

UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA FACULTY COUNCIL (USGFC)

Spring USGFC Meeting 2 of 2 for 2018-2019 AY
Scott Pegan, USG Faculty Council Chair, Presiding
April 11, 2019 & April 12, 2019
University of West Georgia, Newnan Facility

Attendees

Those faculty representing their institution in attendance are listed below (or substitute or absent):

Thursday, April 11, 2019:

Representatives &/or Executive Members: Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College: Amanda Urquhart; Augusta University: Robert M. Scott; Albany State University: Richard Foreman (substitute for Michael Mallard); Atlanta Metropolitan: Babs Onabanjo; Clayton State: Mark Watson (substitute for Dave Williams); Coastal College of Georgia: David Stasek; Columbus State: Chris McCollough; East Georgia State: Robert Marsh; Fort Valley State: Juone Brown; Georgia Southwestern: Chadwick Gugg; Georgia College & State University: David Johnson; Georgia Gwinnett: Beth Cavalier; Georgia Highlands: Steve Stuglin; Georgia Southern: Dustin Anderson; Georgia State: Michelle Brattain; Gordon: Jeremy Richards; Kennesaw State University: Doug Moodie; Middle Georgia: Steven Wallace; Savannah State: Andrew Mudrinich (absent); South Georgia State College: Frank Pridemore; University of North Georgia: Kelly McFaden; University of West Georgia: Judy Butler (we thank you for hosting us!); Georgia Tech: Joseph (Joe) Hughes (Parliamentarian & representative); Valdosta State University: Brian Ring (Secretary & representative); Georgia State: Tim Brown (Webmaster); Dalton State: Sarah Mergel (Chair Elect) & Matthew Hipps (representative); University of Georgia: Scott Pegan (Chair) & Andrew Osiak (representative).

USG Office: Deputy Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs: Marti Vinn & Interim Vice Chancellor for Human Resources: Karin Elliot

Friday April 12, 2019:

Representatives &/or Executive Members: Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College: Amanda Urquhart; Augusta University: Robert M. Scott; Albany State University: Richard Foreman (substitute for Michael Mallard); Atlanta Metropolitan: Babs Onabanjo; Clayton State: Mark Watson (substitute for Dave Williams); Coastal College of Georgia: David Stasek; Columbus State: Chris McCollough; East Georgia State: Robert Marsh; Fort Valley State: Juone Brown; Georgia Southwestern: Chadwick Gugg; Georgia College & State College: David Johnson; Georgia Gwinnett: Beth Cavalier; Georgia Highlands: Steve Stuglin; Georgia Southern: Dustin Anderson; Georgia State: Michelle Brattain; Gordon: Jeremy Richards; Kennesaw State University: Doug Moodie; Middle Georgia: Steven Wallace; Savannah State: Andrew Mudrinich (absent); South Georgia State College: Frank Pridemore; University of North Georgia: Kelly McFaden; University of West Georgia: Judy Butler (we thank you for hosting us! What a great second day); Georgia Tech: Joseph (Joe) Hughes (Parliamentarian & representative); Valdosta State University: Brian Ring (Secretary & representative); Georgia State: Tim Brown (Webmaster); Dalton State: Sarah Mergel (Chair Elect) & Matthew Hipps (representative); University of Georgia: Scott Pegan (Chair) & Andrew Osiak (representative).

USG Office: Chancellor: Steve Wrigley; Deputy Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs: Marti Vinn; Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer: Tristan Denley

AAUP Representative: Ann Richards

Hosts: David Jenks, Interim Provost & VPAA & Russell Crutchfield (UWG). Thanks for your support!

Thursday, April 11, 2019

11:00 AM Meet and Greet and Tour of Simulation Lab at the Newnan Facility

12:00 PM Lunch with Dr. Joe Hughes Discussing Bylaw Revisions

SP introduced JH (GATECH) to discuss the possible changes to the faculty council (FC) bylaws to reflect changes at the system level and within the council. He finished the draft of the bylaws the day before meeting so per the current bylaws the council cannot vote at this meeting. Therefore, it can vote electronically after the members have addressed some of the outstanding issues and have had time to comment. JH passed out a version of the current bylaws as well as a version with the proposed changes. From the discussions at the fall meeting, three major areas of changes seemed appropriate—membership, voting, and committees.

