**Committee Name: Faculty affairs policy committee**

**Meeting Date & Time: Friday, February 10, 2023 2:00 p.m.**

**Meeting Location: Zoom Virtual Meeting Room**

**Attendance**:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Members “P” denotes Present, “A” denotes Absent, “R” denotes Regrets** | | | |
| P | Sabrina Hom (chair) | A | Hank Edmondson |
| P | Stephanie Jett (secretary) | A | Robert Blumenthal |
| P | Frank Richardson (vice chair) | R | Peter Rosado-Flores |
| R | Christopher Clark | P | Olha Osobov |
| P | Matt Milnes | P | Jinkyung Park |
| A | Holly Croft | P | Karl Mandrodt |
| P | Melanie DeVore |  |  |
| Guests: Carol Ward (HR) | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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** | Meeting called to order at 2:00 p.m. The meeting was hosted by Sabrina Hom via Zoom. |  |  |
| **II. Approval of Agenda** | The agenda was in the first minutes of the meeting. |  |  |
| **III. Approval of Minutes** | Minutes from previous meetings were not sent until 1:30 p.m. today so no vote on those. |  |  |
| **IV. Old Business/Review of**  **Actions/Recommendations** | No old business discussed |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **V. New Business** Actions/Recommendations |  |  |  |
| **1. New USG and GCSU Amorous Relationship Policy discussed with Carol Ward (HR)** | **\*\*\*In ECUS after the FAPC meeting, Sabrina found out from RPIPC chair, Dr. Damian Francis, that they also had a representative from HR present discussing the same policies and they were told contradictory information to what we were told regarding the Amorous Relationship policy. Any and all information gained during this meeting is therein suspect and needs further confirmation.**  Discussed changes made to the [USG Amorous Relationship Policy](https://www.usg.edu/hr/assets/hr/hrap_manual/HRAP_Amorous_Relationships_Employee_Relations.pdf) wording: “The professionalism and mutual trust of the workplace is compromised when employees who hold positions of unequal power engage in amorous relationships. The same is true for faculty members, to include graduate teaching assistants, who have amorous relationships with  students they teach or evaluate or whose terms of education or employment they could directly affect. Such relationships create inherent conflicts of interest and lead to complaints of favoritism, decreased employee morale, mistrust by colleagues, complaints of undue access and, claims of sexual harassment, and other negative implications for the work environment.  Accordingly, **Board of Regents’ (BOR) Policy 8.2.18.6 Amorous Relationships prohibits amorous relationships as follows:**  A University System of Georgia (USG) employee, including a graduate teaching assistant, is **prohibited** from having romantic or sexual relationship with **any** student or USG employee who the individual **supervises, teaches, or evaluates in any way.** Additionally, a USG employee is **prohibited** from having romantic or sexual relationship with any student or USG employee whose **terms or conditions of education or employment the individual could directly affect.** This policy reinforces the Board’s and the USG’s commitment to providing a professional  environment for all USG employees and students.”  [GCSU Policy:](https://gcsu.smartcatalogiq.com/en/policy-manual/policy-manual/office-of-human-resources/harassment/amorous-relationships/) “When one party has a professional relationship towards the other or stands in a position of authority over the other, even an apparently consensual amorous relationship may lead to sexual harassment or other breaches of professional obligations.  In accordance with the University System of Georgia (USG) Board of Regents policy, Georgia College **prohibits** all employees from having a romantic or sexual relationship with **any student or employee whom the individual supervises, teaches, or evaluates in any way.** Additionally, employees are **prohibited** from having a romantic or sexual relationship with **any student or employee whose terms or conditions of education or employment the individual could directly affect.** Any individual who violates this policy is subject to disciplinary action commensurate with the offense.”   * FAPC asked Ms. Ward to clarify the scope of the policy   + “Scope” is centered around those who you supervise, teach, or have some impact direct on their employment and/or academics.   + “Gray area” in policy for whether this policy or the Employment of Relatives policy or both applies to married couples     - Greater leeway for married couples??? Needs clarification   + When it comes to faculty to student (undergrad and graduate), “could directly affect” opens it up to a policy violation. “Terms of conditions of employment or academics.” The language is purposefully broad for equity.   + Addition makes it broader for “direct effect” on employment and/or academics.   + Modifications on policy to make it closer to the USG policy. * Q: How do we address them?   + Ongoing process about how to handle them. Not a completed process. Need a faculty representative and where FAPC should come in.   + Awareness of policy change is part of the problem. * Q: How do you report a conflict of interest?   + Typically, would go to chair then go up from there.   + Proactive would be chain of command, reactive is HR. * Q: “Grandfathering in” for those to whom this “prohibition”? Work arounds?   + Policy on relatives in the workplace, there is a prohibition on reporting to anyone you’re related to. Trailing spouses – Probably going to have to work on that to make sure we don’t have violations. Not the same as the amorous relationships. If it exists, need to ask for exceptions from Chancellor.   + \*\*\*Amorous relationships = not the same as marriage. Depends on circumstances, but typically doesn’t apply to legally married couples.   + Have to look at the individual situation and go forward to get the approvals. Can’t make those decisions at the campus level. * [**USG Policy 8.2.3: Employment of Relatives**](https://www.usg.edu/policymanual/section8/C224/#:~:text=Relationship%20by%20a%20family%20or,through%20any%20line%20of%20authority.)   + For the purpose of this policy, relatives are defined as husbands and wives, parents and children, brothers, sisters, and any in-laws of any of the foregoing (BoR Minutes, February 14, 1973, p. 312).   + The basic criteria for the appointment and promotion of USG employees shall be appropriate qualifications and performance as set forth in the policies of the Board of Regents. Relationship by a family or marriage shall constitute neither an advantage nor a disadvantage.   + No individual shall be employed in a department or unit that will result in the existence of a subordinate-superior relationship between such individual and any relative of such individual through any line of authority. As used herein, “line of authority” shall mean authority extending vertically through one or more organizational levels of supervision or management (BoR Minutes, 1989-90, p. 250).   + This standard does not apply to the temporary or part-time employment of children under age 25, nor to any individual employed as of February 14, 1990, at any institution where a relative of such individual then holds a superior position at least one level of supervision removed from such individual in any line of authority. Exceptions may be approved by the Board of Regents upon recommendation of the Chancellor as being clearly in the best interest of the institution and the USG. * Q: If a faculty member is married to another dept faculty member and they want to apply for chair, are they not allowed to apply for chair?   + “Shouldn’t constitute an advantage or disadvantage.” Shouldn’t eliminate them offhand. Very challenging and case by case basis. * Q: If we’re talking about spousal hires, which policy is in effect?   + Relatives in the workplace. * Q: Nepotism. What policies are in place to handle it?   + The relatives in the workplace policy and conflicts of interest policies that prevent that. * Q: What about when we’re looking at higher ups?   + At any level, it shouldn’t exist. If there is any way you could report to that person, it’s a no go. * Q: What is the recourse if it’s violated?   + If Chancellor doesn’t approve, is there another way to resolve the situation, that’s how it will go. Not an immediate “fired” situation.   + It really comes down to in their direct line of authority. * Q: What if having your spouse is in your department and it’s creating an unfair advantage?   + As long as they were both hired due to their own credentials. * Q: What is the responsibility of the faculty if we know of violations?   + Report to HR. Some of these situations overlap directly with Title IX, so it needs to go to them first so they can work with them. Can have conversations with direct chain of command. * Q: Past or present situations?   + Past relationships will be a problem only if one individual moves into a position where they can influence the other’s employment or academic outcomes. At that point, feelings from the past might influence the situation. * Q: Disciplinary actions?   + Depending on severity, progressive guide to discipline policy. Outlined by first, second, third, etc. offense. <https://www.gcsu.edu/sites/files/page-assets/node-716/attachments/prohibitions_and_penalties.pdf>   **Other policy questions for HR:**   * Q: Progressive discipline document scope?   + Guidelines for supervisor. Can be more or less severe than is recommended by the guide. More heavily used in staff. FAPC helped shape the documents, but different removal process for faculty. Better way to lay it out to help differentiate between faculty and staff. Would assuage concerns regarding improper use towards faculty. * Q: Firearms policy changes due to new constitutional carry laws in GA?   + HR will have to talk to legal and systems office for those conversations. * Q: Faculty members are getting feedback from staff members that if they aren’t working during specific hours, they must “clock out”.   + Staff have defined schedules. Faculty, outside of classes, it’s not like that. Apples and oranges as far as HR is concerned. BoR policy with “sick leave” = you would turn in 8-hour work day for missing that day to HR. Departmental expectations also a consideration. * Q: Faculty concerns could be alleviated by simply clarifying for faculty that some of the items on that progressive discipline document are superseded by USG faculty policy.   + Carol welcomes FAPC’s assistance on helping with these changes. * Q: Is HR able to give assistance to those who are looking for applying for green cards or other immigration status issues?   + HR is not involved on the front end. Legal affairs has a immigration attorney to handle that. HR can help with eligibility. HR can funnel people with concerns to the right place. | Sabrina will meet separately with HR for clarification of information learned via conversations in ECUS.  Next committee meeting, FAPC will join with RPIPC in person to discuss the policies in question. HR may be present. |  |
| VI. Next Meeting | Friday, March 3rd at 2 p.m. IN PERSON with RPIPC |  |  |
| VII. Adjournment | Meeting adjourned at approx. 3:20 p.m. |  |  |

