MINUTES OF MEETING
Academic Affairs Policy Council
Tuesday 12/16/14 - 3:15 p.m.
JCLRC 4190 - Clarkston Campus

Brad Tucker
AAPC Chair presiding

MEMBERS PRESENT:
Robert Alderson, Mario Bennekin, Susan Cody, Debra Denzer, Michael Diebert, Leslie Ann Dunn, Kristi Hendrix, Elizabeth Lathrop, Erin Morrey, Matthew Robison, Connie Washburn, Emily Whaley

MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:
Coletta Carter, Tarrah Mirus, Ingrid Thompson-Sellers, Robin Winston

ALTERNATES PRESENT:
Sheila White for Tarrah Mirus

GUESTS PRESENT
Stuart Noel, Paulos Yohannes

I Call to order
Brad Tucker called the meeting to order at 3:23 pm.

II Approval of minutes of 11/18/14
The minutes were approved as presented.

III Old Business

Academic Honesty
Mr. Tucker reported that there had been rampant cheating on this semester’s final exams in ESL and one of the things he realized was that Form A, page 2 (as approved by the AAPC) stated the following: “Because of this violation, I intend to assign your grade for this piece of work as follows...”. However it is possible, because of the nature of the infraction, to assign students a grade in the entire course. He thought the sentence needed to be reworded to say: “I intend to assign your grade for this course or for this piece of work as follows...”

The policy was approved as amended.

Faculty Evaluation Document
One concern that had been expressed was that for Assistant Professor candidates for promotion did meet the old requirements and now would not meet the new ones. Mr.
Tucker explained that the change was actually from two exceptionals to three exceeds, so under the FEC proposal and the AAPC revised version the bar is in effect being lowered a bit for Assistant Professor.

There was also a concern that for Associate and full Professor the bar was being raised. Some people felt that because the criteria under which they were working had changed they would not be able to go up for promotion. Specifically, it is thought that there are now more exceptionals. Mr. Tucker thinks the number of exceptions for Associate is still two, but the change is that one has to be in teaching and one in service and professional activities. Prior to this it was two in any area. For full Professor, there are now more exceptionals, thus raising the bar.

Mr. Tucker had discussed the impact of these changing criteria with Todd Hendricks as the same thing had happened when the College moved from the points system to the current one. Mr. Hendricks said it had been his experience that the Promotion and Tenure panel was willing to give those people who were getting caught between two evaluation systems some consideration – though there were no guarantees – in view of the fact that the bar had been raised. He thought there would still be some of that flexibility in this situation.

The requirement of “earned master’s or higher in the teaching field” was discussed as it was revealed that there are faculty members who do not have their degree in the specific teaching field, but have at least 18 semester graduate hours in the teaching discipline. The requirement was amended to read “earned master’s or higher in teaching field or 18 semester graduate hours in the teaching discipline”.

Discussion of comments from constituents regarding the degree minimum for full Professor

Dr. Cody got comments from the Academic Deans and other directors that work with them. One Dean said that it was a unanimous understanding among the Chairs in that division that the terminal degree is a doctorate. Another comment was that a Professor is highly accomplished and recognized in the field and the rank should be reserved for those who have accomplished greatly in their field of study. One opinion was that we are a state institution or moving towards becoming one, and the BOR has simply given the minimum requirements for full Professor—it is up to us to decide where we should mark our minimum. One person thought that with the change of the language to terminal degree there would be need for a faculty committee to decide for each discipline what “terminal degree” means for each field.

Ms. Whaley presented feedback from MCSE. One person thinks it should be a Ph.D. for full Professor. Others comments indicated that we are not a university and we are not hired here to do research so we should not have the Ph.D. requirement. Some pointed out that the BOR says it is okay for us and for four-year schools to have a Master’s degree.
at that level and we should accept that. In all thirteen constituents said it should be Master’s.

In Health Sciences two persons said it should be a doctorate. The reason one gave is that we are looking at doing the BSN program at some point. The Science department felt that it should be a Ph.D.

Ms. Denzer spoke of one person who has a PhD who said we are not a research institution so he/she wasn’t sure why we should require a Ph.D. in any discipline. While he/she thought the Ph.D. brings value to the individual’s teaching and service, the expertise brought by colleagues with different levels of education and types of experience is appreciated and it is this mix that makes GPC distinctive. Full Professor should be awarded based on work at the College, not on having a research credential.

