MEMBERS PRESENT:
Michael Bradley, Susan Cody, Illiad Connally, Jason Dew, Thomas Graham, Sarah Jennings, Erin Morrey, Paula Porto, Sally Robertson, Doug Ruch, Ingrid Thompson-Sellers, Ted Wadley, Emily Whaley

MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:
Keith Cobbs, Vincent June, Robin Winston

I  Call to order
Brad Tucker called the meeting to order at 3:03 pm

II  Approval of minutes of 2/19/12
The minutes were approved as presented.

III  Old Business

Report on PPAB policy decisions
Mr. Tucker reported that draft policies #134 (Course Prerequisites for Transient Students) and #135 (Course Prerequisites for Special Students) requiring transient and special students to adhere to GPC’s course prerequisites had been tabled by the PPAB. Mr. Watts wanted to look at some BOR policies, and there was a concern about what the proposed policies would mean for summer enrolment.

The Faculty Sick Leave policy was approved. The AAPC had followed the BOR policy [5.1.8] that states that full-time for summer employment is 9 credit hours. A GPC faculty member teaching this would earn the full 16 hours sick leave for June and July. The PPAB amended this to say that full-time is 6 hours, and a faculty member teaching this would earn the full 16 hours sick leave for the two months. Brad Tucker later showed the relevant BOR policy to the interim VPAA who conceded that the PPAB may have to reconsider the amendment. Regarding the matter of how many hours of sick leave a faculty member should apply for when absent for a day, the PPAB approved applying only for the number of hours of responsibility that the person had on campus. If the person only had five hours of responsibility scheduled, then he/she would apply for five hours, not eight hours as the policy previously stated.
The PPAB did not consider the textbook policy. The interim VPAA sent it back to Mr. Tucker because he wanted the AAPC to look at some other things. The Council had added conflict of interest and the approval of electronic components by OIT to the current policy, but had not opened up the whole policy for review. Mr. Smith wants a more comprehensive review. He wants the Council to look at (1) the policy’s stipulation that approved texts must be used, in light of the recent discussions about the use of open texts that would be free of charge to students, and (2) how piloted texts are approved. Mr. Smith felt that it was too easy for a faculty member to get a Chair’s approval to use a different textbook, though Mr. Tucker made the observation that this represents a loosening of the policy that is on the books which requires that the piloting of a text should go through the textbook committee. Further, Mr. Smith wanted the option of faculty not using a text, if the course can be taught without one, to be explored.

The Acceptance of Transfer Credit policy used to be a Student Affairs policy and the AAPC made it an academic policy (renumbered #136), aligning it with BOR policies. The PPAB did not get to consider it but Mr. Smith says he plans to move it along.

Policy 112: Faculty Due Process (revision)
Mr. Tucker had revised the draft of this policy based on feedback coming out of the PPAB. Sally Robertson, Faculty Senate Chair, said that Mr. Watts wanted the AAPC to take its time in revising this policy and to send it back to the PPAB only when the Council feels that it is right. There is to be no rush. She said that the President asked her to say that he supports the faculty wanting this particular policy to be exactly what they want it to be.

Item #12 under Procedures states that all witnesses shall appear before the Hearing Committee unless a hardship is agreed upon by the VPAA and the Hearing Committee Chair. The Council decided to remove the word “Chair” – the hardship is to be agreed upon by the VPAA and the Hearing Committee. The following was also added: “A witness who does not appear before the Hearing Committee may not submit a written statement or other evidence”.

At the request of the PPAB, Mr. Tucker was specific in the revision about who is responsible for certain tasks. For example, it is the complainant who schedules the meeting with the faculty member (item #2 under Procedures), and who contacts the Chair of the faculty senate and the VPAA to request the formation of a Hearing Committee (item #4). Also, the members of the Hearing Committee select the Chair (item #5), and the Hearing Committee Chair writes the notice of the hearing (item #6).

In response to a question from Ted Wadley about the possibility of HR being the complainant, Mr. Tucker explained that the broad identity of the person making the allegation as “…a supervisor or the college administration” would cover that, but HR would have to go through the due process like any other complainant.
Dr. Tom Graham initiated a discussion about whether a supervisor outside a faculty member’s chain of command should be able to bring a charge. It was decided to include the following statement at the end of the policy section:

The complainant must be in the faculty member’s direct chain of command. Those outside a faculty member’s chain of command cannot bring a complaint against a faculty member or impose sanctions.

Further, the complainant was specified to be “a faculty member’s department Chair, Academic Dean, the Vice President of Academic Affairs or the college President”.

Dr. Erin Morrey raised a question from a constituent about whether this policy covered academic administrators, such as department Chairs, Deans and Directors. It was decided that the title of the policy should be amended to Faculty and Academic Administrators Conduct and Due Process Protections (words in italics added). Also, in order to avoid inserting “and academic administrators” throughout the document, the following statement was added:

For the purpose of this policy “faculty members” include tenured and non-tenured faculty as well as academic administrators.

Item #8 was revised as follows:
During the proceedings the faculty member and the administration shall be permitted to have an academic advisor and/or counsel of his/her choice from within the college. The hearing committee will be permitted to have advisory counsel from within the college.

Permission to have a representative of a responsible education association attend as an observer had been removed at the suggestion of the PPAB but was reinstated by the AAPC.

The requirement for the decision of the Hearing Committee to be based on a preponderance of evidence of 51% was deleted in favor of “The majority of the Committee must agree on the decision”.

The wording “The Hearing Committee will not be bound by strict rules of evidence and may admit any evidence which is of probative value in determining the issues involved” was deleted. “The Hearing Committee will make every possible effort to obtain the most reliable evidence available” was considered sufficient.

The Council voted to approve the policy as amended.

IV Other

Membership rotation
The terms of four AAPC members will expire at the end of June – Emily Whaley, Jason Dew, Illiad Connally, and Thomas Graham. Mr. Tucker asked them to let their Deans
know so that the process of electing successors can be put in motion, if this has not already been done. New representatives should be elected and ready to serve by July.

**Summer meeting**
Last year the AAPC met in July because of urgent business regarding SACS. Mr. Tucker said he would talk to Phil Smith to determine if there was anything that would necessitate a meeting of the AAPC this summer. In the event that members are not able to attend if a meeting is called, Mr. Tucker said that representatives could substitute.

V  **Adjournment**
The meeting adjourned at 4:54 pm.