**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)

**Guidance**

**Committee Name:**

**Committee Officers:**

**Academic Year:**

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

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | | | | | | | | | |
| Meeting Dates | | 8/8/22 | 9/2/22 | 10/7/22 | 11/4/22 | 1/6/23 | 2/10/23 |  |  |  |
| Sabrina Hom (chair) | | P | P | P | P | P | P |  |  |  |
| Stephanie Jett (secretary) | | P | P | P | P | P | P |  |  |  |
| Frank Richardson (vice chair) | | P | P | A | P | P | P |  |  |  |
| Christopher Clark | | P | P | R | P | P | R |  |  |  |
| Matt Milnes | | P | P | P | R | P | P |  |  |  |
| Holly Croft | | P | P | P | P | A | A |  |  |  |
| Hank Edmondson | | R | A | R | P | P | A |  |  |  |
| Robert Blumenthal | | R | R | P | P | R | A |  |  |  |
| Peter Rosado-Flores | | R | P | P | P | P | R |  |  |  |
| Olha Osobov | | A | P | P | P | P | P |  |  |  |
| Jinkyung Park | | A | P | P | P | R | P |  |  |  |
| Stephen Rutner\* | | A | P | P | P | A | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| Melanie DeVore | | P | P | R | P | R | P |  |  |  |
| Karl Manrodt\*\* | | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | P |  |  |  |

\*Appointed after 8/8/2022

\*\*Replaced Stephen Rutner at 2/10/23 meeting

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

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

(Including this Approval by chair at committee discretion)