Ms. Lathrop explained that her Master’s is in film history and film criticism, which is what we teach here. If we taught film production then MFA would be the appropriate degree. In the context of English, since MFA is considered to be a terminal degree, it means that for English someone with an MFA in creative writing could get full professorship but someone with a Master’s in English cannot. She thinks a Master’s degree in English is a more appropriate degree to teach the English courses that are offered at GPC than a degree in Creative Writing as there are about four sections of Creative Writing offered each semester. In English the MFA in Creative Writing is not equivalent to a Ph.D. in English. When it comes to Art, Studio Art is different from Art History and if someone teaches Studio Art a PhD in Art History is not appropriate for that field. She thinks the degree requirements for full Professor needs to be determined by the discipline.

Ms. Whaley thought this would lead to a lot of unfairness. Based on the feedback that she has been getting so far, her discipline would likely say Master’s, while another discipline would likely say Ph.D. It would not be fair to have one academic group with higher criteria than another.

Brad spoke of a librarian that got full professorship with a Master’s in Library Science. The librarians got to make that determination based on their professional organization, saying that for a working librarian a Master’s is a terminal degree even though there is a doctorate in library science. So having set a precedence by opening the door for librarians, he doesn’t see why we cannot open the door for others.

Mr. Tucker asked: Should full Professor have to do more with your education or what you have contributed to the college? He remarked that there are people here with Master’s who have been here for years and contributed an incredible amount to the college. He felt that it is great when you publish but that’s not what we are about. Our rank of full Professor is not the same as the rank of full Professor at a UGA or Georgia Tech or one of those big, comprehensive universities where publication and research are highly prized.
Our rank of full Professor is different. We have to decide what we really want to reward here at GPC with that rank.

Dr. Noel added that if you meet all of the requirements in the evaluation you are contributing to knowledge and there are many faculty members with Ph.D. who have not applied for full Professor and probably would not be recommended just because of their degree. Changing it to terminal degree does open it up and if you have made a great contribution and you do have what is considered a terminal degree in your field then you should be considered for that promotion. Mr. Tucker pointed out that there would be a lot of discussions about what is a terminal degree, and each of those battles would have to be fought.

Mr. Tucker proposed that members vote on accepting the AAPC proposal of earned master’s and if that vote fails then he would adjust the language to terminal degree and see if that passes. He explained that we cannot keep earned doctorate since that is not the language of the BOR anymore.

Eight persons voted in favor of earned master’s for promotion to full Professor; two opposed. This part will go forward as written, but Mr. Tucker pointed out that there are many other pieces to consider so the policy is not ready to go to the PPAB. Ms. Denzer will take this section to Faculty Senate so that body can be on record with how members feel about this change. The Senate vote will not change the AAPC vote.

For January’s meeting Brad will pull out some of the other changes that were proposed for the Council to consider.

IV  New Business
The policies below have come to the AAPC from other councils for secondary policy council review.

Policy 203: Alcohol and Drugs
A random underline should be removed.

Policy 422: Faculty Summer Assignments and Compensation
The word ‘procedure’ should be removed as the section so named is a continuation of policy. The sentence “The threshold level and rates of pays [sic] will be set by May 1 of the Academic Year by the Vice President, Academic Affairs” was not clear to Council members. Mr. Tucker pointed out that in practice enrollment threshold levels were not set until around the third day of classes. May 1 was considered to be too late to provide faculty with compensation information. Ms. Denzer pointed out that the VPAA had told the faculty at fall convocation that it would be percentage pay for summer 2015. Faculty were no longer given contracts for summer pay so Mr. Tucker felt that faculty were being obligated to what is in the policy while the administration was being obligated to nothing.
The sentence was amended to read: “The enrollment threshold and rates of pay will be set by January 1 of the academic year by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and contracts provided by the first day of the summer term”.

The following were added to the list of duties that may be included in additional summer commitments for faculty who teach for percentage pay:

- Participate in orientation programs
- Professional development

“Faculty who wish to teach without any additional responsibilities aside from meeting with students on an as-needed basis will receive part-time pay for up to three classes” was amended to read: “Faculty who receive part-time pay are exempt from those additional responsibilities aside from meeting with students on an as needed basis”.

Council members approved the changes that were made so far. Mr. Tucker said that if he did not receive a request to send the policies forward before the next meeting then he would hold them for further discussion.

IV Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 5:00 PM. The next meeting will be on January 20, 2015.