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

MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:
Coletta Carter, Tarrah Mirus, Matthew Robison, Robin Winston

ALTERNATES PRESENT:
Mary Brown for Coletta Carter, Sheila White for Tarrah Mirus

GUESTS PRESENT
Margee Bright-Ragland, Pamela Moolenaar-Wirsiy, Stuart Noel

I Call to order
Brad Tucker called the meeting to order at 3:15 pm.

II Approval of minutes of 9/16/14
The minutes were approved as presented.

III Old Business

Secondary Council Comments on Student Misuse of Course Materials policy
Mr. Tucker provided the background to this policy. A student had taken material that the instructor had given to an online class and sold it to a website. There was not a policy in place to deal with infractions of this nature so the AAPC wrote one. It was approved last February and went to the different councils for comment. It had now come back to the AAPC for review.

Following are the AAPC’s responses to the comments from secondary councils:
- Disregard the question about whether the policy is congruent with copyright and fair use.
- Disregard the question about sharing student’s own lecture notes—that is not what the policy is about.
- Can this policy be enforced? Though there is no way to go out and search for violations, the policy is enforceable when violations are discovered.
- The policy is not just about distribution for profit; if a student should copy the instructor’s work and distribute it to the class without the instructor’s permission then that would be a violation of the policy.

According to the policy, if a student admits to the violation and it goes to department Chair the next step is for it to go to the expulsion panel. One comment was that this seemed harsh. Mr. Tucker felt that this warranted further review by the Council. The panel has limited options: do nothing, suspend for one or two semesters, or expel. Mr. Tucker was of the opinion that faculty members would only invoke the expulsion panel in egregious (involving profit) cases. However, there was no guarantee of that so it would be best to include some control for the more extreme faculty members. The department Chair could talk it over with the faculty member and try to temper the situation if necessary.

Council members explored the possibility of putting this under the Student Code of Conduct policy. Mr. Tucker said that policy lists offenses such as theft and misuse of computer. Violation of copyright falls under the latter, but the policy refers specifically to copying or using software in violation of copyright laws. An alternative is to ask the Student Affairs Policy Council (SAPC) to address this in the Student Code of Conduct (SCC), separately from the violation of software copyright. Theft under the SCC is commonly understood to refer to stealing an article, not theft of intellectual property. It would need to be made clear that misuse of copyrighted material can be considered theft of intellectual property and a violation of the SCC. Mr. Tucker explained that if we went that route this would then become an issue for the College Court that is made up of students and faculty members. It would not be on the academic side of the house, unlike academic dishonesty which is handled through an entirely academic process.

If the SAPC addresses student misuse of course materials in the SCC then if faculty see it happening in classes they could refer it to the Dean of Student Services who could have it sent to the college court where there are a wide range of penalties.

In summary, the choices were:

(1) Revise the policy and limit it to instances where students have profited from the misuse, so that only the egregious cases of selling the instructor’s material will go to expulsion panel.

(2) Keep the policy open by rewriting it to include lesser consequences than just being taken to the expulsion panel.

(3) Ask the SAPC to put the issue in the SCC as a separate category so that when it occurs, regardless of the level of severity, at the instructor’s discretion it can be turned over to the student Dean with a request for it to go to the College Court.
When a student goes as far as trying to profit from the misuse of course materials then that is a conduct issue (theft), not an academic honesty issue, so it seems more appropriate to get it under the SCC and make it explicit that this is a type of theft. Council members agreed with this position. Mr. Tucker will take it to the Chair of the SAPC and request that it be put on that Council’s agenda.

### IV New Business

A three year review cycle for policies has been established. If there are no changes then the policies stay as they are. If the AAPC makes changes then they will circulate to the other policy councils.

**Academic Honesty**

Ms. Whaley pointed out that the part of Form A where the instructor is to outline what happened is missing. She and Mr. Tucker will work to correct the problem and present the revised form at the next meeting. Mr. Tucker will post all the forms as Word documents under Faculty Resources on the Academic Affairs website.

Much of what is under the heading “Procedure” is policy so the heading is to be removed from its current position. Under “possible courses of action for the student” #A, “proves to” was changed to “convinces” the instructor.

**Alternate coverage of classes**

Dr. Morrey brought up the point that in some departments faculty are compelled to cover classes, if they are available to do so. They are not asked but told that they have to. Some departments employ other alternatives like online instruction.

A new item was added under the heading Substitute Instructors:

2. Full time faculty members may volunteer but cannot be compelled to substitute for absent faculty members.

A new bullet was added:

- If a full-time faculty substitutes for a part-time or full-time instructor, the division dean must approve overload pay or a reduction in course load.

The second bullet under #5, which deals with long-term absence, was adjusted to read:

- If a full-time faculty substitutes for a part-time instructor, the division Dean must approve a decrease to the part-time instructor’s salary unless an exchange is arranged.

The majority of members voted to approve the policy as amended. Mr. Tucker will send it on to the other policy councils.
Archiving of Grades and Final Exams
For clarification, Sheila White (from the Registrar’s office) explained that grades for students on the class roster in Banner are saved for infinity. However, if names are added in iCollege they will not be reflected in Banner.

A discussion arose about whether faculty members are required to submit attendance records. Inconsistencies in practice exist college-wide. Mr. Tucker will do some research to see what BOR requirements are in terms of attendance records. The policy was tabled until the next meeting.

Faculty Evaluation document: Promotion to Assistant Professor and Associate Professor
Faculty members will be required to have three or more years of expected performance in all the ten areas in which a faculty member is rated—three under Teaching Effectiveness, four under Practices and Performance, two under Service, and one under Professional Activities. Formerly, if someone got a rating of needs improvement at any point the clock had to start over again as the three years of expected performance would have been broken. By BOR rules a faculty member can only be in a non-tenured position for seven years before he/she will have to be let go. A rating of needs improvement could kill a person’s career at the college. The proposed document says someone can have up to two ratings of needs improvement in the previous six semesters, any such rating must be followed by a rating of expected in that area, and the most recent evaluation must not have any rating of needs improvement.

A faculty member who earns a Ph.D. will immediately become eligible for promotion to Assistant Professor. If a faculty member comes in “all but dissertation” (ABD) and completes the doctorate that year, then he/she could seek promotion to Assistant Professor in the next review cycle. Such a person would not meet all the other rating criteria; the Promotion and Tenure panel would look at what the person has and make a determination. If the panel feels that the faculty member has only been working on the PhD dissertation since being at the College, with little evidence of actual work, the faculty member may be denied. Earning the PhD makes someone eligible for promotion but does not make it automatic.

The degree/experience requirement for someone with a Master’s degree and no graduate hours in the teaching field is three ratings of exceeds expectations or better in teaching effectiveness. In 2016 this will increase to five. Formerly the requirement was for two exceptional ratings.

BOR recently changed the wording “earned doctorate” to “terminal degree” for promotion. Who will determine what the “terminal degree” is in each discipline will be a problem at GPC.

IV Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 5:06 pm.