

UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA (USG) FACULTY COUNCIL

December 1, 2017
Fort Valley State University
Agricultural Technology Conference Center
46 Camp John Hope Road Fort Valley, GA 31030

Elizabeth F. Desnoyers-Colas, USG Faculty Council Chair, Presiding

Attendees

Georgia Tech: Joseph Hughes; Georgia State University: Timothy Brown; Augusta University: Wendy Turner, MJ Weintraub; University of Georgia: Scott Pegan; Kennesaw State University: [TBD]; University of West Georgia: Julia Farmer, Judy Butler; Valdosta State University: Peggy Moch, Brian Ring; Albany State University: Victoria Smith-Butler, Richard Forman, Zephy Okonkwo; Armstrong Atlantic State University: Elizabeth Desnoyers-Colas; Clayton State University: J. Celeste Walley-Jean; Columbus State University: Chris McCollough; Fort Valley State University: Josephine Davis, Juone Brown, Regina Butts, Meigan Fields; Georgia College & State University: Alex Blazer, Glynnis Haley; Georgia Southwestern State University: Chadwick Gugg; Middle Georgia State University: Edwynn Wallace; Savannah State University: [TBD]; University of North Georgia: Kelly McFaden; Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College: Amanda Urquhart; Atlanta Metropolitan State College: Babs Onabanjo, Gyuheni Choi; Dalton State College: Sarah Mergel; Georgia Gwinnett College: Taylor Smith; Gordon State College: Jeremy Richards; South Georgia State College: Becky Sims; AAUP: Robert Scott, Steve Anthony; USG Retiree Council: Mildred (Missy) Cody; USG: Steve Wrigley, Tristan Denley, Marti Venn

Meeting Minutes

I. Welcome (8:45 AM)

Dr. Elizabeth F. Desnoyers-Colas, USGFC Chair, Armstrong State University

Dr. Paul A. Jones, President, Fort Valley State University

Elizabeth Desnoyers-Colas (EDC) welcomed the members of the council to the meeting. Dr. Jones was unable to attend, but Juone Brown welcomed the council to FVSU noting the campus was very excited to have everyone here. She explained there would be an opportunity to tour the campus later in the day for anyone who wanted to do so. Finally, she thanked the chancellor and the vice chancellor for their support of this meeting.

II. Call to Order

Elizabeth F. Desnoyers-Colas, USGFC Chair

EDC officially called the meeting to order at 8:54 AM.

III. Approval of the Agenda
Elizabeth F. Desnoyers-Colas, USGFC Chair

EDC asked for a motion to approve the agenda. Peggy Moch made a motion; Victoria Smith-Butler seconded. After no discussion, the council approved the agenda.

IV. Approval of the Minutes.
Previous Meeting, March 17, 2017, Elizabeth F. Desnoyers-Colas

EDC asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the previous meeting on March 17, 2017. Wendy Turner made a motion; Sarah Mergel seconded. After no discussion, the council approved the minutes.

V. Remarks (9:00 AM)

a. Elizabeth F. Desnoyers-Colas (EDC), USGFC Chair

- i. EDC asked those in attendance to introduce themselves; she then proceeded to her remarks by once again welcoming everyone to the meeting.
- ii. EDC said the year so far has been productive one for the council. She was proud to say through the electronic listserv the council had been doing a good job to move on issues at the request of the system office. She also noted the council was becoming a more relevant body through its listserv activity since faculty feel comfortable sharing their experiences and seeking input from other members.
- iii. EDC noted the challenge of cooperating across the different institutional missions. However, she pointed out the council worked to help inform the policy on Campus Carry and Title IX. She also would like to grow the role of the council, so its members can be more of a resource to the USG.

b. Dr. Steve Wrigley (SW), Chancellor

- i. SW thanked EDC and Juone Brown for coordinating the faculty council meeting; he also hoped the council members would take advantage of the opportunity to tour the campus to see the great things happening at FVSU.
- ii. SW addressed the on-going comprehensive administrative system review, which deals with issues across the system in terms of organization and process efficiency. The president from University of West Georgia has been chairing the committee. SW said the review is a major undertaking that will take about two to three years to complete. The goal is to make the system more efficient and more effective; hopefully, it will result financial savings that can be put back into the academic efforts of the system.
- iii. SW mentioned the College 2025 initiative where the system is studying how best to meet the educational needs of Georgia students.
- iv. SW said the "Momentum Year" initiative is designed to help improve retention and progression rates, but Dr. Tristan Denley would speak more on the issue.
- v. SW indicated the new legislative session will open soon, and the system office has been focusing on the budget and seeking full funding of the formula.
 1. SW said he is optimistic the legislature will do so, but he also noted nothing is ever certain. The state budget has not been finalized yet, and it will be the second week of January before the governor releases his budget recommendations.