Article IV provides for two types of representatives: (1) institutional representatives and (2) officers. Under institutional representatives, the only change was to clarify the notion of a proxy and an alternate. The section also adds term dates (from July 1 to July 30), which allows council can be working prior to the fall meeting. For officers, the revised draft added the role of treasurer as part of the secretary's job. It also added the new position parliamentarian. The council also discussed replacing the name of webmaster for a newer term such as technology officer or communications officer. The council then addressed the descriptions of the officer roles. JH pointed out that the chair elect would chair the proposed strategic planning committee to allow the incoming chair to be forward thinking about what he or she would want to accomplish while chair. SS (GHC) had a question about multiple year terms and voting rights; JH indicated sometimes officers have voting rights and sometimes do not. Someone else asked about electing the chair-elect; JH said he inadvertently left that language out. SP also mentioned the two issues about officers voting—the officers should not vote, or the officers vote not for their institutions but for council. RS (AU) noted the bylaws should also recognize liaisons or ex officio members from the retiree council and the AAUP—Georgia Conference. JH worried about linking that representatives to a specific role. Discussion ensued about the appropriate term, but whatever they are called they would be non-voting. TB suggested adding assisting with onsite technology at meetings to the role of webmaster. A member also suggested that since officers serve a term of one year those dates should coincide with the terms of the council members (i.e., July 1 to June 30). Another member recommended adding a sentence that says no individual may hold more than officer position at one time.

Article V gives the Executive Committee the ability to call for electronic meetings. Institutional representatives can designate proxies who vote for the institution, but the proxy must be a representative of the institution. Institutions can send an observer who does not vote. KM (UNG) asked to change the he/she to they or gender-neutral language.

Article VI discusses voting issues including general requirements as well as defining combined voting and tier voting. Combined voting includes officers except the chair unless the chair's vote will change the vote. Tier voting excludes the officers from voting. MH (DSC) asked a question about abstention meant. He thought Roberts Rules said abstentions were a yes vote; JH said that was not his understanding. Looking at Robert's rules it seems like someone not voting counts with the majority (whether that is yes or no). SM said whatever the institution decides we need to have a common understanding whatever we decide. SW (MGA) asked about why sometimes officers vote and sometimes not. He was worried about

giving officers two votes in tier voting. SM pointed out that officers do not vote in tier voting unless they are the institutional representative. SP noted that officers really need to think about themselves in their role at the council level not at the institutional level. Naturally, there should be some safeguards to prevent abuses of the leadership not changing. JH noted that for boards which run organizations the bylaws usually indicate as a member of the board a person have an obligation to act in the best interest of the board not the institution or entity that sent the person there. MH (DSC) had concerns for about how the body calls for tier voting. JH said tier voting is mostly important for amendments to the bylaws but would be best to otherwise make it more difficult to call for tier voting otherwise (i.e., needing two-thirds of the combined voting to go there).

Article VII is a new section covering standing and ad-hoc committees. SM asked a question about what happened when a committee reported to the EC not the full council—can the EC act without the council? JH mentioned he was fine with adding something more specific. SP mentioned the EC could act if necessary but was open to suggestions as to how to reflect the procedure. JH also asked SM if she felt the strategic planning committee would have been useful. A council member asked about how to report information to committees over the summer for example. JH said requests can also go to the EC.

1:00 PM	Welcome/Approval of the Agenda Dr. Scott Pegan, USGFC Chair, University of Georgia
---------	---

SP welcomed everyone formally to the meeting; he thanked JB (UWG) for hosting the meeting. He went over the agenda for the afternoon. JB said for the evening dinner the bar would be open at 6:30, and dinner would be served about 7:00. There was a question about committee meetings on the agenda. Faculty Affairs was listed on the agenda, but the committee does not exist. Therefore, that slot was given to the bylaws committee to discuss some of the suggestions made in the previous discussion. SM asked that during meetings for someone to take notes for the minutes. SP called for a vote on the agenda, and it was approved.

1:15 PM	Tier Committee Meetings Council members met in their tier committees to discuss issues relevant to the different types of institutions.
---------	--

Research Universities		Comprehensive Universities
Andy Owsiak	UGA	Brian Ring
Michelle Brattain	GSU	Dustin Anderson
Joe Hughes	GATECH	Doug Moddie
Robert M Scott	AU	Judy Butler
		VSU
		GA Southern
		KSU
		UWG

State Universities		State Colleges
Richard Foreman	Albany	Amanda Urquhart
Chris McCollough	Columbus	Babs Onabanjo
Mark Watson	Clayton	David Stasek
Juone Brown	Fort Valley	Matthew L. Hipps
Chadwick Gugg	GSW	Robert Marsh
David Johnson	GCSU	Beth Cavalier
Absent	Savannah	Steve Stuglin
Steven Wallace	Middle GA	Jeremy Richards
Kelly McFaden	UNG	Frank Pridemore
		ABAC
		ATLM
		CCGA
		Dalton
		EGSU
		GGC
		Highlands
		Gordon
		SGSC

2:15 PM

Planning for the 2019-2020 Procurement Karin Elliot

Karin Elliot said the USG is planning on doing an RFP for benefits, and she is with the FC to get faculty input on benefits. She mentioned that the Total Rewards Steering Committee has a set of values and vision that determine the benefits and to ensure those benefits are competitively priced.

