



Date: May 9, 2025

Time: 10:00 – 11:30 a.m.

Location: Zoom meeting

Attending	Absent	Guests
Tim Peterson, Chair	Allison Dickerson	Jen Chance
Tracy Crockett	Breana Sylwester	Rachel Knox
Galit Ruebush	Thomas Wrisley	Justin Borowsky
Marilyn Waller-Niewold		Kathy Smith
Sara Henson		Cory Darling
Laurie Chesley, President		Stacey Donohue
Kyle Matthews, Recorder		

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

1. Old Business

- a. Review Minutes from April 11, 2025 Meeting – Tim Peterson
 - Motion to approve the meeting minutes.
Motion made by Marilyn Waller-Niewold, seconded by Tracy Crockett.
 Motion approved by all voting members present.
- b. Proposed Revision to CCDC Committee Charge, 2nd Reading – Jen Chance
 - Motion to approve the second reading of this proposal.
Motion made by Galit Ruebush, seconded by Tracy Crockett.
 Motion approved by all voting members present.
- c. Recommendations from the Artificial Intelligence (AI) Taskforce, 2nd Reading – Tim Peterson
 - Peterson shared an updated version of the proposal that included positions for representatives on the proposed committee from eLearning *and* ITS. There were also updates to the language in the committee’s proposed guidelines as recommended by the College Affairs Committee (CAC), the Shared Governance Committee and the eLearning department. The representative from administration would be appointed by the President, classified representatives would be selected by the Classified Association, faculty representatives would be selected by the Faculty Senate, and representatives from ITS and eLearning would be recommended by their respective departments.
 - Ruebush asked if the recommendations made by the CAC during their first reading were included in this updated document.
 - Peterson confirmed this and added that they would be passed onto the AI Committee if the CAC approves this proposal.
 - 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.
- d. Proposed Updates to HR Policy G-32-18 and Procedure HR-12-0 New Employee Moving Allowance Policy and Procedure, 2nd Reading – Rachel Knox



- Motion to approve the second reading of this proposal.
Motion made by Galit Ruebush, seconded by Marilyn Waller-Niewold.
 Motion approved by all voting members present.

2. New Business

- a. G-32-12.5 Military Leave Policy Update, 1st and 2nd Readings – Rachel Knox
 - This proposed update is in response to changes in Oregon legislation and will not require a month’s delay for a second reading. The language referring to “15 days” would be removed as it is no longer accurate, and it would not be replaced by a different number of days. Instead, it would say that COCC will always follow the law.
 - Motion to approve the first and second readings of this proposal.
Motion made by Marilyn Waller-Niewold, seconded by Tracy Crockett.
 Motion approved by all voting members present.
- b. Faculty Senate Proposal for Office Hours Update, 1st Reading – Justin Borowsky
 - Ruebush asked what the current requirements are for faculty office hours.
 - Borowsky said faculty members must pre-schedule five office hours. If they teach virtually, one to two of those hours can be virtual.
 - Ruebush asked if this proposal would allow for virtual instructors to change all of their office hours to virtual if they choose.
 - Borowsky said that the proposal calls for instructors’ office hours to reflect the modality of their teaching. If they teach in-person, some of their office hours must be in-person. If they teach online, some of their office hours must be online. Only faculty members who teach exclusively online would be able to opt to have office hours exclusively online. Any by-appointment office hours can still have an in-person option for students.
 - Peterson asked if scheduled appointments would need to have equal modality to a faculty member’s teaching format.
 - Borowsky said it would be primarily driven by their students’ needs.
 - Henson noted that this language was included to the proposal after receiving feedback from students.
 - Peterson asked if there were any challenges to this proposal from the Faculty Senate.
 - Borowsky said there was less support from administrators for the “by-appointment” portion of the proposal. There seemed to be a general amount of support for moving toward more virtual office hours. According to the compiled survey data, students were scheduling appointments three times as much as using regular office hours. The faculty and the ASCOCC overall seemed supportive of this proposal.
 - Peterson asked how administrators’ feedback was presented.
 - Borowsky said Annemarie Hamlin spoke with the instructional deans and brought their feedback to the Faculty Senate. They also held two readings that were posted in COCC Headlines, which gave College personnel an opportunity for open comments.
 - Henson noted that the feedback from the administrators was not accompanied by any data to support their concerns.