2. SW did want to point out the request for FY19 is based on FY17 enrollment data. There was an enrollment increase that year, so the budget request for this years is larger than the past few years. He wanted the council to know the budget is the single most important piece of business the system office handles. Moreover, the situation in Georgia is better than other states in terms of state support, i.e., state funding for the system is higher than in other states.
 3. SW also said there will be a significant general obligation bond funding request to support campus construction projects. Usually the request is in the \$200 to \$220 million range, which does not go that far considering the need of campuses. The governor’s office allowed the system to make a request of \$360 million. SW did not know whether that amount will be funded, but he feels good about the request.
- vi. SW indicated the legislative session should also be exciting because it is an election year; however, he hopes the system will not be too involved in the controversial issues.
1. SW thought there might be some talk on issues of tuition, such as four-year tuition plans. The system office has spent a lot of time talking to legislators about the nature of tuition. USG tuition has gone up about 2 percent in the last few years, which is on par with inflation. The tuition for USG institutions is modest in comparison to other systems.
 2. Peggy Moch asked if there is anything faculty can do on their campuses to address this concern. SW thought the office had done a good job of mitigating individual legislator concerns, but tuition remains popular political issue. He suggested if faculty know their local legislators, they could raise the concern since most of them support their local institution and it would be good hear from people as far as how it might affect campuses. Joseph Hughes asked if the national trend for “free tuition” had hit Georgia. SW said he had not heard much about it here.
- vii. Timothy Brown asked about the future of MOWR.
1. The chancellor said the now rebranded “dual enrollment” is doing well in that participation is high and is growing both in the USG and in the TCSG. However, the funding formula means the expense is growing as well. He thought the program remains popular among students, but there are also clear issues to address with financing and there is an on-going audit report.
 2. Brown also mentioned some problems with implanting dual enrollment in terms of coordinating between the colleges and the high schools on accessibility issues particularly in courses offered fully in the high schools. SW suggested working at the institution level, but Brown thought the problems were possibly higher up. The representative from Kennesaw State mentioned they had some issues with accessibility, but they are working with the high schools on implementing a better plan. Tristan Denley said the obligations in the high school setting are slightly different from those at the college level. Marti Venn said that there were some concerns about quality issues as it pertained to courses offered strictly in the high schools.
 3. Brian Ring asked about how dual enrollment at TCSG is affecting core course offerings at system institutions. He wanted to know if the USG discusses this issue with the TCSG. SW said he talks with the TCSG regularly. To some extent, dual enrollment is probably affecting growth in some core courses. The USG is still seeing overall growth in its number of students; however, it is also seeing more students coming with 12 to 15 hours. SW said campuses need to look at how to see this an opportunity not a challenge. Students might still stay for four years because they have the option stay at system institution for a master’s degree. Peggy Moch

said high school counselors would prefer the students go to a USG institution not at TCSG institution and so the USG should try to do more to attract dual enrollment students

4. Another council member commented about the challenges for some USG institutions to keep dual enrollment students; it can be a lot of effort without any benefit in terms of RPG numbers. Tristan Denley mentioned that students who might not have been likely to go to college are using dual enrollment, and then are staying in college. Therefore, this service is a good one for students across the state no matter what institution they end up at. He did note the system needs to look at data to make sure all institutions are recognized for their contribution to the program, so it will not look badly on RPG for any institutions.

c. Dr. Tristan Denley (TD), Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer

- i. TD mentioned it was nice to meet members of the faculty council. He wanted to cover a couple of key issues in his remarks.
- ii. TD discussed the College 2025 initiative chaired by Dr. Kyle Marrero (West Georgia). The group includes faculty, students, administrators from student affairs and fiscal affairs and a number of industry partners. The composition of the committee was designed to get as many voices in the room as possible. The goal for College 2025 has not been to solve the problems but to provide some guidance.
 1. Looked at where higher education is headed not just what is right around the corner but what is coming in the future. Georgia has been out in front on many of the developments coming to higher education, but this committee has been looking at how the system can anticipate where it will need to be in 2025 and how it can position itself and shape the future. TD thought it has been a “cool” group to work with.
 2. Used technology to make sure the group is well informed about what is happening around the country while also seeking a variety of viewpoints.
 3. Led the group through a design thinking process on what will college be for in 2025 from the learners’ perspective and society’s perspective in order to determine common themes.
 4. Synthesized the work into three basic lenses: Adaptability, Essential Skills, and Life-Long Learning. TD suggested these are things that most people would come up with, but the meaning of the terms has been changing over time. For example, the system wants our degrees to be nimbler while also educating graduates who are adaptable to changes in the workplace.
- iii. TD addressed the key points of the Momentum Year initiative. He began by mentioning the system is handing in the CCG reports for 2016-2017 to the governor on December 2, 2017, which relates to the efforts of the initiative to look at RPG.
 1. CCG has increased the number of degrees by 18 percent overall and 40 percent for minority students, but there is still more to do. TD sees this effort as a means to take the learning from across the system because of CCG and apply the lessons more strategically to make further improvements in RPG.
 2. Effort is designed to help those students who do not know what they want to do. TD said indecision is an inherently human trait; many undecided students feel like they cannot make a well-informed choice (i.e., they suffer from choice overload/choice paralysis). Like most people, students who can choose later will choose later, which is especially true for minority and first generation students.