The USG is looking for a vendor that provides a comprehensive approach focusing on the whole employee—the USG well-being initiative is reflective of that. About 40 percent of the employee population engaged in the program in 2018; about 30 percent completed the process and earned the full credit. KE also said the USG allocated up to \$10,000 for individual institutions can request via application to promote wellness initiatives. A council member asked about the most common health issue among system employees. KE mentioned diabetes and its ancillary conditions was the most common. SS (GHC) asked about mental health services for employees. KE mentioned the Espyre through the Employee Assistance Program (which the system has paid for, but institutions will need to pay for going forward). KE asked the FC what the best way was to communicate to faculty. She would like feedback.

Currently the system has three insurance plans: (1) Self-Insured Plans with Anthem (GSBSSGa)-84,000; (2) Self-Insured Plans with CVS Caremark-84,000; and (3) Fully-Insured Metro Region HMO with Kaiser-9,000. Self-insured means the USG manages the plan and takes all the risk to pay the claims for anyone year. The RFP will be issued in November; company proposals will be due in January; selection will happen in April; and the board will approve the plan in August. The new options will take effect in January 2021.

KE also noted the system has a pretty good handle managing the cost of medical expenses but is having problem with pharmacy expenses. JH (GATECH) asked whether the providers will stay the same in 2020. KE said yes; also, she mentioned the state legislature funded an increase in health care for the next year's budget.

TB asked whether the system set the open enrollment period. KE said yes, and she explained why the office cut it from four weeks to two weeks. Regardless of how long the period, people tend to choose on the last two days, so the UDG shortened it to two weeks. AO (UGA) said a longer period might be because faculty and staff might be trying to review the information. SS (GHC) asked if there was any financial cost to allowing for a longer period. KE said no. The mailings do go out at the end of September and by October 1 campuses are having open enrollment meetings. SP and AO (UGA) said people probably defer looking until they can enroll. AO mentioned the problem with the tobacco question and the warning returning. SW (MGA) mentioned the plan options have not changed much in the last years; in 2020, people might need more time since they might be changing plans. KE also mentioned that employees will have to certify eligible dependents because it is very expensive to pay for dependents. Someone asked if they could move the communication plan for dependent certification forward because it would seem more courteous and might improve the hit to morale. KE said certification could save the system about \$4 million which should keep premiums lower. The FC does not disagree with the policy but wants it to seem less punitive to the employees.

KE also mentioned that when the system thinks about healthcare there are challenges and opportunities as far as available services versus costs. If everyone has one provider statewide

then it would be Anthem or United. If there are more providers, then the system office has more management. Another challenge is the vocal nature of the employees as well as the implications of ACA. Some questions emerged like: Should there be targeted programs based on demographic or health status (would it be an opt-in)? How many vendors and plan options statewide? Is it okay to have different plan options and pricing based on location? What is the right balance between cost, quality, and access? How aggressively do we want vendors to ‘manage’ our members?

DM (KSU) said it might not make sense financially for statewide because some places have higher or lower costs for services. SS (GHC) said more options is not always the best thing; he likes the idea of being fair and with insurance spreading the risks. A statewide system keeps you in-network throughout the state. The size of the system might make it easier for good pricing. Someone mentioned that there could be a combination of statewide and regional options. JH mentions the sense among faculty is that the USG seems to keep taking away from employees, and he thinks if this will result in a single healthcare option will make people think something else is being taken away. KE also mentioned that more options means more costs which was what drove the retirement changes and the healthcare changes because there is less and less funding. CM (CSU) mentioned the retirement changes did benefit him because it meant less service fees. KE asked what if the system provides a very limited plan in terms of access to service that provided a much lower premium without raising the deductible significantly. DS (CCGA) said that would be terrible if it was the only option. BC (GGC) said it would be okay if it is an option not the required plan. SW (MGA) noted that it could ultimately drive costs up; KE said the benefits would be similar to other plans but would just limit where people could get services.

3:00 PM	Break
3:15 PM	Bylaws Committee Meeting OR Human Resources Committee Meeting

Human Resources Meeting: BR (VSU) asked KE about how many institutions received raises in the previous academic year (which started in January). BR (VSU) said he was under the impression that ten institutions allocated money for raises; he wondered what institutions did. BR (VSU) also mentioned a plan in his region that took advantage of having a third-party vendor use a campus facility where employees can then get health services on campus that were cheaper. KE said it would have to be a lower cost than what people can get from the plan. SW (MGA) mentioned it was essentially a Quick Care. KE said if BR could provide a contact that she could speak to the system office would investigate it further.

DS (CCGA) asked about the 12-month salary issue. KE said they are still in the assessment phase because there are so many processes that need to be put into place as well as issues with TRS. She noted UGA did it for a couple of years, but it did not work well. Given the challenges, they do not want to offer it for a small number of faculty. KE said perhaps it was just a conversation about financial management. SM mentioned the EC disagreed with that notion in that it somehow hurt faculty. DJ (CGSU) asked if it would cost the system money or make the system money? He also suggested the possibility of a systemwide savings plan for people who want to spread the money out. KE said the institutions would hold that money so theoretically they make interest on the money. She did not think it would be cost prohibitive if enough of the faculty took advantage of it. SM asked about the tax implications; for R1 institutions it affects the ability to buy out contracts and could put faculty into a different tax bracket if they had larger checks for two months. Someone

mentioned grant issues as a conflict of time commitment, not conflict of pay (it depends on what the contract or grant specify); BR (VSU) mentioned the issue of the 33.33% faculty summer pay rule and the efforts leading to updates of the USG policy from last year's USGFC meetings.

