**Committee Name: Academic Policy Committee**

**Meeting Date & Time: November 1, 2019, 1400-1515**

**Meeting Location: Health Sciences Building 211**

**Attendance**:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Members “P” denotes Present, “A” denotes Absent, “R” denotes Regrets** | | | |
| P | Nicole De Clouette (Chair) | P | Bryan Marshall |
| P | Carolyn Denard | P | Wathsala Medawala |
| P | Melanie DeVore | P | Christine Mutiti |
| P | Sarah Handwerker | P | Samuel Mutiti |
| R | Min Kim | P | Gennady Rudkevich |
| P | Julian Knox | P | Christina Smith (Vice Chair) |
| P | Alesa Liles | P | Jessica Wallace (Secretary) |
| P | Catrena Lisse |  |  |
| Guests Carol Ward, Chief Human Resource Officer Susan Kerr, Chief Information Officer  Jim Berger, Director of Center for Teaching & Learning  Barbara Szyjko, Instructional Technology Staff Specialist, Center for Teaching & Learning | | | |
|  | *Italicized text denotes information from a previous meeting.* |  |  |
|  | \*Denotes new discussion on old business. |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Agenda Topic** (Committees should feel free to customize this template to make it as functional for them as possible. Other categories of topics might include Reports, Information Items, Unfinished Business, etc.) | **Discussions & Conclusions** | Action or Recommendations | **Follow-Up** {including dates/responsible person, status (pending, ongoing, completed)} |
| **I. Call to order** |  | The meeting was called to order at 2:00 pm by Nicole DeClouette. |  |
| **II. Approval of Agenda** | The agenda was sent out to committee members prior to the meeting by Nicole DeClouette.  The motion to approve the agenda was made by Christine Mutiti and seconded by Catrena Lisse. All members present approved the agenda. |  |  |
| **III. Review and Approval of Minutes** | The minutes of the last meeting were approved via email.  The committee briefly discussed formalizing how we approve the minutes.  The motion to approve minutes automatically and contact secretary if any changes need to be done was made by Bryan Marshall and seconded by Gennady Rudkevich. All members present voted to approve. |  |  |
| **IV. Reports** | No reports. |  |  |
| **V. Unfinished Business** |  |  |  |
| 1. **Discussion of Prohibitions and Penalties Guide** | Guest: Carol Ward.  The Prohibitions and Penalties Guide is intended to apply to both staff and faculty.  The Prohibitions and Penalties Guide was created in 2012 by Human Resources and Legal Affairs and sent to the President’s Cabinet for approval. It was revised in 2017. New employees get brief orientation on the document, and it is mentioned in the annual compliance training for faculty and staff (though it appears that no link to the document is given in the training). Ms. Ward noted that it appears information is not getting to the right people, if most faculty are unaware of this document and its application to them.  She clarified that the document’s intention is to be educational and offer a path forward for improvement. For faculty, the supervisor would be the department chair. The guide offers clear guidelines for addressing different problems that may arise in the course of duties: for instance, if you have to miss class, there is a clear policy for how to communicate this to your chair. If faculty fail to follow policies, the guide also communicates to chairs what the appropriate steps would be to help educate. First steps should be a conversation about the policy and how to follow it; after several such violations of policy, a letter of direction is filed as a pre-disciplinary action and the chair and faculty member should create a performance improvement plan to do better and grow as an employee. Serious breaches of policy like assaulting a colleague can and do go straight to disciplinary action, while unintentional policy violations are intended to be treated as an area to improve. The guide was implemented to try to improve consistency in how these situations are handled across units, but a lot depends on how chairs and supervisors are applying the guide. There clearly are some differences between faculty and staff, and within those larger groups, too (maintenance staff vs. administrative staff, for instance), so there is leeway depending on the employee type. It should be applied consistently across all employees in that type/department, though, to avoid favoritism or bias against a particular employee.  Alesa Liles asked how academic freedom intersects with this document. Ms. Ward stated that when faculty are operating within the scope of academic freedom, disciplinary guides shouldn’t creep in to infringe on that freedom. One bad student review, for instance, should not trigger a disciplinary event.  Catrena Lisse clarified that APC’s major concern was that much of the guide seems to have been written with staff in mind, and because of that, its application to faculty doesn’t always seem to apply—the issue of dress code, for instance, since there are no formal faculty dress codes, and appropriate dress can vary tremendously across disciplines (lab sciences and arts will not wear the same clothing as those working in less messy or hazardous environments). Multiple committee members agreed that this was at the heart of the committee’s concern about this guide. Ms. Ward stated that things like dress code are largely dependent on departmental codes—if your department does not have a department dress code, you cannot be disciplined for a dress code infraction under this guide.  Nicole DeClouette asked if there are inconsistencies between USG policies and this policy, is that something we need to address?  Ms. Ward stated that recently, this document has been going out on the annual compliance training and that when you complete the training, that serves as your “acknowledgement of receipt.” She stated it would be important to make sure that the link to the actual document is included in the training module, that chairs are knowledgeable about it, that faculty are well informed of what this is, where it is on intranet site, etc. It is not clear if faculty were involved in the original drafting.  Christina Smith stated that there may be faculty pushback once they are more uniformly made aware of this guide, because right now it reads as if it was written for staff and then applied to faculty.  Melanie De Vore asked what faculty should do if they feel a chair has misapplied the guide. Ms. Ward noted that chairs also have supervisors, so a functioning chain of command should help prevent misapplication. If Human Resources doesn’t know about how the guide is being applied in a specific situation, there isn’t much they can do about it. Board of Regents policy states that campuses have to have statutes/guidelines, so this guide was the attempt to meet this requirement. It was not intended to be a sweeping indictment against faculty or staff but rather to help fairly apply rules and use progressive training before discipline.    Ms. Ward clarified that the IT section isn’t meant to apply to incidental use of technology for non-work stuff. However, if you are running a side business using GCSU equipment and resources and are not fulfilling your GCSU responsibilities because of that side job, that would be grounds for removal. | Catrena Lisse suggested revisiting the issue of faculty not being aware of this document and its application to them. How can Human Resources make sure that faculty have more information about this topic?  Bryan Marshall suggested that faculty take another look at this document and compare to the USG policies governing faculty. There may be contradictory policies in place that would need to be changed in the GCSU document. It may be useful or necessary to rewrite the guide to make it more applicable to faculty situations. | Nicole DeClouette will bring this topic to ECUS and see what they recommend. |
| 1. **Fair Use Laws of Online Content, Committee Recommendations Plagiarism Reporting System** | Guests: Susan Kerr, Jim Berger, Barbara Szyjko  APC had previously made the recommendation to add a copyright notification to all GA View courses. Upon reaching out to IT and the Center for Teaching & Learning, the consensus was that such a notification would have to be added manually to each page, which would be a very tedious process.  Ms. Kerr presented several options IT came up with for accomplishing this:   1. We could just add the copyright notification to mandatory syllabus statements. 2. If faculty wanted students to acknowledge receipt of copyright notification, that would require a survey or quiz that faculty would have to copy into their courses. 3. D2L is in the process of adding badges to courses. GA View does not yet have this option, but down the road there could be a copyright badge that students could earn to showcase their skillsets and relate to a competency-based education. Ms. Szyjko stated that she would have to do some testing before this would be an option at GCSU.   Bryan Marshall said that putting the notification on the main splash page should be fine.  Nicole DeClouette stated that an acknowledgement of receipt could be incorporated into a syllabus contract, if faculty use that.  Catrena Lisse suggested that we pursue both options. It can be included on a written syllabus statement and on the main GA View splash page.  APC committee members and guests then discussed the specific language to be used. Dr. Berger and Ms. Szyjko said there is already a USG policy who language we could use. Catrena Lisse suggested using this language for the digital versions, and faculty can adjust if they want in their own syllabi.  Bryan Marshall raised the possibility of having a course in GA View that addresses copyright law and fair rights usage. This course could be added to the annual compliance training. Dr. Berger suggested the best way to go about starting this might be digitizing some of Jennifer Townes’ recent training sessions.  Ms. Szyjko says GCSU does not have a policy that faculty have to use GA View for classes. If you’re using other programs, security measures are a concern when you’re dealing with grades, private student information. Non-GA View programs are also not supported by IT or CTL. If students have consistency across the board in what online course programs they are using, it will be helpful to them. Sam Mutiti stated that this consistency issue came up from students a few years ago. Faculty cannot be forced to use GA View, but grades must be given privately to students—you cannot post them on the cloud.  Melanie De Vore raised the issue of faculty log-in information remaining on classroom computers when they think they are logged out. This may be because they accidentally clicked “yes, save password.” Ms. Kerr asked faculty to let SERVE know what machines are saving this information and they can clear the cache from that machine. IT is currently looking into ways to make those clearing out periods happen more frequently/on an automated schedule, but they won’t be able to do this until after fall semester. | APC will recommend to Kay Anderson that we add the copyright notification to the mandatory syllabus statements.  APC also recommends going forward with the GA View splash page notification.  Finally, APC recommends that copyright training be included in annual compliance training, and that a good starting point is with the materials Jennifer Townes has already put together. | Barb Szyjko will take care of the D2L notifications on splash page once the specific language is nailed down.  Nicole DeClouette will reach out to Kay about syllabus statement.  On the question of training on copyright, Nicole DeClouette will talk to ECUS about path forward. |
| **VI. New Business** | No new business. |  |  |
| **VII. Information Items** | None. |  |  |
| **VIII. Next Meeting** | The next APC meeting will be January 10, 2020 @ 2:00 in Health Sciences 2111. | Meeting scheduled already. |  |
| **IX. Adjournment** | The meeting adjourned at 3:16 pm. |  |  |