3. Evidence has suggested that choosing later does make a difference because most students drop out before they make a choice about a career path/major. TD would like to see more conversations about what students want to do because often times they do know, but they cannot articulate it. Institutions need to enable students to find their path to a degree through a new “on-boarding process” with some general direction to an area without a specific major (i.e., “flavor” undecided with a new element of orientation). USG institutions need a way to better use information to help students make better choices.
4. TD also noted when three of the ten courses a student takes in their first year are in their generally area, they are more likely to progress to degree. The “Gateways to Completion” project will be a way in which institutions can use modern pedagogy to help students be more successful in the foundational courses for their discipline. Unless faculty are able to really help students, those students will not be successful. He wanted to make sure the council members understood this initiative is not about making courses easier; he would like to see more not less rigor.
5. TD also spoke on how the system will go about doing this. In particular, he wants institutions to look at the social aspect of learning related to the growth mindset. Namely, faculty need to help students recognize they can learn new material. Faculty must assist students in thinking differently about themselves as learners.
6. Victoria Smith-Butler mentioned the faculty concern about how this reinforcing the area of interest in the first interest might affect students who change their majors. TD said students would not take upper division classes in their first year. Rather, the goal would be to emphasize courses that reinforce the major interest, but can still help them toward graduation. He mentioned first year seminar courses could help with this by grounding students in their interest area.
7. Another council member made a comment about prerequisites, and asked if this initiative would this facilitate the need for “principles” classes in different disciplines. TD mentioned that this initiative is more about examining how faculty deliver the information in first-year courses; he saw it as an opportunity for students to learn basic principles that would carry them through their other courses.
8. Timothy Brown asked whether the system was considering some mechanism to force students who are not successful in foundation courses to think about another major (i.e., a student who attempts a basic math course multiple times for a major that requires a significant amount of math). TD said the system was looking at a way to provide campuses with analytics information to assist in facilitating difficult conversations with students about other options. He indicated that he does not favor non-negotiable hurdles for foundational courses. Victoria Smith-Butler asked about a roll out date for this program; TD said he hopes it will be available in the spring.
9. Robert Scott commented that institutions need to find the balance between helping students find jobs and preparing students for the future; he believes the real need of institutions is to promote life-long learning to help students beyond their initial job. TD wanted to point out that each institution needs to know what its mission and vision are; the Momentum Year is not about making every USG institution the same. Some institutions are focused on students’ short-term needs whereas some institutions are focused students’ long-term needs.
10. Peggy Moch asked about the math/English hurdle, and its relationship to motivation. Specifically, she wanted to know if there would be an effort to help faculty understand why these pedagogical changes are necessary and to help faculty transition to different instructional approaches. TD said there absolutely needs to

be an effort to help faculty to see the need; the message must be shared with people on the front line. The Motivate Lab at UVA (<https://curry.virginia.edu/faculty-research/centers-labs-projects/research-labs/motivate-lab>) has been helping with educating faculty and staff on how to make these changes. The system has hosted summits with faculty and advisors who directly work with students. Juone Brown wanted to make sure faculty, staff, and administrators remember that teaching is a two-way process. She would like to avoid the tendency to get too wrapped up in the data; all parties need to remember the human element and the cultural component (Gagne's Nine Events of Instruction).

11. Zephy Okonkwo said regarding issues related to math instruction, he would like to see more efforts to focus on concepts that students will need for their discipline; in other words, cohort groups could help with allowing faculty to gear the content to what the students will need. TD said the system would like to see multiple opportunities for flavoring, without making it too specific to a discipline or a major so the course can still be transferable.
 12. Wendy Turner asked how the system or faculty could address issues with students who come in with the basic courses, hit a roadblock, and then quit school. TD said the system and its institutions needed to need to know more about why students make the choices they make. People are likely to choose something that is familiar. When we know more we can help students have an informed conversation about their future. Wendy Turner followed her question by asking about how to handle successful students who do not make it into programs with limited slots for students; TD said he recognized the need to deal with this as well.
- iv. TD wrapped up his remarks up by noting this will not be a one size fits all approach, but he did see it as system-wide approach based on common principles. He would like to see a good dialogue between faculty, staff, and the system office.
- d. Dr. Marti Venn (MV), Deputy Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
- i. MV wanted to provide some nuts and bolts comments, to follow up on TD's comments, and to address some of the lingering concerns from last year's meetings.
 - ii. MV would like by January to have in place an associate vice chancellor to deal with faculty development. The information/training coming out of the office will be focused on helping to facilitate the Momentum Year. Each campus will need to have some form of teaching and learning center; the office will look for ways to help those centers grow based on where they are in 2018. The office will consider the campus resources, and campuses can stabilize their current offerings or work to expand their offerings. There should also be an effort on campuses to look at how the annual evaluation process as well as the promotion/tenure process can align with this initiative to encourage faculty to participate.
 - iii. MV mentioned the on-going system-level policy review, which is a three-stage process. In the initial phase, the system has been looking at outdated language like the BOR approving faculty hires and language about the regent's exam. In the second phase, the system will look at more substantive changes such as the language on faculty and teaching and learning. The system would like to add two awards for faculty in the area of student success. MV asked the USGFC executive committee to create a small group of the council members to work her office on this initiative. In the final phase, the system will look at adding new policies. Similarly, the system would like to see input from the faculty council.
 - iv. MV outlined the new process for approving degrees. Notably, MV said new programs will not be accepted if they require 60 credits hours to achieve a degree since the system

requirement is 36 credit hours. The system would like to see institutions place more focus on transferability and concentrations. MV also noted there will be a change in how the system conducts program review; it will be a virtual review. She wanted to point out that faculty sitting on these review committees need to set aside loyalty to their institution and look at the bigger picture of how degrees and programs will benefit students in a particular region. In other words, faculty should look at whether the curriculum is built in such a way to help students move into a career. The system needs critical attention and thinking, not institutional perspective. Sarah Mergel asked if the shift in new program development will led to a review of existing programs on campuses; MV said yes it would, and the provosts are aware if this issue.