DS (CCGA) asked about ORP sick leave resolution; KE said the chancellor is ready to sign a response. However, the answer is that ORP will not pay out employee sick leave. USG does not pay the actual sick leave for TRS, and ORP would cost the system money therefore they cannot support any change. SM mentioned how the on-boarding process probably needs to be revised because employees are not informed about all the differences between the plans. CM (CSU) echoed the concern about perceptions of faculty do not trust their HR departments. BC (GGC) asked about the one-time conversation to TRS. KE said that it comes before the legislature every year, and once again it did not pass.

EG (GSW) asked about the summer contract conversation; KE said MV would discuss that issue. SW (MGA) asked about maternity/paternity leave. KE said system employees will not get leave from the state, and that it would only come if the federal government mandated leave. She mentioned FMLA options for fathers. To make the change, the BOR would have to vote to approve it and last year the chair covering that issue on the BOR did not support it. The new chair might consider it. Someone asked the question about the 33.33% question. KE said MV would address that question, but the USG policy has been updated.

4:15 PM	Organizational Committee Meeting OR Academic Affairs Committee Meeting
	Academic Affairs: MH (DSC) mentioned the possibility of core redesign. Discussion followed about what this would mean for faculty and students. SM mentioned this conversation involved faculty in terms of important content and jobs. CM (CSU) mentioned his institution received a generic letter that core redesign; KM (UNG) said her institution was starting core redesign and was told to stop by the USG. Discussion also talked about compliance issues, DFW, and gateways to completion. SP mentioned coming up with some questions to ask TD.
	AO (UGA) mentioned asking where we have input, where can we have continued input, and what will the effect of the faculty input be on the process? MH (DSC) asked if students were having a trouble with gen ed flexibility at other institutions. EG (GSW) asked what that was; CM (CSU) explained it but discussion did not really go anywhere.
	SP mentioned the executive order regarding free speech and loan accountability. MH (DSC) mentioned the RACS have already been asked to provide a report on the usability of degrees; AO (UGA) said that if faculty are not out in front of the issue then it will be taken out of our hands. Academic Affairs Committee/Faculty Council should come up with some ideas to put in front of the system office.
	KM (UNG) mentioned for the less quantifiable degrees to connect them to things like teacher education. MH (DSC) said faculty also need to change the narrative about soft skills. MW (CSU) did point out that employers keep saying that they wanted soft skills. JH (GATECH) also mentioned that employers say one thing and want another thing. EG (GSW) said she keeps getting asked the question about what students will do with a degree; faculty should ask what potential employees need so faculty can make those skills possible. AO (UGA) pointed out that the legislature wants to deal with the short-term so sometimes the "life-long learner" narrative does not always work.

SM mentioned that while faculty want to promote critical thinking, the legislature does not really want that. MH (DSC) mentioned the technical colleges are doing what the legislature wants. EG (GSW) said that technical colleges produced employees; USG institutions create the people who will become entrepreneurs and make jobs. CM (CSU) and AO (UGA) mentioned USG institutions promote education which will allow advancement not static positions. Retiree Council representative said faculty/institutions should be asking students what is important.

JB (UWG) mentioned about the UWG tech fee because a legislator's son was upset about the fee. BO (ATLM) said enrollment is going down since the economy is better and so institutions need to adapt. SM and AO (UGA) mentioned maybe what faculty are asking is that the system acted like a system. CM (CSU) mentioned the chancellor met with the presidents to discuss research by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and how the system should think about the USG system. Discussion followed about the esoteric meaning of education and system.

5:15 PM Executive Committee Meeting

The executive committee did not hold a meeting as there were no issues that needed to be addressed prior to Friday's meeting.

7:00 PM Dinner with the Chancellor at The Cellar (20 Jefferson St, Newnan, GA)
Dr. Steve Wrigley, Chancellor of the University System of Georgia

Friday, April 12, 2019

8:00 AM Welcome/Approval of the Minutes from April 27, 2018
Dr. Scott Pegan, USGFC Chair, University of Georgia

SP called the meeting to order at 8:05. He asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the October 2018 meeting. EG (GSW) motioned; DA (GASO) seconded. The council approved the minutes.

