Minutes of the Faculty Affairs Committee
2 March 1999

Present: Gabor Patonay (Chair), Yezdi Bhada, Marsha Clarkson, Ernest Larkins, David Pavesic, Phyllis Johnson, Bernadette Hartfield, Bill Kinyon, Diane Willen, Marian Meyers, Jim Senn, Richard Deane, Ramona Matthews, Juane Heflin, Ed Lai, Barbara Green, Hugh Hudson, Valerie Fennell, Donna Williams.

The minutes of the previous meeting (15 February) were approved with the following amendment to the fifth sentence, which should read as follows: Discussion continued on this topic and it was agreed that Dr. Bhada would ask the Provost for a formal position statement on the matter that would indicate which workload policy would take precedence should a discrepancy occur between the policy of the Senate and those of the individual colleges.

Gabor Patonay introduced to the group Ms. Donna Williams, the Alternative Dispute Resolution Coordinator and Student and Staff Ombudsperson.

Faculty Workload Policy

Dr. Patonay distributed a response from the Provost to the question that has been discussed in the past two meetings regarding the faculty workload policy. Committee members voted unanimously, with one objection, to include the response in the minutes; it reads as follows:

In response to the request on my position on college documents that appear to be inconsistent with the Senate workload policy, I will not approve such college documents. However, I remind the committee that the Senate document in question sets a goal of up to 4 courses for faculty with substantial, demonstrated, and active records of research/creative and service activities within the constraints of the university's budget. Thus, it says "goal". Further, it does not say research faculty - instead it uses the phrase "substantial, demonstrated, and active records . . .". Further, it provides a significant caveat of "within the constraints of the university's budget." RJH.

Evaluation of Administrators

Dr. Patonay announced that the document for the Evaluation of Administrators has been forwarded to the Executive Committee. Hugh Hudson said that there were no problems with the document in the Executive Committee. Dr. Patonay stated that he expects it to be presented at the next meeting of the Senate.

The Bookstore

Diane Willen reported on progress made dealing with the problem of the University Bookstore. She informed the group that not only does the Bookstore have a new textbook manager, but also that Follett Stores has a new regional manager, Gerald Alley, who has recently met with William Decatur and who is committed to improving the situation. Mr. Alley has heard all of the complaints and has an action plan that will go into effect in stages. In particular, the Bookstore will institute a special hotline telephone in the textbook department that will only be available to faculty so they will be kept informed about the status of their orders. The Bookstore will also be included in the University email system, thus ensuring a way for faculty to receive feedback regarding the status of textbook orders, and in particular to provide an immediate way for the Bookstore to notify faculty when textbooks are not available. Follett would also like to revive a Bookstore Advisory Committee, which will be composed of faculty, staff, and students, that will meet quarterly to review Bookstore performance. In order to monitor the situation this Bookstore Advisory Board will meet periodically with representatives from the Bookstore so that faculty will have a way to channel complaints and keep grievances from building up. Volunteers are needed for this Board. Committee members asked
about the proposed size of the Faculty Advisory Board. Dr. Willen indicated that there is no prescribed size but that voices from different colleges would be optimal. Joan Carson, Chair of the Department of Applied Linguistics and English as a Second Language, has volunteered to be on it because her department has had so many problems with the Bookstore. Dr. Willen also volunteered and indicated that membership on the Board would not be exceptionally time-consuming as it would just meet periodically to receive information.

A motion was passed unanimously to establish a Sub-Committee on Bookstore Support of the Academic Programs, which will convene meetings periodically with all college bookstores that support Georgia State. Dr. Patonay will serve on the Sub-Committee and will send email requests for other volunteers to serve on it. Drs. Hudson and Willen also volunteered.

Dr. Willen explained that increasing numbers of faculty have begun to send their textbook orders to other bookstores and that the resultant loss of revenue is what the University Bookstore is responding to in its zeal to make these necessary changes. Committee members asked whether or not a University policy requires faculty to send all or a percentage of book orders only to the Georgia State Bookstore. Dr. Patonay stated that he would contact Dr. Decatur and check on any contractual obligations Georgia State might have with Follett Stores.

**Part-time Instructors**

Ramona Matthews reported on the activities of the Committee assigned to review the concerns recently expressed by part-time instructors. The group has met twice over the past five weeks. Both Dean Abdelal and representatives from the PTIs have spoken to the Committee. The major issues have now been identified, and thus the information gathering phase is concluded. The Committee will meet again in two weeks to discuss the specific issues raised and to divide up the work among Committee members. Some of the issues relate to budget, and although the Committee can possibly make recommendations it does not have responsibility for the budget.