- v. MV addressed past concerns about deactivating low producing degree programs noting that low producing programs will now be looked at within a family of degrees. She gave the example of math, math education, and statistics; they will be collapsed into a group so less likely to appear on the list. The system office will also be visiting campuses to address questions about low producing programs in order to better understand the dynamics of those programs on the campus. Wendy Turner asked about support degrees; MV mentioned the system has recognized this issue and how it relates to faculty resources. TD said he sees this effort of grouping degrees as part of an effort to call a degree what it actually is.
- vi. Joseph Hughes mentioned that sometimes in trying to address an issue with a one size fits all approach can cause problems requiring exceptions. MV reinforced that the 60-hour rule does not apply to professional programs like nursing or engineering because of those degrees have specific requirements necessary for accreditation. Joseph Hughes wanted to know if there was any thought to make different policies for different institutions. TD said the goal was to craft a smarter system-level policy that can apply to all schools; he also thought there was a lot to be learned from the co-requisite model about creating for example a calculus pathway. He wants to see the creation of pathways that enable more students to complete degrees. MV also mentioned that with the one-step degree approval process the schools have the option to explain why they need more credits for a degree.

VI. Morning Discussion Items

- a. Implementation of Campus Carry (HB-20)
- b. Implementation of Shared Governance at the System Level (Ensuring Consistent Faculty Input)
- c. Process for Updating USG Policy Manuals and Handbooks
- d. Increasing Faculty Diversity
- e. Attracting / Keeping Qualified Faculty
 - i. Faculty Salaries
 - ii. Faculty Benefits (oneUSG benefits system/System Control)
- f. Taxing Tuition Waivers
- g. 15 + 1 Calendar Implementation
- h. Outside Activity Policy
- i. Presidential Selection Process
- j. Confederate Monuments on Campuses

After the remarks, Elizabeth F. Desnoyers-Colas shifted the focus to the morning discussion items. Given the limited time remaining with the chancellor and the vice chancellor, she asked for more information about campus carry as well as looking at how the faculty can be used earlier in the process for policy

development (shared governance). EDC noted that faculty are experts in their fields, but feel estranged from the policy developments at the system-level. Additionally, she recognized the faculty played a role in the RACs, but the focus there was more on academic programs, which she saw as a different area of concern.

In terms of shared governance, Marti Venn noted the provosts have expressed some of the same concern as the faculty as far as being asked for input only after changes have been proposed. The policies currently under review are some of the more basic policies that needed little updating; the next round will require more in-depth study which was why she asked for a small working group from the council to provide faculty views on those policies before they are revised. She also mentioned the system saw a role for the faculty council in the development of new policies. Tristan Denley reinforced the notion in the next round of policy updates would be more formative in order to help the system become more forward looking. Scott Pegan asked about the composition of this committee; Marti Venn said the system would like representation from the different sectors with possibly five to six people. Steve Wrigley also pointed out that current the policy review really is designed to streamline the policy not change the meaning of existing policies. EDC said she would put out a call for volunteers.

EDC asked about whether it would be possible to have a faculty member on the BOR. Steve Wrigley noted the governor appoints the members of the BOR, so the chancellor does not have much control over changing the composition to include a faculty member or a student (which the students have asked for). A faculty representative mentioned that about fifteen years ago the legislature discussed a bill to add faculty to the BOR, but it did not go anywhere. Richard Scott asked if the BOR could on their own decide to have a faculty or student liaison to serve as a non-voting member. SW said he did not know if it was possible or if a liaison would do more than effective communication between the USGFC and the BOR would do. Victoria Smith-Butler expressed a desire among faculty council members to become more proactive instead of reactive. Steve Wrigley thought this shift would require more of a time commitment from people on the faculty council. Brian Ring asked if there was a time when the system office met regularly that a member of faculty council could attend so as to pass along important information to the council. EDC mentioned more regular communication between the vice chancellor and the council, which she would provide more information on later in the day.

EDC asked about the presidential selection process, especially whether the process for hiring new presidents had changed since comments made at the USGFC meeting in Fall 2016. Steve Wrigley said the policy is still to do a national search, but faculty need to understand national searches are not always feasible. He gave the example of the South Georgia State College where he appointed a president after talking to the campus community. His decision took into consideration the situation on the campus. The chancellor also mentioned the faculty do play a role when there are searches as well as when an appointment is made. Richard Scott asked should the faculty council could have a role in determining whether there should be a national search for an institution president. Steve Wrigley said no because the decision should come from the governing body of the institution (i.e., the USG office).