8:15 AM Remarks/Question and Answer Period
Dr. Steve Wrigley, Chancellor

SW mentioned a few things about what is going on in the system including the textbook initiative, momentum year, the issue of course scheduling, and pathways that will all involve the FC. SW mentioned that legislators ask often about students who cannot get the classes they need; one legislator wanted to introduce a bill that when a student needs one class and they cannot get it they will not pay tuition. SW also said that the provosts voted in favor of looking at the core curriculum and the USG wants the FC input. This initiative has developed rapidly over the last few weeks. Moreover, the USG is also looking at issues of financial literacy to help students look at the cost of their education. Lastly, the BOR has launched a new strategic plan; it is in the early phase, so he does not know how the process will look but will require FC and campus involvement.

On the government regulation piece, the USG has been encouraging institutions to communicate with their own legislators. He believes the USG has made some progress with

the legislature. SW suggested bringing the legislators to campus from April to November while they legislature is not in session, such as the chairman of the higher education committee. DM (KSU) mentioned he was once told faculty should not engage with their legislators, but he wanted to know if we should. DW mentioned that he has been encouraging faculty to get out and work with the legislators (which was also discussed at the last meeting).

KM (UNG) asked in relation to the financial literacy component about the narrative of the value of a college degree (namely to compete with technical college). SW said that higher education lost the narrative about ten to twelve years ago in part because of how higher ed talks about itself, and the system office has been trying to address the issue. SW also spoke with the head of the TCS and their advertising campaign did not net a major gain. SW still thinks marketing should happen at the institution level and institutions should not cut marketing budget. Each institution should tell its own story focusing on the difference each institution makes. Any campaign to promote the USG waste money which the system does not have. AO (UGA) asked why USG/BOR does not centralize the messaging. SW said the system office does spend time thinking about the message should be, and it is speaking with the institutions to get that message out. JH (GATECH) mentioned that many high school counselors might now know about institutions around the state; part of the message should be designed to deal with population and demographic changes. Does the system look at this issue? SW the USG has a data that looks at the demographic changes, especially the population decline. Some of the institutions are marketing in the population centers as a result of those changes; he also expects to see out of state institutions advertising in the state's metro area. Some state systems are also changing how they price for surrounding states to increase student population.

BC (GGC) asked where the USG is on the open positions on the BOR. SW said the appointments are done by the governor and it is not his business to intervene (and governors get touchy about it). BC (GGC) followed up by asking if the lack of appointments is a political move or some other power play regarding education. SW said he thought it was more bureaucratic than anything else.

MH (DSC) asked regarding recruitment how can the USG stop the system from poisoning itself; DA (GASO) agreed regarding a cohesive message. SW said the USG will put a stop to one institution trashing another institution. It happened once in the past that the office knew about, and it was dealt with. Institutions should let the system office know if this happens. SW also said that each of the 26 institutions are unique and they target specific populations. Students are not really looking at all 26 at one time. SP asked if part of the strategic plan would be to look at this issue. SW/MV said the system tightened the definition of the sectors about five years ago. SM asked if that meant we would not see much in the way of sector movement; SW said he did not think there would be much of that.

SW (MGA) asked how the system would deal with the declining traditional high school population in terms of attracting non-traditional students. SW said the USG is not really good at that because higher ed is not really flexible enough; the system office has been looking at how adult learners can navigate toward a degree. For most people they can get to campus in 30-45 minutes; the worst thing the institutions can do is have a great marketing campaign and then makes it hard for students to navigate upon arrival. JH (GATECH) asked if at the system level to provide online degrees using especially at the graduate level. SM mentioned there is the system level efforts with eCore and eMajor; SW did reiterate that eCore and

eMajor but he also noted that adult learners sometimes need to be in the classroom. TB asked about whether institutions should look at new scheduling models to target adult learners. SW said the system should be look at it. He likened it to Amazon where you can do anything with one click; higher ed needs to be more accessible. He also mentioned that accreditors will not like it but being more accessible is part of gaining students. FP (SGSC) asked about mergers; SW said there are no active conversations about mergers. He knows they are disruptive.

10:00 AM USG Momentum Year Update
Dr. Tristan Denley

TD said a little over a year ago the USG had the kickoff meeting for the Momentum approach. There have also been co-requisites and mindset academies that involve faculty on campuses as well as the advising summit—focusing on how institutions transition students really depends on the type of students entering (the message should not always be the same). He noted the faculty learning communities have been another as another way faculty are involved in momentum programs. He estimated that roughly 1,000 faculty are involved across the system. FP (SGSC) and AO (UGA) mentioned that the FLCs have been useful on their campuses. TD said what the USG is doing in terms of faculty development is the first time it has been done on such a scale nationally. The system has learned a lot about the process as they implemented it. The second momentum summit happened in late February; each campus has plans in place and the department chairs and deans also participated in a meeting to discuss how they play a role in student success and leading their departments to support student success. The next step is to create broader strategies that go beyond the first year as far as making purposeful choices, creating a productive mindset, outlining pathways and focusing on academic focus, and maintaining a full schedule (30 hours each year).

