MEMBERS PRESENT:
Michael Bradley, Illiad Connally, Jason Dew, Susan McGrath, Erin Morrey, Paula Porto, Sally Robertson, Doug Ruch, Emily Whaley

MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:
Sarah Cantrell, Keith Cobbs, Vincent June, Ron Key, Ingrid Thompson-Sellers, Ted Wadley, Robin Winston

I Approval of minutes of 10/23/12
Regarding the Inclement Weather policy, Emily Whaley suggested the wording information on college closure “needs to be announced in the media by 6:00 am” instead of “needs to get out by 6:00 am”. The minutes were approved as amended.

II Old Business

Policy 110 Revision – Textbook policy (being revised to include conflict of interest)
The first paragraph of the previous conflict of interest draft stated that a conflict of interest may exist when a GPC employee is involved in the selection process and that employee stands to gain financially from a specific textbook or software adoption. Emily Whaley presented an update to this paragraph based on feedback from the MCSE division as follows:

A conflict of interest may exist when a GPC employee is involved in the selection process and
1. the employee stands to gain financially from a specific textbook or software adoption, or
2. the employee was involved in the creation of ancillary materials for a textbook under consideration.

Working for a publisher in a capacity that is not related to materials being considered for adoption does not constitute a conflict of interest but must be disclosed [italicized words added after discussion].

The rest of the draft remains the same. With a consensus to allow persons who disclose a conflict of interest to participate in text selection, the Council voted to approve the amendment to Textbook Policy #110.
In relation to textbooks, and, more specifically, to related software (which had been a subject of discussion at the previous meeting), Michael Bradley brought up the matter of e-book versions of textbooks and the protection of confidentiality of students who use them. The concern is that these are not secondary support sites—they are textbooks—and students may be graded on work done through this medium. Increasingly publishers are allowing tracking of students’ movements through textbooks via logins linked to personal identification. Based on research he had done, Mr. Bradley spoke of the use of gender neutral pseudonyms and throw-away email accounts through which students are identifiable only to the instructor and not to a third party. It was not clear to what extent OIT needed to be involved in such a process.

Brad Tucker will talk to interim VPAA Phil Smith regarding OIT and the use of e-books.

Policy 112 Revision – Faculty Conduct and Due Process Protections
Brad Tucker had updated this policy based on feedback as follows:

1. Instead of a Dean or Department Chair being able to show up at a meeting and make allegations against a faculty member who does not know what to expect, the complainant shall deliver a written statement to the faculty member within 10 business college instructional days [new wording from the meeting] of the alleged misconduct. Previously the complainant was required to deliver the statement at the meeting; now the allegation has to be put in writing before the meeting is scheduled.

2. The concern about college breaks lengthening the process was addressed by regarding them as exceptions that are considered mitigating circumstances. Except for such circumstances, the complainant and the faculty member shall convene a meeting within 10 business college instructional days [new wording from the meeting] of receiving the letter. The faculty member and the complainant may each have one advisor present at the meeting.

3. The Dean and the Department Chair who sit on the Hearing Committee must be impartial.

4. At item number 6, “Service of notice of the hearing...” was reworded to “Notice of the hearing...”

5. The opportunity for a faculty member to appeal an adverse decision to the President was introduced. There is no opportunity for the complainant to appeal as the burden of proof lies with the complainant/institution.

6. The President is added to the list of persons who must receive formal notification, in writing, of the decision and disciplinary [adjective added] recommendation, if any, of the Hearing Committee.
These changes emerged from the discussion:

1. References to working days and business days were clarified to mean *college instructional days*, except for appeals to the President which must be made within 10 business days. The President will also reach a decision within 10 business days.

2. Notice of the hearing must be given within 10 college instructional days instead of 20 days.

At item number 10, the tape recording or transcript of the proceedings that will be made available is the responsibility of the college and will not be at a cost to either the faculty member or the complainant.

The Council voted to approve the policy with amendments.

New policy 134 draft – Course Prerequisites/Co-requisites for Transient Students and  
New policy 135 draft – Course Prerequisites/Co-requisites for Special Students  

These policies are very similar and so they were deliberated upon together. Both titles were expanded to include *co-requisites*, as there are instances when students want to take a course that has more than one component (such as a lecture and a lab). There are in fact differences between institutions as a student can do Anatomy and Physiology without the lab at Kennesaw State University, but GPC requires it.