EDC then brought up concerns about faculty diversity and the efforts to keep qualified faculty. The faculty council would like to see system institutions do more to build a diverse faculty across a broad spectrum (i.e., race, ethnicity, gender, political views, etc.). She asked if the USG would consider a policy to target developing a more diverse workforce. Victoria Smith-Butler mentioned the pre-consolidation policy at Darton State where every search committee has someone on the committee with training in looking past implicit bias. She thought it would be an amazing thing if the program could go system wide. EDC said Harvard University and the University of Washington have excellent program for diversity recruitment training, and the USG lags in how it recruits for broad diversity. Steve Wrigley said

he understood the desire to recruit all perspectives as opposed to exclude certain perspectives. He could envision something like that in the policy revision process (in the third phase). Celeste Walley-Jean also suggested avoiding having just one person on a committee with an understanding of implicit bias; a whole search committee needs to be better trained.

Timothy Brown mentioned a concern about the conversion to OneUSG and flexibility for faculty as it related to worked hours. Juone Brown further explained the move to OneUSG, especially the recording of hours worked, has translated into a literal reading of faculty recording their time worked. Steve Wrigley, Tristan Denley, and Marti Venn did not realize this was happening on campuses in the first phase of the roll out. Denley thought the central human resources office probably needed to talk to human resource personnel and provosts on campuses about managing this process. Juone Brown also said when it comes to issues like OneUSG implementation, faculty seem to be the last campus constituency to know about how system-level changes are affecting them. Steve Wrigley said something is breaking down and that is a concern. Marti Venn said human resources office across the system were supposed to disseminate information on the OneUSG initiative, but such a policy runs counter to the normal way in which faculty receive information. Brian Ring mentioned that at Valdosta they have been actively working to deal with issues as the transition happens, which in turn should help institutions in the later phases of the roll out. Scott Pegan also mentioned faculty at his institution have been told by human resources they can no longer make purchases related to their grants because of system policy.

Joseph Hughes also wanted to raise a concern that because of OneUSG and other system-level benefits changes the faculty benefits committee at Georgia Tech no longer has ability to tailor the benefits to attract faculty. Steve Wrigley said that OneUSG is simply a process to record information, but that is different from the basic benefit package offered to system employees. Several years ago, the system created a benefits advisory committee (the Total Rewards Steering Committee) to look into expanding the system-wide offerings for benefits. Before the current model, individual institutions made their own arrangements for things like dental and vision coverage. Many of those packages were not all that great; Wrigley noted the system-level benefits have been better for most employees. The system went through the centralization process to have the benefit of scale, and the Total Rewards Steering Committee would be the group to take concerns about the benefits not helping to attract faculty.

Prior to leaving, Steve Wrigley thanked the council for the opportunity to speak with the members about the important issues raised; he also mentioned that he was looking forward to the spring meeting. Finally, he asked the USGFC to look at issues related to lowering textbook costs since that is another barrier to completion for some students.

VII. Reports

- a. Elizabeth F. Desnoyers-Colas, USGFC Chair
 - i. EDC provided an update on some of the council operations; she noted the monthly conference call with the vice chancellor. She asked council members to keep questions and concerns coming through the listserv. And, she encouraged council members to reach out directly to the system office with issues specifically related to their institutions.
 - ii. EDC wanted to remind council members everyone serving on the council a responsibility to disseminate information to their home campuses from the meetings and through the listserv. In cases where there are time constraints, the executive committee sometimes provides feedback and then informs the members of the council.

- iii. EDC mentioned how very excited she is to have the opportunity to participate in the policymaking process. She asked council members to consider volunteering or to recommend someone on their campus who is willing to report the information back to the faculty council. The goal is to share information as much as possible.
 - iv. EDC has found the College 2025 to be an enlightening experience. She went in with the attitude of what will the faculty be expected to do and how will the system support the faculty to do so. She revealed the possibility of more coordination of off-campus opportunities with businesses who might need training in a certain area. She referenced one discussion about individualized instruction for students in a class to help meet the needs of students. The faculty on the committee said students need to develop people skills to communicate in the college environment as well as beyond.
 - v. EDC mentioned the council is working on the spring meeting date. The council voted a year or so ago to have the fall meeting on a campus and the spring meeting at the USG office. The benefit of holding a meeting at the system office is it allows more people from the office to provide different perspectives. EDC also said the schedule of the chancellor and the vice chancellor's schedule drive the date. Scott Pegan asked council members to think about whether their institution would be able to host the Fall 2018 meeting.
 - vi. Celeste Walley-Jean asked how the council works to get to a common faculty perspective so as to address issues with one voice. EDC said the chair has traditionally tried to think about the common themes, or they will ask for feedback from all the representatives or those on campuses most affected by developing issues. The agenda items for the council meetings tend to be collective issues.
- b. Robert Scott (RS), AAUP Update
- i. RS mentioned the AAUP is the one organization the faculty have independent of their disciplines. There is a national organization, regional subsets, and state chapters. Colleges can have a chapter if there are seven AAUP members on a campus.
 - ii. AAUP has a fall and spring meeting. They also recently hosted a regional AAUP presidents meeting since southern colleges and universities face common issues as far as the working climate (i.e., right to work, etc.). The cross-region and cross-state operation can help in dealing with concerns of faculty.
 - iii. AAUP has a national meeting in June, and the organization does at time take positions on national issues positions and it lobbies on the behalf of all faculty. For example, the AAUP has done a position paper on the proposed national tax reform law and its impact on graduate school. Additionally, the AAUP has summer workshops on the development of effective faculty manuals and shared governance systems.
 - iv. The core mission of the AAUP is to support academic freedom for faculty as well as looking for ways to help faculty, especially those who do not have tenure or do not work at institutions with tenure, to achieve the benefits of tenure as far as academic freedom goes. AAUP also wants to ensure the faculty have the right and the ability to craft educational programs to attract students. Students do not come to college for the director of admissions, etc.
 - v. AAUP can act as a policy body, which the faculty council cannot really do. The organization has a voice with the legislature through a paid lobbyist. RS mentioned the more members the AAUP has, the more pull it will have with legislators.
 - vi. Someone asked a question about the Texas gun control law and the court case relating to the laws impact on academic freedom. RS said nothing has changed at this point. He asked