**Distribution(as determined in committee operating procedure – one possibility given):**

First; To Committee Membership for Review

Second: Posted to the Minutes Website

**Approved by:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

Committee Chairperson (Including this Approval by chair at committee discretion)

**GuidanceCommittee Name: Academic Policy Committee**

**Committee Officers: Nicole De Clouette, Christina Smith, Jessica Wallace**

**Academic Year: 2019-2020**

**Aggregate Member Attendance at Committee Meetings for the Academic Year:**

**“P” denotes Present, “A” denotes Absent, “R” denotes Regrets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | | | | | | | | | |
| **Meeting Dates** | | **Sept. 6** | **Oct. 4** | **Nov. 1** | **Jan. 10** | **Feb. 14** | **Mar. 6** | **Apr. 10** |  |  |
| Nicole De Clouette (Chair) | | R | R | P |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Carolyn Denard | | R | A | P |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Melanie DeVore | | P | P | P |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sarah Handwerker | | P | P | P |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Min Kim | | R | R | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Julian Knox | | P | P | P |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alesa Liles | | P | P | P |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Catrena Lisse | | R | P | P |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bryan Marshall | | P | R | P |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wathsala Medawala | | P | P | P |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Christine Mutiti | | P | P | P |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sam Mutiti | | P | P | P |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gennady Rudkevich | | P | A | P |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Christina Smith (Vice-Chair) | | P | P | P |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jessica Wallace (Secretary) | | P | P | P |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

CHAIRPERSON SIGNATURE DATE \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_-

(Including this Approval by chair at committee discretion)