DM (KSU) pointed out the issue of students working 40 plus hours trying to take a full course load. TD said it was a good point and there are competing forces; however, statistically the fewer credits students take the less likely they are to finish. He also noted that the ways people create their schedules and their levels of involvement impact degree completion. The system and the institutions can be more flexible about scheduling and prerequisites to make a fuller schedule possible for students with other commitments. Faculty and administrators need to break the habit of scheduling for their ease and schedule for student needs. SW (MGA) asked about gateway courses (i.e., English and Math). TD provided a graph looking at success in those courses and the impact of the co-requisite model of learning support. DA (GASO) asked if the office could share that slide on the momentum site.

RS (AU) asked about the outsourcing of campus resources decreasing job opportunities for students meaning they need outside jobs. He suggested looking at bringing student workers back to campuses, so their employer is more flexible with class schedules. SW said bringing jobs back to campuses does not mean institutions do not have to do other things to be flexible. JB (FVSU) asked relating to the English/Math charts and how the data has been affected by OERs; TD said the system does have some data on that issue and the impact has been positive. She mentioned many of her students work to pay for textbooks, and so bringing costs down will allow students to come to campus. CM (CSU) asked about the quality of the materials. TD said there has been some effort to vet the materials to ensure it is better material. TB asked about the link between OERs and homework software systems. TD mentioned that ALG has been working on lowering cost for ancillary materials—he

mentioned specifically the RTTP and how ALG is funding the development of three games where the resources will be free. SP asked if the system had a plan to continue to fund these initiatives; TD mentioned CAR savings will help some institutions, but there are some resources to make that happen. JH (GATECH) asked if there was a plan in place to help develop OERs in upper level courses. TD said there has been some interest in moving in this direction and that the plan is to attempt to create entire degree programs where there are OERs from the first class to the capstone course. FP (SGSC) asked if the gateway course information was being conveyed to the state and local legislators. TD said that they are telling the stories and that these stories are valuable currency in conversations with government officials.

TD linked the Momentum approach to financial costs of education: "Know More Borrow Less." Every institution will be providing every student a letter with how much they have borrowed and what it will take them to pay it back. SM asked in the planning phase this program did the system consider the panic factor when students see the financial breakdown. TD said that the system did talk to students as part of the planning, and they are hoping to hit the sweet spot of knowledge without panic. Financial aid is binary (or all or nothing). Less than one-tenth of one percent borrowed only part of what they qualified for. Students took both federal subsidized and unsubsidized loans; the decisions were not correlated in any way projected family income at the time and in the future. Banner screen on financial aid gave students the all or nothing option so many students thought that was the only choice. Discussion ensued about the issue as well as the solution. MH (DSC) asked about levels of parental education in addition to the student education about borrowing. The system is creating FERPA approved notification options. SP mentioned that the system needs to find a way not to force students out of loans and into jobs that require 80 hours a week. JB (FVSU) said the message should not just be for first generation students because financial aid is complicated and always changing; just because parents might have familiarity they might not understand the current system. TD said the system will track usage of the information on their financial aid site. SW (MGA) asked a question about how the process will change; TD said the entire process for accepting financial aid is in the process of being revamped.

TD also discussed the system level efforts to encourage Core Redesign as part of the Momentum approach. At the system level, core redesign has come up as the system has addressed the different questions about how the pieces fit together. TD mentioned the last time the core changed was in 2011, but there was a lot of grandfathering of the old system that created confusion for students. (1) Create a core curriculum student can understand what is happening when they go through the core and how it prepares them for the future [list of checkboxes to list of requirements]. (2) Create a more consistent core for the system because there is a random logic to why students allow or do not allow a course in an area [skill based]. The system will convene a group like College 2025 that brings together various constituents to draft design principles that will go to the board in Fall 2019. That will be followed by a larger group that will create a core curriculum and rolling it out across the campuses for Fall 2020.

SP mentioned the FC feels strongly about faculty representation is important to them because at the end of the day they must implement the changes. TD does agree it has to an academic conversation, but it cannot solely from the academic perspective because the conversations about the narrative of the importance of a college education. DM (KSU) asked about efforts to pack the core to ease pressure on upper-level classes. TD said that students

do need to see the connection between the core and their major. DA (GASO) asked whether the USG was celebrating the indirectness as much as the directness. TD said it is not doing that now, but it needs to do so. JH (GATECH) asked if there was a mixed message between the Momentum approach and core redesign as far as the utility versus the big picture.

MH (DSC) asked about the timing as it relates to obtaining faculty input since it already is happening. VPs of academic affairs know, but faculty do not, and it will create problems on campuses. TD said that the College 2025 model will bring in faculty and take comments and hope that faculty will comment at that stage. TD said the provosts are the chief academic officer on the campus, and they need to engage their own faculty in the process especially when the second group starts to look at implementation. AO (UGA) noted by the time the faculty are involved it is too late for them to have meaningful input. FC members struggle on their own campuses to explain how faculty play a role because the role is very limited. TD emphatically said there is no list of skills or principles in place, and the faculty will have an opportunity to inform the conversation. SW mentioned he knows there is still some suspicion as people go into these projects and the system needs the FC help to change that impression on campuses. RS (ASU) mentioned that the time table is not conducive to campus realities. SW mentioned the rest of the world does not stop in the summer. KM (UNG) pointed out that there should be some accountability to make sure provosts suggest meaningful faculty input.