Steve Anthony, a retired Georgia State faculty member, who works as the AAUP lobbyist in Georgia to provide more information on the AAUP's legislative agenda.

1. Steve Anthony mentioned in addition to the Texas case there is an injunction request regarding the Georgia law, but he does not think the court will issue an injunction. He has been trying to schedule a meeting with the chancellor to discuss the future of the gun law and its implementation on USG campuses. Anthony mentioned at this point it does not look like the legislature plans to broaden the gun law (i.e., it could be worse).
2. He said the budget is coming in late, and it is likely tied to what is happening in Washington with the proposed tax law and budget discussions. He noted over the past few years the General Assembly had been stingier with the budget for the system because of positions taken on the campus carry law. He particularly wanted council members to know about the agenda of Earl Ehrhart, the general assembly representative who controls the budget, as his efforts have tended to have a negative impact on higher education.
3. He updated the council on H.B. 218, a proposal to allow faculty to make a one-time move from the Optional Retirement Plan to the Teacher Retirement System. Stacy Evans introduced the measure before she resigned her seat in the legislature to run for governor. The bill had a favorable audit report, and he hopes it will be passed in the upcoming legislative session. However, the past struggle for H.B. 218 has been that faculty asked for ORP a number of years ago (before the 2008 financial crisis), and some in the legislature are suspicious of the desire to change in light of the financial crisis' impact on retirement savings. Peggy Moch asked if there would be a cost to the employee to move from ORP to TRS. Anthony said employees would have to buy into TRS, but he and Marti Venn said employees could use ORP money to buy-in to TRS.
4. Finally, Anthony mentioned the AAUP Georgia website has tons of information of interest to faculty working in the state. He reiterated the need for faculty to join the organization because faculty are under attack. No one in the legislature will speak for faculty; some members would even be willing to do away with higher education or at least state support of higher education.

c. Mildred (Missy) Cody, USG Retiree Council Update

- i. Missy Cody said system retirees are now also using OneUSG, and in recent months the Retiree Council has made a concerted effort to locate retirees to ensure everyone registers for OneUSG. She noted that not all the information from ADP transferred automatically into OneUSG including bank/payment information; all retirees need to be integrated into the new system to ensure continuation of benefits.
- ii. She also noted the Retiree Council is looking to improve the pre-retiree information through printed literature and webinars, which is an important step to help transition into retirement, especially to ensure a continuation of healthcare.
- iii. She said that people can find representative information on the USG retiree council webpage. The Retiree Council would like to reiterate its previous request for a member of the USGFC to serve as a non-voting member of their council and she recommended having an alternative to serve as well.

VIII. Old Business

a. Summer Pay Study – Scott Pegan, University of Georgia

- i. Scott Pegan went over the current system policy on the 33-1/3 percent cap on summer pay, which will be addressed as a separate point. He then went over his effort to collect information about how institutions pay faculty for summer work. Of the institutions that responded (and about 50 percent did), policies varied very dramatically in terms of how institutions compensate faculty for summer teaching. Some had quite prescriptive policies and some had no policies.
- ii. As the council moved forward on this issue vis-à-vis possible recommendations, he indicated the members needed to decide whether it was possible to create a standard USG policy for all institutions and absent that what aspects could be standardized.
 1. Peggy Moch said when the council first began to discuss the issue of summer pay it related more to how summer pay related to grant money. Scott Pegan said he was looking more at the general policies on summer pay especially as it related to teaching especially when faculty begin to teach a course that is later cancelled.
 2. Brian Ring said the council also needed to look at the difference between credit hours and contact hours if it wanted to create a policy.
 3. Timothy Brown reminded everyone this particular conversation (separate from the grant money question) started with people asking questions about what happened on different campuses.
 4. Wendy Turner pointed out summer semesters need be self-supporting for USG institutions; therefore, standardizing would be impossible because each campus needs to meet their expenses. She thought the faculty council could recommendations dealing with issues of faculty not being compensated since the real issue is about ensuring fair compensation for work done. Joseph Hughes also expressed concern about attempts to standardized policy since institutions are so different.
- iii. EDC asked the council to identify what possible things could be standardized.
 1. The council discussed credit hours and contact hours as well as the possibility of a minimum standard or no less than a percentage of pay.
 2. Juone Brown mentioned framing the discussion in a way the BOR, the system office, and individual administrations could understand. She thought the data from a recent Carl Vincent study on workload (as it related to rank, length of service, etc.) could help draw out the connection between summer pay and PRG (a key component of the salary study).
 3. Timothy Brown said the council could focus on standardizing when faculty receive notification of their summer salary (i.e., creating a deadline for when a faculty will be informed of their guaranteed summer pay). Wendy Turner said the contract should come before the semester starts; faculty should not be paid for course preparation. Juone Brown said that on some campuses faculty start to teach a course and then it is cancelled midway through so the faculty are not paid for teaching the course.
 4. Peggy Moch said given all the issues raised by council members that maybe standardization of anything related to summer pay could make the situation worse.
 5. Scott Pegan said there is a trend to move toward more summer classes, but other representatives indicated that was not the case at their institutions.
- iv. Given the complicated nature of the issue and the need for more discussion, Sarah Mergel made a motion to create a committee to discuss a resolution on summer pay so as to

