MEMBERS PRESENT:
Susan Cody, Michael Diebert, Sarah Jennings, Elizabeth Lathrop, Erin Morrey, Paula Porto, Sally Robertson, Matthew Robison, Shyam Sriram, Ingrid Thompson-Sellers, Ted Wadley, Connie Washburn, Emily Whaley, Robin Winston

MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:
Vincent June, Doug Ruch

I Call to order
Brad Tucker called the meeting to order at 3:04 pm.

II Approval of minutes of 2/18/14
The minutes were approved as presented.

III Old Business

Revised policy 125 – Protection of Student Information Online
Renard Flot from OIT attended the meeting to discuss email security in terms of instructor-student communications, and specifically FERPA protected content. He explained that email on the internet is unsecured protocol and encryption is the only thing that can make it secure. Encryption takes information that is in clear text, jumbles it up so that it cannot be read by humans, sends it on its way, and at the receiving end there will be a program with the keys to unscramble the message and make it readable.

To make student email secure would require encryption at both ends, like what is done to facilitate online shopping and banking transactions. However, we use a Microsoft 360 cloud service for student email (students are on an email domain that is external to GPC) which does not have the other end that we need to encrypt and decrypt—it is not part of the software offering. So up until recently sensitive email could not be sent to students using our GPC email. Last year OIT put in place a solution called Proofpoint that allows us to send an email to a student using a GPC email client and the student will be able to retrieve the email. The email is sent secured, the student gets a message that a secure email has been received, and directing them to click a link to retrieve it. That link takes the student to the service in the data center at GPC, the student then has to create an account, after which he/she can read the email. While admitting that it is a
cumbersome process, Mr. Flot said there is no other way to do it except an end-to-end-connection which requires a solution on both ends.

In addition to being cheaper, Mr. Flot explained that having student email managed by Microsoft 360 makes it easier on the administration side. Students refer their email issues there rather than to our helpdesk. Mr. Wadley suggested that priority should be given to the convenience of faculty and students rather than administration. iCollege / D2L is secure because it is contained and a student has to be logged in to read the email, but a big problem for faculty members is that advisees are not in their iCollege/D2L classes and so they do not have that option for secure email communication with them. Mr. Flot explained that not only would it cost a lot to purchase the certificates to facilitate end-to-end encryption, but it would also cost a lot for the infrastructure team at GPC’s data center to create the environment to handle it. Mr. Tucker asked him to find out what the other USG institutions are doing in terms of this issue.

“I need to discuss an Academic Honesty issue with you. Please check your iCollege messages for details” was deleted from the policy as an example of information that can be posted through GPC email. The majority voted to approve the policy as amended. Mr. Tucker will send it forward with a comment that it was approved with reluctance because the Council decries the current situation of a lack of satisfactory email security.

Withdrawals
Mr. Tucker had received withdrawal data from the Office of Institutional Research and Planning. Pointing out that our funding from BOR is based on graduations and transfers, Ms. Washburn shared her analysis of the inverse correlation between withdrawals and graduations/transfers, though Ms. Whaley cautioned that correlation does not mean causation. Ms. Washburn also showed that 14,793 withdrawals for AY 2013 represents 493 classes, 55 full-time faculty, and an expenditure of over $4m to teach those students who are withdrawing. She felt that withdrawals should be limited to two so that we can get more serious students who will not take more courses than they can handle. Ms. Porto agreed that the numbers support the notion that an unlimited amount of withdrawals may not be fiscally sound for the institution anymore, as its survival depends on financial support, and on our students transferring or graduating.

Ms. Winston pointed out that when the Council moves the policy forward it must have an iron-clad number and a rationale for that number because the executive team will convert it to dollars to see how much we are going to lose. She said that the number should not be so stringent that it will not be approved all the way through, and suggested that two is too stringent as we are considered an access institution by the BOR and there is a level of preparedness that we are expected to do to get students to the next level. This was echoed by Mr. Sriram who felt that the non-traditional nature of our student population—such as veterans—should be taken into consideration. Some of these students do not have the skills for college and he felt that the purpose of a college like GPC is to teach those skills to students.
Mr. Tucker noted that GPC is the biggest feeder institution into Georgia State University (GSU), which allows six withdrawals as an undergraduate, with the first two semesters of withdrawal not counting towards the amount. He thought that if we try to set a more stringent policy than GSU then it might not get approved. He agreed that setting the number of withdrawals at two may be too low and suggested that we set something more in line with GSU.

The Council voted to set withdrawal limits at five hardship withdrawals and four regular withdrawals. Mr. Tucker will prepare a draft policy and bring it for final vote in April. He asked members to write up what they think should be included in the rationale.

Common Course Outline
Changes to this policy seek to give disciplines a little more leeway in making changes to their course descriptions. Mr. Tucker outlined some problems with the current process of sending everything to the Faculty Senate:
1. It takes up a lot of time for the Senate to approve every detailed change
2. Some persons were deterred from making necessary changes because the process of going through the Senate was considered onerous
3. Sometimes Senate members from other disciplines get too involved with the changes that a particular discipline, in which they have no expertise, tries to make.

With the proposed changes, the following will have to be approved by the Faculty Senate:
I Course Abbreviation
II Credit hours
III Course Title
IV Prerequisites and Co-requisites

The curriculum committee/discipline, with Dean approval, will handle:
V Catalog Description
VI Expected Educational Results
VII General Education Outcomes
VIII Course Content
IX Assessment of Expected Educational Results
   a. Course grade
   b. Department assessment
   c. Use of assessment findings
X Date the Common Course Outline was submitted or updated

All committee members voted in favor of the changes to the Common Course Outline policy. Mr. Tucker issued a proviso that if the amended policy was not approved by the Senate then it would not be pursued any further.
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IV New Business

Changing the meeting time
Some persons from Dunwoody who have to travel to Clarkston after classes asked if the meeting time could be changed to 3:15 pm instead of 3:00 pm. The Council accepted this.

V Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 4:38 pm.