin concurred that digital and AI literacy may need to be listed as two separate types of literacy.
- As Chair of the CAC, Peterson recommended moving forward with establishing a standing AI committee by the end of the year. There has been interest from personnel across the College who would like to participate. He offered to write a proposal for the CAC, or the recommendation document presented in this meeting could be considered sufficient for a first reading.
  - Sylwester suggested the recommendations presented in this meeting could be considered a first reading. Crockett and Ruebush concurred.
  - Peterson noted the proposal included six positions on the committee in order to keep it small and easy to schedule meetings. If they need more input, they can request it from outsiders.
  - Peterson asked Broadbent for his input on the proposal for a permanent position for a staff member from ITS or eLearning.
    - Broadbent said that ITS would certainly be interested in having a representative on the committee, but did not now about eLearning’s interest.
    - Peterson said that there seemed to be some reluctance from the eLearning department to participate, so he offered to modify the proposal to only have a permanent position for an ITS staff member and not for eLearning.



- Christopher Hazlett and Eric Magidson have expressed interest in serving in the two faculty designated positions on the committee. Peterson strongly recommended both of them for these positions.
    - Hamlin asked if faculty members would be appointed or elected, noting that faculty committee elections were coming up.
    - Peterson suggested starting with Hazlett and Magidson, and then continue as the College normally does.
    - Henson suggested staggering terms for each position so committee membership doesn't change all at once.
    - Peterson concurred and said he would discuss it further with Justin Borowsky from the Faculty Senate.
  - Chesley noted that she did not feel informed enough to make any presidential appointments for this committee.
  - Peterson noted that the SGC would also review this proposal before the second reading.
  - Motion to approve the first reading for the proposal to establish an AI committee. Motion made by Tracy Crockett, seconded by Breana Sylwester.
    - Motion approved by all voting members present.
- d. Discussion Item: Rescheduling the June 13 CAC Meeting
- The End of Year Awards ceremony was announced the morning of this meeting, and it will happen at the same time as the CAC's monthly meeting that is scheduled for June 13, so a new meeting time is needed. Peterson and Matthews will send out some options for the CAC to decide on.

Motion to adjourn the meeting.

Motion made by Breana Sylwester, seconded by Marilyn Waller-Niewold.

Meeting adjourned at 11:06 a.m.

NEXT MEETING: Friday, May 9, 2025 at 10:00 a.m. via Zoom