Dr. Matthews explained that the concerns of the PTIs are both emotional and economic and categorized the major issues identified by the Committee as 1) benefits; 2) salary; 3) professional respect and office space. She further stated that the Committee is looking at the University's dependency on PTIs and at various ways to address that issue. Before the Committee finalizes its recommendations, Dr. Matthews will give a preliminary report to the Faculty Affairs Committee in order to gather as much input as possible.

**Conflict of Interest Policy**

Juane Heflin reported on the latest draft of the document now entitled "Georgia State University Conflict of Financial Interest Policy." She distributed copies of the conflict of interest policies developed by the Georgia Institute of Technology and the Medical College of Georgia and briefly compared the policy of Georgia State with those of the other two institutions.

Dr. Heflin explained that the document from the Medical College of Georgia lists what is not a significant financial interest, and suggested that we may want to use some of the same language in our policy. She called the attention of Committee members to the sections on Appeals, Gratuities (which includes a no gifts policy), Research Conflict of Interest, and pointed out the definition of "family" which is defined as follows, "family' means spouse or any dependents."

The document from the Georgia Institute of Technology follows the Medical College of Georgia in its definition of significant financial interest. The document from Georgia Tech is more concerned with the nature of consulting than are those of Georgia State or the Medical College, and has a comparatively lengthy section on the nature of consulting. Georgia Tech maintains a focus on conflict of commitment, and its prohibited activities are similar to those in the Georgia State document.
Dr. Heflin was asked to interpret the Georgia State policy regarding the hiring of students. She explained that faculty are prohibited from hiring students if they stand the chance of directly or indirectly financially benefitting, unless it is a situation where the student has been assigned to work, for example as part of a course or as a graduate assistant. Hiring students to work in a consulting company where they would be paid extra is acceptable as long as the faculty member is not in a position to assign them a grade or to influence the conferring of the degree. Dr. Heflin explained that the dual relationship must exist where the student is both in a course and being paid by the faculty member before it is perceived as a conflict, and suggested that the problematic nature of this relationship be clearly articulated in the Georgia State policy.

Dr. Heflin pointed out the changes in the latest draft of the Georgia State policy: 1) Appendix A, which provides a list of sample activities that do represent conflicts of interest; 2) Appendix B, which provides a list of sample activities that may, but do not necessarily, represent conflicts of interest; 3) the overall shortened length of the policy; 4) the combining of the first two paragraphs of the Preamble in the previous draft; 5) the more clearly articulated definition of "conflict of interest" in the section listing the principles, which begins on line 95, along with a narrative that looks at financial gain; 6) the deletion of most references to the reputation of GSU, which were thought to be ambiguous;

With regard to the concern in past meetings over the appeals process, Dr. Heflin explained that an appeals process can be found on the webpage of the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs that can be applied to allegations of misconduct in research. This appeals process goes to the Provost, then to the President, and then to the Board of Regents. For appeals having to do with promotion and tenure, faculty are referred to their own college documents.

Hugh Hudson stated that this document should not establish a separate appeals process and suggested that the section regarding appeals in this document should be placed at line185. Dr. Hudson suggested the following change. After the comma in line 185, the text should read: "S/he may appeal through established procedures; the next two sentences should be deleted and the text should begin again on line 189. The University document that describes these established procedures should be determined and then listed in the document. Dr. Hudson stated that the document in question, which was approved by both the Senate and the Board of Regents, defined a general appeals process that could be applied to all faculty grievances.

The next issue discussed was a paragraph in the Georgia Tech document, that states that "Full-time Georgia Tech employees may not be on the payroll of other organizations except as a consultant. (Payment for services must be reported on an IRS 1099 Form, not on a W2 Form.) To be listed otherwise may be in conflict with OMB Circular No. A-21 and result in financial penalties against Georgia Tech." Dr. Heflin stated that this same type of wording could be included in the Georgia State document in the interest of clarity.

One committee member asked that the statement defining "financial interest," which is currently only in the disclosure form (lines 279-280 in the current draft), be included in the document as well. After discussion it was agreed that the definition of "employee" should be made clear, and that it should also be made clear whether or not "employed" conveys the idea of permanence.

Phyllis Johnson raised a question about the first line of the Preamble, which refers to both faculty and staff. She questioned whether or not this document applies to staff, and it was agreed that it should be made clear exactly which groups are covered by this document. Dr. Johnson also suggested that perhaps the title "Faculty Affairs Committee" is a misnomer for this Committee, as it also addresses administrators and staff.

Dr. Heflin asked that additional suggestions regarding the document be sent to her.

Minutes prepared by Mary Robbins.