standardize some of the policies relating to fair compensation. Juone Brown seconded. Further discussion followed, and the council approved the motion.

- v. Scott Pegan, Wendy Turner, and Brian Ring agreed to serve on the committee.
- b. Resolution on Summer Pay – Victoria Butler and Richard Forman
- i. Victoria Smith-Butler said that Richard Forman conducted research into the policy related to capping summer salary at 33-1/3 percent of a faculty member’s annual salary. Forman found the system policy on 33-1/3 percent was originally based on federal policies related to grant money; namely, the government did not want to pay more than 33 1/3 to avoid widely varying rates related to research. Based on how the USG wrote its own interpretation of the federal guidelines, most institutions apply the rule to faculty even when their summer pay has nothing to do with federal grants.
 - ii. Forman noted there was never any intention of the federal government to deal with teaching and administration. The goal of the proposed resolution is to stop system institutions from applying the rule to work outside of grant-funded research. The federal government did not create the policy to determine how much money faculty could make, but rather to determine how much it pays researchers.
 - iii. Based on the proposed resolution, someone asked a question about what the policy should say. Forman said it was not appropriate to write the BOR policy.
 - iv. Wendy Turner made a motion to accept the proposed resolution; Victoria Smith Butler seconded. Discussion followed about the proposed working of the resolution, especially as it related to the recommendation the faculty wanted to make.
 - 1. Josephine Davis asked if the resolution should have some clarification by way of explanation of the resolution since as proposed the resolution referenced an attached document.
 - 2. Scott Pegan mentioned that the federal government has already made these changes. Institutions should be aware of this.
 - 3. Zephy Okonkwo raised a concern that by taking away the 33 1/3 it would drop the minimum. EDC and Victoria Smith-Butler explained the goal was to remove the current maximum as institutions under the current policy can pay up to 33-1/3 but not over that amount. EDC read the current language in the Section 8.3.12.3 of the BOR Policy Manual in an attempt to clarify the situation.
 - 4. After revising the last sentence of the resolution, Wendy Turner accepted the friendly amendment. Victoria Smith-Butler made a motion to call the question; Amanda Urquhart seconded.
 - v. EDC then informed the council it would vote on whether to support the revised resolution, and the council approved the resolution (see Exhibit A).
- c. Committee on Consolidation – Victoria Smith Butler, Albany State University
- i. Victoria Smith-Butler said she is still looking for volunteers to serve on the committee on consolidation.
 - ii. She went over the phases of consolidation. She asked for a show of hands from those who have been through consolidation. She believes this committee will help to draw a list of common concerns.
 - iii. Marti Venn asked for the committee to organizing the report by issue to help the deal with the concerns.

- iv. Consolidation Committee: Victoria Smith Butler, Brian Ring, Tim Brown, and Sarah Mergel. This committee will work to compile a list of faculty concerns about the consolidation process to help inform future transitions.
- d. Committee on Administrative Staffing/Administration Evaluations
- i. Juone Brown did not have much by way of update because she too is still looking for volunteers for these committees.
 - ii. Brian Ring asked about what administrative staffing meant. Juone Brown said the committee was designed to study the growth of administration vis-à-vis faculty. Brian Ring asked why we did not combine the two committees; Juone Brown and EDC thought they were to separate issues. He wanted to know if these committees had a specific charged, such as fact-finding.
 - iii. Joseph Hughes said these committees also needed to look at how administrator is defined because lots of people have administrative responsibility. Zephy Okonkwo thought as faculty the issue of administrators is really about who is above them in academic affairs. EDC and Scott Pegan thought each committee should decide who to look at.
 - iv. Juone Brown shared the BOR policy on consolidation as it related to staffing because she sees its information on administration staffing relevant to questions of how all institutions in the system operate. it relates to operation. The faculty council needs to be realistic as far as dealing with the expansion and evaluation of administration.
 - v. Staffing Committee Members: Juone Brown (chair), Michael Lewis, Peggy Moch, and Joseph Hughes. This committee will look at the expansion of administration and how it relates to the ability of faculty to meet the needs of the students they serve.
 - vi. Evaluation Committee Members: Brian Ring (chair), Robert Scott, MJ Weintraub, Celeste Wally Jean, and Babs Onabango. This committee will engage in fact-finding about how faculty evaluate administrators.
- e. USGFC Representative for Retiree Council
- i. EDC asked for volunteers to email her.