10:45 AM Government Affairs
Dr. Steve Wrigley, Chancellor

SW mentioned the legislative session turned out pretty well for the system. He thinks the USG and institution efforts are having an effect because he heard fewer complaints about tuition and expenses. He also pointed out to the legislature how the current funding formula is \$1.2 billion underfunded. SW sat with the new administration and walked them through it. The budget request was fully funded and there is a 2 percent merit pay increase. The legislature is also going to create a study committee on higher education outcomes.

The system office has two government affairs people; about fifteen or sixteen institutions have dedicated government affairs staff. The USG meets with all those people to ensure the message is the same; reps cannot advocate on behalf of their own institution but rather for the entire system. This model has been the plan for years and the legislators prefer it that way. The legislature will use any backstabbing against the USG. All government affairs people then send the same message about the budget or other issues. Because there are not enough resources the legislature is looking for a way to say no and it will lead to less funding.

The budget goes to the governor's office by September 1 after an internal process and approval by the BOR. The funding formula is always the system priority based on the increase in credit hours (not by performance); the budget also includes a healthcare increase and maintenance and operations. Separately, the USG advocates for pay increases. Increase in the formula was \$143 million over the previous year as part of a two billion-dollar budget. The current formula is still \$1.2 billion underfunded because of the austerity that came from the Great Recession. State funds by historical verbal agreement have been 75/25 split of state appropriations to tuition. At present the split is about 50/50. As that has shifted since the early 2000s, the USG has also seen more complaints about tuition increases. SW said the USG is trying to highlight that costs are not decreasing so with lower appropriations means tuition is bound to go up. Georgia, in terms of state funding, is better than other systems

around the country. For the past five years, the system has secured increases in the formula though it is still not fully funded as noted. JH (GATECH) asked if the house or the senate is talking about changing the way institutions are funded; SW said that the conversations are happening but is nascent. SW said the system is always looking for advocates in state government. He believes the current governor recognizes the issues even though he did not campaign on that given the nature of politics; he does seem to understand the education challenges. SW also mentioned that the USG is sometimes hard to help.

SW wants campuses to use the faculty as part of the government relations process and encourages them to get involved in the process. The USG can help put that effort together when institutions seem reluctant. He recognizes the system cannot stop faculty from saying that what they want to; however, there is a right way and a wrong way to build a relationship with a legislature. He also hopes that faculty representatives will support the system initiatives to reinforce the message. The process does not have to be adversarial; despite the polarization of politics the USG and individuals need to figure out how to have reasonable conversations with legislators because it is hard to rebuild after alienation. People will never agree 100 percent, but that does not mean they should stop the conversation. Legislators need to feel like faculty are willing to work with them not against them. Faculty need to understand that legislation is usually linked to bigger issues and sometimes taking a pause to figure that out before acting is beneficial. Discussion followed about government relations. BOR is created in the state constitution and the legislature can allocate a lump sum; the legislature cannot micromanage the budgets. JB (FVSU) asked for institutions without a government affairs person who faculty should contact; SW said go to the president of your institution.

12:00 PM	Question and Answer Period Dr. Marti Venn, Deputy Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
----------	---

MV said she did not have much to add to what SW and TD said previously. MV noted during the legislative season when a bill comes up dealing with education SW's chief of staff and assistant notify MV and a working group looks at the bill and how it will impact the institutions. She mentioned the dual enrollment bill and the dyslexia testing bill. Usually the system can make the legislation better; she has also learned in working on bills that while the committee chairs and members are new, they do connect to a local institution. Therefore, MV said she reaches out to institutions they know. She recommended looking at the members of the higher education committee to see what institutions they know. She also encourages provosts to work with legislative affairs (and overcome some of their natural fear of faculty). BC (GGC) asked about living in one district and working in another and who should faculty approach. MV said look at the people's connections as opposed to looking at them as voters.

The system will hand over the summer salary analysis that came in from the provosts. MV said with the data the council can then make some recommendations about policies. SM asked members once they got the data to review it to ensure that it lines up with faculty experiences across campuses (not just personal experiences). The council will then ask the human resources committee to develop some suggestions/resolutions. MV also said the USG will continue to explore the summer salary cap, grants and daycare. SP asked MV about the 12-month salary. MV said Claire Arnold in fiscal affairs met with TRS; they said that it was possible but there would be significant costs at the system level. MV said she is not optimistic that the system will allow faculty members to have a 12-month pay. SM

mentioned at the HR committee meeting the members talked about other low-cost savings options to help faculty and if the 12-month pay option is not available the council would support other initiatives. SP also mentioned the FC would like to ensure transparency in the process of making the decision. MV mentioned all institutions will be using OneUSG to send contracts so the policies maybe easier roll out to all the campuses if the system office approves the council recommendations.