- Ruebush asked what concerns were shared by the administrators.
 - Henson said they had suggested that this proposal would be less student-ready and that students might be intimidated to schedule appointments with faculty. They felt that faculty not having at least three in-person office hours suggested a lack of commitment.
 - Borowsky added that there was a concern about how the suggested changes might affect campus culture, especially faculty availability to administrators and classified staff. Their suggestions did not seem to be student-focused.
 - Smith commented that her students are busy and don't have consistent schedules. They prefer setting appointments.
 - Henson added that these proposed changes would allow faculty to be more available to meet with colleagues and serve on committees.
 - 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.
- c. G-6-9.6 Safety/OSHA Committee Charge Updates, 1st Reading – Cory Darling
- Darling explained that the existing policy calls for quarterly safety inspections by committee members. However, the Campus Safety department conducts monthly safety inspections on all of COCC's buildings on all of its campuses, and their inspections are documented. The proposed change to this policy is meant to reflect the College's current practices.
 - Peterson noted, as a former Safety Committee member, he would feel more comfortable with Campus Safety staff doing these inspections, rather than Committee members.
 - Darling concurred and noted that Campus Safety has access to areas that Committee members do not, such as boiler rooms.
 - Ruebush asked if the Safety Committee has been regularly conducting quarterly inspections.
 - Darling said that Committee members have not done inspections since he started working at COCC.
 - Peterson asked if the Safety Committee would still have access to documented findings from Campus Safety's monthly inspections.
 - Darling confirmed this. The Committee meets quarterly with Campus Safety and their findings are reported, including any repairs that have been made as a result.
 - Motion to approve the first reading of this proposal.
Motion made by Galit Ruebush, seconded by Marilyn Waller-Niewold.
 Motion approved by all voting members present.
- d. Discussion Item: Proposed Academic Freedom Policy – Stacey Donahue
- Donahue explained that the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) created a taskforce to draft an academic freedom policy as COCC does not have one. They presented the proposed policy to the Faculty Forum, the Faculty Senate, the Chairmoot, CTE directors and administrators for feedback. The AAC has also approved a first reading of this proposal and will need to approve a second. The taskforce has made revisions based on the feedback they have received. For example, the word "citizens" was replaced with "community members" as not all faculty are



U.S. citizens. The purpose of this policy is to allow faculty to teach and research controversial topics without fear of interference from politicians or administrators. A line on freedom of speech is included for students as they would not be eligible for the protections of academic freedom. This policy could be listed in the faculty section of the General Policy Manual (GPM), in the students' section, or somewhere else.

- Henson noted that the Faculty Forum's contract has had an article on academic freedom in the past, but it only applied to full-time faculty as they were members of the bargaining unit. This proposal is intended to include part-time faculty as well.
- Chesley asked about a section of the proposal titled "Freedom of Inquiry and Expression at COCC for Staff, Administrators and Students." She noted that the College's policies on the rights and responsibilities of students do have some limitations on freedom of speech, including hateful speech and signage in support of political candidates. Does this proposal align with those limitations?
 - Donahue noted that a line in this section states, "As with faculty, this freedom carries responsibilities, including ethical conduct and respect for diverse perspectives, in keeping with COCC's Principles of Community."
 - Chesley concurred that sentence is helpful. Would it make sense to add language to address legal restrictions?
 - Peterson added that future changes to academic freedom law should be considered.
 - Donahue said the taskforce studied many academic freedom policies from various community colleges. While they could not find any conflicting language, she noted that these policies were all written within the last five years, so they may be due for updates.
 - Henson noted that other colleges she researched included webpages that gave more context to the history and meaning of academic freedom and how it is different from freedom of speech. It may benefit COCC to include similar information on the College's website that is linked to the proposed policy.
- Ruebush asked if there are existing policies at COCC on permitted/limited forms of speech for College personnel.
 - Chesley said that, during election seasons, the Marketing and Public Relations department emails reminders to all COCC staff about what they can and cannot say/do regarding political candidates/policies.
 - Peterson asked if this policy has to do with the fact that COCC is a public institution, and if staff at private institutions are allowed to show support for political candidates.
 - Chesley was not sure, but suggested it would be based on the fact that COCC receives public funding.
 - Henson noted that these are OER regulations and are not found in COCC's GPM.
- e. Discussion Item: Next Year's College Affairs Committee Chair – Kyle Matthews
 - Matthews reminded the CAC that next year's Committee Chair will need to be decided by their next meeting. While they have a quorum this meeting, they can wait until they meet again on June 10. They should consider current CAC members who will be continuing their term on the CAC during the 2025-26 academic year.
 - The CAC opted to wait until June 10 to elect next year's Chair.



Meeting adjourned at 10:51 a.m.

NEXT MEETING: Tuesday, June 10, 2025 at 10:00 a.m. via Zoom