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

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

NON-MEMBERS PRESENT
Deb Homer (for Keith Cobbs), Deborah Robinson (OIT)

I Approval of minutes of 12/18/12
The minutes were approved as presented

II Old Business

Policy 110 Textbook Revision policy
Deborah Robinson, Chief Information Security Officer, addressed the matter of OIT approval of third-party software. Primarily, the AAPC wanted to know where in the text selection process the OIT review of all electronic or internet-based components that go along with a textbook would be best placed. Ms. Robinson outlined security and academic support issues from OIT’s perspective.

Any third-party software or service may create a risk of security exposure or weaknesses or other types of issues if it is something that has to work within the IT environment. For this reason, OIT requires the opportunity to review third party software to make sure there are no security issues. Information in ancillary/auxiliary products used for giving assignments, providing feedback, and doing tests is FERPA protected, so OIT has to check that the security surrounding these is compliant with FERPA requirements.

Academic support is managed by Ms. Tracy Adkins. She checks to see if the software interfaces with iCollege and considers what would happen if a faculty member who has been using it in classes leaves the college—can someone else access it? Also, if a student challenges a grade after a course, or has some reason to get back into it, who does the data belong to? Will there be access to be able to download it? Can we access it in the
event that we are doing an investigation? These are non-security issues that OIT tries to factor in.

In general, third-party software security concerns arise when a student is required to answer a question or leave a comment, or a faculty member gives feedback to students about their work. Apart from FERPA, if someone is signing an agreement to use a product in any way other than just as a reference, Ms. Robinson said it would be a good idea for OIT to look at it because there are other security and other IT considerations, specifically if there are things that need to be downloaded and run on our machines. OIT has to make sure that there will not be a conflict with our configuration and that it fits within our environment and works correctly. They also look at what support is provided externally for these products as OIT will not be able to support everything.

To facilitate the review, OIT will need the name of the product, how it is going to be used (e.g., in coursework, grading, or tracking), and contact information for the vendor. The turnaround time for an OIT review will depend on how easy it is to contact the vendor and what else OIT is working on at the time. In terms of where in the text selection process the review would come in, OIT would like us to do some filtering and come up with a shortlist, as a large number cannot be reviewed in a timely manner on an ongoing basis. Ms. Robinson will follow-up on the whereabouts of a list of software that OIT has already approved so that it can be made available for reference.

In terms of procedure, Ms. Robinson thought that the best way to request a software review might be through OIT’s ticketing system, as progress could be tracked. However, she said she would discuss this with Ms. Adkins. The Academic Affairs policy on Text Selection will identify the Chair of the textbook committee as being responsible for making submissions to OIT, and being the contact person. Brad Tucker noted that new text selections are now due in February, so that a lot of the work by the textbook committees and the OIT reviewers would have to be done in the fall. Emily Whaley made the point that getting OIT approval should be a part of the process of compiling the shortlist, as it would be best to have OIT verify that the options are viable before publishing them to the academic group.

Ms. Robinson said she is in the process of rewriting the Third Party Software policy with a view to simplifying it. She is open to suggestions and advice and would like feedback from the AAPC on whether some things are practical or reasonable. Brad Tucker informed her about the concerns that faculty expressed with that policy when it came to AAPC for comment—that it was too restrictive and used FERPA too broadly to include a lot of things that they did not think related to FERPA—and suggested that AAPC members who had received such feedback from faculty pass it on to Ms. Robinson.

Making the observation that there has been a push over the past few years to use social media in instruction, with some persons perhaps still using Twitter and Facebook as a supplement to their online work, Michael Bradley suggested that it might not be
acceptable to use such media in instruction given the security issues that Ms. Robinson had outlined, including the exposure of the identity of students to others. Ms. Robinson confirmed this assessment, explaining that if you are dealing with the student educational data that is the concern of FERPA, if it is on Facebook and Twitter then it can be considered as “totally public” and that becomes a problem. Social media sites are not secure enough to handle data to the standard of reasonable and appropriate security of electronic data that FERPA requires. Brad Tucker asked if it would be acceptable for a faculty member to have students post things on YouTube, and the comments put in iCollege. Ms. Robinson said that was fine because the feedback is not on YouTube.

Mr. Tucker informed the meeting that the conflict of interest section that the AAPC had included in the Text Selection policy had not yet been approved by the PPAB. He now needed a volunteer to write up a short paragraph on the OIT review, decide where to place it in the procedure, and then it could be tweaked at the next meeting and a vote taken. Sarah Jennings volunteered. Deborah Robinson will pass her information to Mr. Tucker and he will pass it on to Ms. Jennings, who will prepare a draft one week in advance of the next meeting.

Policy 445 Faculty Sick Leave (revision)
Mr. Tucker had spoken with the Interim VPAA and received the go-ahead for the AAPC to write what the faculty wanted in the Faculty Sick Leave policy (which is a Financial and Administrative Affairs policy) and put it forward for discussion. He had also spoken to Jim Rasmus of HR and learned that there was no specific policy for online instructors, though there is a movement afoot at the BOR to give faculty two personal days, perhaps from their sick leave so that they would not have to lie about personal time off.

Sally Roberston’s earlier survey of USG institutions had revealed that Southern Polytechnic University and Gordon College allowed faculty to apply only for the number of hours for which they had college responsibilities when they took an entire day off. Those institutions were exceptions, however, as others reckoned a full day’s absence as eight hours. Mr. Tucker argued that since Southern Polytechnic and Gordon College do otherwise, then that means that it is possible under BOR policy. He referred to a section of BOR policy 8.2.7.2 Sick Leave with Pay which states that “Sick leave may be granted at the discretion of the institution and upon approval by the supervisor...” which could be interpreted to mean that it is left to the institution and the supervisor to decide how to handle sick leave for faculty.

Emily Whaley suggested the following wording to replace the last paragraph of policy 445 (under Procedure):

The number of hours of sick leave reported will be equal to the number of hours of college commitment that were missed that day.
The AAPC voted with a majority to recommend the substitution of the new sentence. Michael Bradley dissented.

Ms. Whaley also suggested that the second paragraph under Procedure should be deleted as it is not on topic. It defines the work week of administrative, professional and staff employees, and describes the flexibility of a faculty member’s schedule.

With regard to the first paragraph under Procedure, Ms. Whaley further suggested the following rewording:

- Full-time faculty accumulate eight hours of sick leave per calendar month. Sick leave is cumulative with no cap.

Mr. Tucker will seek clarification from HR on the following sentence in that same paragraph:

- During the summer semester, faculty accumulate sick leave in an equivalent ratio based on the number of hours taught.

The AAPC will vote on Ms. Whaley’s proposed changes at the next meeting, after Mr. Tucker gets the necessary clarification.

III Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 4:34 pm.