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

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

Note on membership:
A number of new representatives are in place due to rotation of members:
Sarah Cantrell – Online
Keith Cobbs – Student Deans
Susan McGrath – Social Sciences
Paula Porto – Health Science
Sally Robertson – Faculty Senate Chair
Ingrid Thompson-Sellers – Dean, GPC Online
Michael Bradley – Arts & Humanities
Ted Wadley – Department Chairs

I Call to Order
Brad Tucker called the meeting to order at 3:04 p.m.

II Approval of minutes of 7/17/12
The course stated on page 4 line 4 under SIS and Withdrawals should be Math 1111, not Math 1101.

The minutes were approved as amended.

III Old Business

Changes to Policy # 905 on Development and Revision at the PPAB
Mr. Tucker demonstrated how to navigate the Governance and Policy website to see what happened to the policies that were approved by the AAPC at the last meeting. He explained that approval by the President’s Policy Advisory Board (PPAB) is actually approval by the President, as the PPAB only provides advice/recommendation to the
incumbent. The Chair of the AAPC does not sit on the PPAB. The Faculty Senate Chair sits on both the AAPC and the PPAB. Changes that were made to the original policies by the policy councils and the PPAB are color coded according to where they originated.

Mr. Tucker made specific reference to the change made by the PPAB to the following AAPC wording:

The President’s Policy Advisory Board may accept, return for revision, or reject the policy proposal.

This is the wording that the PPAB approved:

The President’s Policy Advisory Board may accept, accept with revisions, return for revisions, or reject the policy proposal.

Faculty Senate Chair, Sally Robertson, said she voiced the AAPC’s concern at the PPAB meeting that the option “accept with revisions” could lead to significant changes at that level. She was told that would not be done. She was able to push for the ability to track which body made which changes.

Policy 407 - Conflict of Interest
The discussion centered around two issues – how to disclose outside activities and how to deal with conflict of interest in textbook selection. A form exists for reporting of outside activities but there is no uniformity in how it is used. In terms of conflict of interest as it relates to textbook selection, Brad Tucker thought that it would be good to have a policy that sets out what is appropriate and what is not, as different Deans could make different decisions in their disciplines without any consistency. It may be that as long as someone discloses connections with publishers then he/she can participate like anybody else. He suggested that the matter could be addressed under the Textbook Selection policy, which could be modified to include a statement about full disclosure.

Emily Whaley is to write a paragraph for review at the next meeting.

Bylaws
The AAPC bylaws were revised to reflect current realities. The changes were as follows:

Non-Rotating members
The VPAA or his/her designee (1, non-voting).

Formerly the VPAA did not appoint a designee, and the position carried voting privilege. The designee serves as Chair.

The Chair of the Academic Affairs Task Team was removed.

Task Teams no longer exist as part of the governance structure. Reference to the Academic Affairs Task Team was also removed under Article V: Committees.
Rotating members: Two years
The title Academic Division Dean replaces Dean of Academic Services.
Faculty Senate Chair was removed from this category to the one below to correspond to
the term of office.

Rotating members: One year
Faculty Senate Chair was added
Student representatives were removed

Section 1. Powers and Jurisdiction
Correction: The Chair submits recommendations to the Office of Governance and Policy,
who distributes them to the Secondary Policy Councils for comment.

The Council voted to approve the Bylaws as amended. Brad Tucker will finalize and
republish them.

Policy 420 - Faculty and Lecturer Compensation
This policy is from the Financial and Administrative Policy Council and was sent to the
AAPC for comment. Mr. Tucker pointed out that the change to this policy was the
addition of two categories under the heading Salary Adjustments Based on Change in
job Title. These are Tenure-Track or Tenured position to a staff or Professional &
Administrative position within the Academic Affairs Department and Tenure-Track or
Tenured position to a Staff or Professional & Administrative position outside of the
Academic Affairs Department.

The AAPC was concerned that while the policy addresses what happens to compensation when someone moves to a higher position, it does not address what happens when he/she reverts. It was felt that there was no uniformity in practice where this was concerned. Mr. Tucker summarized the position of the AAPC thus: “the policy must include salary adjustments when [someone] moves back to faculty from any kind of administrative appointment.” He will add a comment to this effect.

Policy 423 - Faculty/Staff Professional Travel policy
This is another policy from the Financial and Administrative policy council that was sent
to the AAPC for comment. Compared to the original policy (#802.0809), Mr. Tucker
noted the following:

- A policy statement was added.
- The word “procedure” was added to identify that section.
- The word “normally” was removed from the sentence “Travel at the request of
  the College is normally paid in accordance with current state rules and
  regulations.”
- Travel requests within the USA or to Canada are to be handled at the discretion
  of the Budget Manager or appropriate manager, similarly the amount of funds
  allocated will be at the discretion of the Budget Manager or appropriate
  manager (formerly it was the Department Chair or Dean).
Up to $3,000 in funding for travel outside of the USA or Canada will be considered (an increase from $1,500).

The AAPC did not suggest any changes to this policy.

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

Mr. Tucker provided some background for this policy. About two or three years ago the Faculty Senate passed a resolution calling for the college to create due process protections for faculty members who were alleged to have committed some misconduct. Amidst some controversy, a policy to this end was passed by the AAPC and approved by the PPAB last year. However, the VPAA asked Mr. Tucker to start from scratch this year with a completely new policy. He prepared a draft for the AAPC to review. The BOR has a policy for the removal or dismissal of faculty, but institutions are expected to provide their own standards and sanctions, short of dismissal, to govern faculty misconduct.

It is specified under Procedures (#4) that “the complainant shall meet with the faculty member within 10 working days of the alleged misconduct”. Emily Whaley made the point that “working days” (meaning college working days) might make it difficult for a faculty member who is asked to accommodate such a meeting at the end of a semester when he/she has plans to be on break. She suggested that “instructional days” be specified instead. Brad Tucker, however, did not think it would be good for a meeting to be delayed by a long break. He suggested that the AAPC continue this discussion at the next meeting.

The draft did not include an appeal process. However, it is possible that the President (not the Hearing Committee) may end up making the final decision and the BOR has a policy on employment appeals (8.2.21) which deals with review of presidential decisions. Mr. Tucker asked Council members to continue thinking about how to weave a possible appeal process into the draft narrative.

Who decides the sanctions was a major point of discussion. According to the draft, the complainant identifies the misconduct and delineates the sanctions (see #2). Some persons felt that the Hearing Committee should decide the sanctions as there would be too much disparity if it is done by individual complainants. Dr. Thompson-Sellers suggested input by Human Resources to ensure that sanctions are fair.

Discussions on the Faculty Conduct and Due Process Protections policy will continue at the next meeting.

**VI  Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm.