MEMBERS PRESENT:
Michael Bradley, Sarah Cantrell, Illiad Connally, Jason Dew, Susan McGrath, Ron Key, Erin Morrey, Paula Porto, Sally Robertson, Doug Ruch, Ted Wadley, Emily Whaley, Robin Winston

MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:
Keith Cobbs, Vincent June, Ingrid Thompson-Sellers

I Call to Order
Brad Tucker called the meeting to order at 3:08 p.m.

II Approval of minutes of 10/23/12
The minutes were approved as amended.

III New Business

A number of policies from other Councils had been sent to the AAPC for comments. The originating policy councils are in brackets.

Policy 211 – Free Expression (Student Affairs Policy Council)
There were no comments on this policy.

Policy 223 – Coaches Code of Conduct (Student Affairs Policy Council)
The content of this policy is not properly separated into policy statement and procedure. Much of what is stated as procedure is policy.

Policy 224 – Student Government Association Constitution (Student Affairs Policy Council)
The policy statement reads in part:

Georgia Perimeter College recognizes the Constitution of the Student Government Association (SGA) as a sovereign document...

AAPC members did not understand what “sovereign document” meant.
Policy 425 – Anti-Harassment and Anti-Retaliation (Financial & Administrative Affairs Policy Council)
The demarcation between policy and procedure needs to be more accurate. Much of what is stated as procedure is policy.

Policy 449 – Tobacco on Campus
- The policy must include smokeless tobacco, not just smoking.
- Who has the responsibility of enforcing the policy must be clearly stated. It should not be faculty.
- The following language is convoluted and needs to be simplified:
  “…areas adjacent to a GPC facility whose configuration and/or physical circumstances allow smoke to enter and affect the internal environment or to adversely the environment of those entering or exiting the facility.”
- What about county ordinances that are more stringent? Should the college specify a lower standard? Do county ordinances refer to government buildings only?
- Some persons suggested that we should seek to move towards a smoke-free campus.

Policy 427 – Inclement Weather (Financial & Administrative Affairs Policy Council)
Information on college closure needs to get out by 6:00 am to facilitate persons who have 7:00 am classes.

Policy 421 – Doctorate and Administrative Officers (Financial & Administrative Affairs Policy Council)
Opinions were split on whether administrative officers should be given an increase in pay for achieving a doctorate. It was agreed, however, that the wording “in a discipline that is related to their current role/function”, as well as what positions fell under “Academic and Administrative Officers” need to be clarified. There was also the matter of “Academic Officers” who have faculty rank—would they be entitled to the current $5,000 increase that faculty members get for earning a doctorate, instead of the $3,000 stated in this policy?

Policy 459 – GPC Volunteer Program (Financial & Administrative Affairs Policy Council)
The demarcation between policy and procedure needs to be more accurate. This policy has a section on Background, and has Procedures within Procedure. The general layout needs to be improved.

According to the policy “Anyone eighteen (18) years of age or older...may provide volunteer service to the College.” Sally Robertson felt that the policy should be opened up to allow younger students, with parental consent, to volunteer. That would cover dual enrolment students and would reflect the current practice in Fine Arts.
Policy 432 – Pre-employment Drug Testing (Financial & Administrative Affairs Policy Council)
Item #12 under Procedure says “Test results will be e-mailed to a managerial member of the Human Resources Department.” The AAPC felt that this should be flagged for further consideration by the originating council as there could be a confidentiality issue.

Policy 506 – Third-Party Software (Information Technology Policy Council)
In general, faculty were concerned that this policy is too restrictive. The gist of what is to be sent forward from the AAPC to the originating council is as follows:
- The language is too broad and all-inclusive—software that accompanies approved texts is of particular concern
- The policy doesn’t reflect current practice
- FERPA is being stretched beyond its real intent
- There is not a clear procedure in place for faculty to seek approval of third-party software
- There should be an avenue for appeal against an adverse decision by the Chief Information Officer.

Policy 501 – Web Server Infrastructure (Information Technology Policy Council)
According to the policy, after a six-month period system administrators may delete the web pages of persons who have left the college, and are not responsible for archiving them. The AAPC felt that personal web pages should be deleted by OIT immediately upon a person’s separation from the college, at the same time that login accounts to servers are disabled, except in special circumstances (which are stated in the policy).

Policy and procedure need to be properly separated.

Policy 600 – Access Control (Information Technology Policy Council)
Policy and procedure need to be properly separated.

Policy 612 – Password Management (Information Technology Policy Council)
Policy and procedure need to be properly separated.

Policy 134 – Course Prerequisites for Transient Students (New)
This policy was drafted by the Academic Division Deans. Brad Tucker explained that the current policy allows a transient student to not follow our prerequisites for courses. He cited a case this past summer where a transient student was able to take ENGL 1101 and ENGL 1102, and another where a student took three Education courses when one was a prerequisite for the other two.

The problem is that we have no way in Banner to enforce our prerequisites on transient students. Because their prior courses are not in Banner, we cannot set them up for our prerequisites to apply to them, so right now transient students can register for whatever they want to. Mr. Tucker suggested that only way to address the problem was to deny
transient students the opportunity of self-registration. They would have to interact with someone (say, in ACRS) and be required to show evidence of having met prerequisites. However, he noted that this would be unworkable because it would involve thousands of students, which would impact our enrollment and our classes making in the summer.

Doug Ruch pointed out that the number of students that are in violation form a very small percentage of the total transient population. He gave the following statistics from the past summer’s enrollment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total enrollment</td>
<td>13,000 – 14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient students</td>
<td>3,000 – 4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of violations of prerequisites that came to his attention</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While conceding that there were no doubt additional cases that did not come to his attention, he maintained that the magnitude of the problem is small and said he considered the language in the draft to be a little too strong. Brad Tucker made the point that transient students are told up front that they are responsible for ensuring that they meet prerequisites. The policy is intended to back the instructor in removing an unprepared student, who does not meet the prerequisite(s), from the class.

Brad Tucker and Doug Ruch will revise the draft policy for the next meeting.

**IV Old Business**

**Policy 112 - Faculty Conduct and Due Process Protections policy**

For the next meeting, Mr. Tucker asked members to read the new draft of the Faculty Conduct and Due Process Protections policy that he had revised based on the discussion at the last meeting.

**V Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 5:04 pm.