Mr. Tucker underscored the importance of the policies. There is no way that we can systematically check every transient/special student’s registration. We cannot set up Banner because their coursework is not there, so the alternative would be to make them do in-person registration. This would discourage a lot of registrations as prospective students are widely dispersed geographically and may find it inconvenient to visit a campus. Although we cannot systematically enforce the policies, they exist as points of reference to prevent students from making poor course choices, and provide backing for instructors to remove unprepared students from their classes.

Since the policies will not be used to actively seek to identify violators, a definite procedure was not outlined. Instead the language “…subject to removal from the course or courses…” states the outcome of violation. Though vague, it gives the registrar and the instructor the necessary authority to remove a student from a course.

The Council voted to approve both policies.
III New Business

Policy 445 – Sick Leave with Pay/Faculty policy
A case had been brought to Mr. Tucker’s attention of a faculty member who was going on sick leave for several weeks and her Chair wanted to deduct sick leave at the rate of eight hours per day for four days per week, as her teaching responsibilities are from Mondays to Thursdays only. She does not come to campus on Fridays. This would mean that thirty-two hours per week would be charged to her sick leave instead of forty, although she would be off for entire weeks. The policy states, however, that sick leave for faculty members should be reported at the rate of eight hours per day, meaning all five days. Mr. Tucker informed the meeting that the interim VPAA, Phil Smith, concurs with this eight-hour/five-day rule.

Online faculty members are not required to apply for sick leave. Mr. Tucker explained that this has implications for benefits under the Teachers Retirement System, because one gets time towards time served for accumulated sick leave. An online faculty member who never takes sick leave over a span of time can eventually bank two years of service because of sick leave. This is an advantage over a face-to-face faculty member who has to apply for sick leave when absent.

The policy states that “A faculty member is allowed a more flexible schedule and is scheduled for twenty-five hours per week. It is assumed that additional hours will be required outside of the scheduled time...” Not only did faculty members feel that it was unfair that they should have to apply for a day of sick leave when they were not scheduled to be in attendance, but they did not think that they should have to apply for eight hours for a day of sick leave when they are actually scheduled to work fewer hours.

Brad Tucker will convey this sentiment to the VPAA. Sally Robertson will check with other faculty senates to see how their institutions handle sick leave for faculty, and will also take the matter to the GPC faculty senate. The item will again be placed on the agenda for the next meeting.

Policy 437 Revision: Reassignment and Transfer of Personnel among Campuses/ Centers
The current policy was approved by the PPAB in February 2012. In September 2008 the Dunwoody faculty senate drafted a Reassignment and Transfer policy because of an attempt to transfer four faculty members from the English department to other campuses the previous spring. No reason was given, and the faculty members felt that the transfers were punitive because of some issues that were taking place in the department at the time.

The general faculty senate endorsed the draft, but that body cannot approve or disapprove policy so it went no further. Upon the approval of the current policy, some persons wanted to know what had happened to the 2008 proposal. It was felt that many
of the protections that were in that document were not included in the policy that was approved. Phil Smith gave the go-ahead for the AAPC to reconsider the 2008 proposal.

The question to be considered is this: Does the current policy lack the protections that faculty need against punitive transfers? Sally Robertson and Jason Dew will review the 2008 senate document and the current policy, see if/where safeguards were lost, and create a new proposal with more protections. Ms. Robertson will speak with Greg McLean, one of the primary authors of the senate document, to get his opinion. A draft will be done for the next meeting.

**Policy 121 Revision: Grade Forgiveness**

Doug Ruch explained that there was no problem with the policy itself, but because the form is attached to it on the web, students download it and try to get the Department Chair’s signature on their own. He wants the form to be removed from the web and made available to students only through the Enrollment and Registration Services (ERS) office. Advisors can review courses with students, see if they are eligible for grade forgiveness, and then send them to the relevant Department Chair for signature. Mr. Ruch also wants the policy to state what the Department Chair must check for before signing. To this end the following sentence was extended by the section in italics:

> Before Enrollment and Registration Services will process the request, it must have the Department Chair’s signature to verify that the student has not violated the Academic Honesty policy.

In addition, a statement to the effect that the Department Chair has verified that the student has not violated the academic honesty policy for the particular course is to be inserted above the Chair’s signature.

The Council voted to approve the policy with the amendments, and the removal of the form from the web.

**IV Adjournment**
The meeting adjourned at 5:05 pm.