JB (FVSU) asked about the 360 review of administrators, specifically when the results would be seen by the campuses. MV did not know. SM asked about the schedule and the process. MV said reviewers met with the administrative cabinet, deans and chairs, faculty/staff representatives, and students. Several council members said SW asked for the head of shared governance to participate. MV also said the council could consider a resolution about releasing the results, but she also noted it is a personnel record thus she is not sure about the legal implications of that. JB (FVSU) was less concerned about the results as letting people know about the bigger finding that helps to identify issues on campuses. MH (DSC) asked whether the system could help with the dissemination of information to faculty and staff. MV said regarding the core there is an option to require a communication plan, and she also offered to intervene on behalf of the faculty. SM mentioned for institutions who do not want to make a direct complaint can contact the FC chair who can raise the concern anonymously.

MH (DSC) about CAR, specifically what happens at the end. MV said at the end of the process there will be a systemwide report. FC members mentioned that things are changing on their campuses because of the review which may or may not be attributable to the review. Faculty is suspicious. SP noted the first report from Huron should be accessible to faculty but the end report of how the institution implements the results probably will not be seen giving the personnel implications. DA (GASO) asked if institution is required to report it out or are there best practices that have been identified. SM asked about the level of knowledge at system institutions. Only a handful of members knew and only a handful had faculty involvement in the implementation process. MV said the final implementation plan must be approved by the chancellor and then the institution needs an implementation team. EG (GSW) mentioned some changes in academic unit organization and thought it might be part of CAR. MV and SP said that CAR was not looking at academic units.

JH (GATECH) asked if there are any new initiatives coming out of the system office that the FC had not already heard about. MV mentioned (echoing TD) the push to apply the momentum approach to juniors and seniors. She also mentioned there is a perception that teacher candidates do not know how to teach reading. The USG will be taking an in-depth look at teacher education curriculum and possibly nursing curriculum. There will also be some publication of teacher preparation programs.

1:00 PM	Committee Reports and Consideration of New Resolutions from Committees
---------	--

Bylaws: SP mentioned that the current bylaws require 30 days for comment before changing the bylaws. He outlined a process for review of the updated of the document. SP wants council members not necessarily to wordsmith the document, but to look at whether it captures the essence of what the council can live with. JH motioned to suspend the provisions in the bylaws (Article VIII) so as to allow a vote by electronic ballot thirty days after the final proposed replacement is posted. EG (GSW). Discussion followed about what

the asynchronous voting. Motion approved unanimously by tier voting with one abstention (DA-GaSou) since he did now hear the motion the committee was voting on.

JH discussed some of the changes made after the bylaws committee discussed the proposed changes especially related to Article VI. The committee decided that the chair will not vote only when your vote changes the outcome or via a secret ballot. The rest of the executive committee will only vote if they are also the institutional representative. The committee also talked about the threshold for meetings and voting. The role of abstentions and whether they vote yes, no, or with the majority (whether for or against). Regarding tier voting it would be a simple majority as opposed to a higher threshold. RS asked about the auxiliary representatives- they will be called non-voting representatives. SP said three tier membership—institutional, executive committee, and non-voting representatives.

SM recommended that the remaining committees provide updates on things the council has not discussed in the morning. Academic Affairs, Human Resources, and the Tier Committees had no further points for discussion. RS (ASU) said the Organizational Committee pointed out that it would be good for the various system-level initiatives to have more follow up with respect to whether those initiatives worked. They also spoke about CAR, consolidations, etc.

2:00 PM Nominations - Elections

SP called for nominations for the officers for 2019-2020.

- Chair Elect – Andy Owsiaik, Doug Moodie, Brian Ring
- Secretary – Matt Hipps
- Parliamentarian – Joe Hughes
- Webmaster – Tim Brown

SP called for a vote on the three unopposed. DA (GASO) seconded. Approved. SM moved to forgo tier voting for the chair elect. It was seconded and approved. The council then voted by paper ballot for the chair. Brian Ring had the majority of the votes thereby winning the election.

2:30 PM Announcements/Adjourn

Prior to adjourning SM mentioned a few of the things the council members should be expecting in the next few months including the bylaws voting and transitioning of council members. She asked members rotating off to work with their successor to ensure a smooth transition of communication. She will also create a form to collect information about committee service. Once the committee is set, she hopes the committee can start working on some of the initiatives, like summer pay and core redesign, prior to the fall meeting. The fall meeting will be held at Coastal College of Georgia; the date will be determined based on the chancellor's availability. The meeting adjourned around 2:30 PM.

Lastly, the USGFC was wonderfully hosted by Judy Butler and volunteers at the Newnan campus of UWG. We would like to thank your team of organizers and for the support given to hold this meeting by the administration of both UWG and the USG Chancellor's office.