Call to order
Brad Tucker called the meeting to order at 3:20 pm.

Approval of minutes of 10/21/14
The minutes were approved as presented.

Comments from the Chair
The AAPC had approved some changes to the alternate coverage of classes at the last meeting, most important of which was that a faculty member who substitutes for another is eligible for compensation for doing so. The interim VPAA advised that the whole policy will have to undergo a major rewrite because of the rules pertaining to new health care law. A faculty member, even an adjunct, cannot substitute for someone if it put that faculty member over 18 hours per week. The policy will not come back to the AAPC to make those changes. Mr. Tucker told the interim VPAA that it was important to the AAPC that a faculty member should not be compelled to fill in for someone who was absent.

Old Business

Academic Honesty
Ms. Whaley and Mr. Tucker reviewed the Academic Honesty policy, to which changes had been made after it was approved by the AAPC some years ago. This policy statement, which had been removed, was adopted:
Georgia Perimeter College is committed to teaching and learning. It is expected that students attending Georgia Perimeter College will be honest in the presentation of their academic work. In keeping with this expectation, the college requires that students not attempt to defraud, deceive, or mislead an instructor in arriving at an honest grade assessment.

The heading “Procedure” was relocated to page 2, immediately below the examples of cheating. The timeframe of five business days that the Council had approved for the instructor to assign a grade was changed to five college instructional days. This was deemed to be a good change as instructional days are teaching and examination days only, so days when faculty members are on break would be excluded.

The following amendment was made: “The student proves to convinces the instructor that there was no violation”. The following wording that had been removed was returned to the document: “A hold will be placed on the student’s record to prevent him or her from registering until after the panel has made its recommendation to the Vice President”.

The section for the faculty member to give an account of what had taken place had been removed and was put back on Form A. “Because of a violation of the Academic Honesty policy, you did not receive your graded work named above” was removed as it was not applicable in all situations. Check boxes will be added on page 2 of Form A for the instructor to indicate that he/she will or will not request that an expulsion panel be convened. At Dr. Robison’s suggestion, less legalistic/judicial wording was adopted: “Signing does not indicate that you agree with the instructor” replaced “Signing is not an admission of guilt”. The Checklist for Faculty was removed.

The AAPC approved the Academy Honesty policy as amended.

Archiving of Grades and Final Exams
Mr. Tucker and Ms. White revisited this policy. As far as state regulations go, GPC meets the requirements. Mr. Tucker consulted with the interim VPAA regarding the differences in requirements among the Chairs for grade and attendance records. While Mr. Smith did not see a need for attendance records to be turned in, since the date of last attendance has to be put in if a student fails, he had no problem with the differences between departments.

The word “Procedure” was deleted. There was no other change so a vote was not taken.

Faculty and Librarian Evaluation Documents
Mr. Tucker said that librarian Lora Mirza is here to represent the librarians in the discussions as the changes the AAPC makes will be reflected in the Librarian document.
That document does not read exactly as the one for regular faculty, but there are major areas that, once approved, can be rolled over to the librarian document. The things that are particular to the librarians will be looked at later.

Regarding promotion, Mr. Tucker had analyzed the Faculty Evaluation Committee’s proposal and designed a three-column document for purpose of comparison. The first column represented the current system, the middle column had the proposed system, and the last column contained his suggested revisions, after discussions with some faculty members. These revisions concerned mainly the eligibility of faculty members with a Master’s degree plus 30 hours and six semesters of evaluation for promotion to Assistant Professor, versus the requirement for two Exceptionals in Teaching Experience over ten semesters of evaluation for persons with Master’s only. A faculty member in the latter category would have to be at the college for five years before being eligible for promotion, while someone in the former category would be eligible after three years.

Mr. Tucker felt that it was unfair that someone with a Master’s only should face a higher bar in Teaching Effectiveness than anyone else. On the matter of immediate eligibility for promotion of persons with Ph.D. Mr. Tucker asked the meeting: “If you come in ABD and complete your doctorate in two years, should you be able to short circuit these Teaching Experience requirements?”

It was decided to remove all distinctions for eligibility for promotion between Ph.D., Master’s plus 30 hours, and Master’s only. A single category for all levels of promotion was defined as “Earned Master’s or higher in teaching field”. For promotion to Assistant Professor the faculty member is immediately eligible if he/she earns a terminal degree and three Exceeds (to be increased to five in 2016) in Teaching Experience. For promotion to Professor, the proposal of “10 or more semesters above average performance” was deleted as there was no definition for “above average performance”.

Mr. Tucker will include all the amendments in the document and circulate it to Council members so that they can send it to their constituents for feedback. The Council will vote on the matter at the meeting in December.

IV New Business

Policy 106: Attendance (Periodic Review)

The following was stated in the singular:

Though a student may not fail a class solely on the number of absences, his/her grade may be lowered due to excessive absences as established in division guidelines”

In addition, the word “Procedure” was removed. The policy was approved as amended
Policy 107: Pay for Independent Study (Periodic Review)
There was no change to this policy

Policy 109: Study abroad Pay (Periodic Review)
The word “Procedure” was removed.
The policy was approved as amended

IV Adjournment
The next meeting will be on December 16, 2014.