IX. New Business

- a. TRS Resolution
- i. Brian Ring said at VSU a faculty member came to their senate with a resolution to update the policy on sick leave in ORP, namely to treat it the same as it is treated in TRS (where faculty are paid for their sick leave when they retire). The resolution essentially “implores” the chancellor to encourage the state legislature to make this change (see Exhibit B).
 - ii. Robert Scott asked if this was something that required the legislature to pass a law or this was something the BOR or the system office can change. Marti Venn said she would find out at the system level who as the authority to make a change such as this one.
 - iii. Taylor Smith thought the resolution should ask for something more specific (i.e., for compensation for sick leave in ORP). PM mentioned the faculty member who brought the issue and the resolution to the VSU senate thought the vague language was best.
 - iv. Joseph Hughes said the council needed more information to move on this issue. Taylor Smith made a motion to table the issue until the spring council meeting. Scott Pegan seconded. The motion passed.

b. Bylaws Updates

- i. Juone Brown said the council needs to look at the bylaws. Joseph Hughes, Robert Scott, and Juone Brown agreed to look at the current bylaws and get feedback about possible changes.
- ii. Peggy Moch said this committee should be become a standing committee of the council. Robert Scott said that would require a change to the bylaws. Joseph Hughes said he would put that on the committee list.
- iii. Juone Brown also wanted to ensure that the revised bylaws looked at when the committees meet in order to ensure continued improvement in how the faculty council operates. She sees these changes as helping to make the council more effective.

c. Other Issues

- i. Scott Pegan wanted to emphasize that as a council we need to think about how to make this council more permanent and relevant. Beyond the two meetings a year, it will take an effort on the part of all the members. This move reflects an effort by the current executive council. MJ Weintraub commented that institutions needed to ensure continuity of membership, and perhaps that could appear in the revised bylaws.
- ii. Victoria Smith-Butler mentioned that the faculty council has no real budget; to become more relevant, the council should consider a resolution to request money from the USG for travel and professional development. Marti Venn said not to wait until spring, but to send a budget her office so she can make it part of her request to the chancellor for the upcoming year.
- iii. Peggy Moch updated the council on the faculty participation on the system-wide wellness advisory committee. She and Sarah Mergel, who represent the council on the committee, will provide updates as more information on the wellness initiative becomes available.

X. Adjourn

- a. Victoria Smith-Butler made a motion to adjourn the meeting; Wendy Turner seconded. The meeting officially adjourned at 3:00 PM.

Exhibit A

USG FACULTY COUNCIL RESOLUTION (DECEMBER 2017)

- WHEREAS, BOR Policy 8.3.12.3 regarding the 33 1/3% maximum limit to academic year (AY) faculty summer compensation was originally developed in response to Federal Government concerns which ultimately became part of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-21
- WHEREAS, the Federal Policy A-21 portion pertaining to summer faculty compensation (now located within OMB Policies 2 CFR, Parts 215 and 220) was revised in 2013 to remove the 33 1/3% wording in an attempt to make its intent and scope more clear than did the previous language
- WHEREAS, the policies in 2 CFR, Parts 215 and 220 are meant only to restrict federally sponsored research activity compensation over summer, and not to impact teaching or other activities
- WHEREAS, BOR Policy 8.3.12.3 is applied too broadly, and to activities never meant to be restricted by the Federal Policy A-21
- WHEREAS, applying BOR Policy 8.3.12.3 in the manner it has been enforced since 1985 limits USG institutions from offering the entirety of summer course offerings that enrollment may potentially require in any given summer due to the restrictions on faculty compensation during that period
- WHEREAS, limiting course offerings may prevent USG students from graduating as rapidly as they might otherwise do
- WHEREAS, limiting student progress is contrary to 'Complete College Georgia' and our responsibilities to our students
- WHEREAS, a modified, correctly focused policy would allow USG institutions the flexibility needed to offer summer courses in the number and manner which would most benefit their students and enhance graduation rates throughout the system
- THEREFORE, be it resolved that the USG Faculty Council calls for BOR Policy 8.3.12.3 be removed; and that the related Business Procedures Policy 5.3.4 be eliminated.

**Proposed USG Faculty Council
Resolution
(December 2017)**

WHEREAS, University System of Georgia employees, who have accumulated sick leave, have redeemed such accumulation under the TRS program upon their retirement.

WHEREAS, University System of Georgia employees, who have also accumulated sick leave do not have the same benefit to redeem such accumulation under the ORP program.

WHEREAS, employees should be rewarded for consistent job attendance and there should be no inequity or discrimination in recognizing loyal and faithful service.

THEREFORE, University System of Georgia ORP employees should equitably be given the same benefit to redeem accumulated sick leave upon retirement.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the **UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA FACULTY COUNCIL**, to request the Chancellor of the University System of Georgia to pursue this resolution before the **BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA**.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the **UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA FACULTY COUNCIL**, to implore the Chancellor of the University System of Georgia to contact the state legislators representing the University System of Georgia to pursue legislation in support of this resolution.

SO RESOLVED, this _____ day of _____, 2018