

UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA (USG) FACULTY COUNCIL

April 27, 2018
University System of Georgia Office
270 Washington Street, SW
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

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: Joya Hicks, Jennifer Purcel; University of West Georgia: Julia Farmer; Valdosta State University: Brian Ring; Albany State University: Zephy Okonkwo; Georgia Southern University: Elizabeth Desnoyers-Colas; Clayton State University: J. Celeste Walley-Jean; Columbus State University: Neal Thomson; Fort Valley State University: Juone Brown; Georgia College & State University: Alex Blazer, Glynnis Haley; Georgia Southwestern State University: Chadwick Gugg; Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College: Amanda Urquhart; Atlanta Metropolitan State College: Babs Onabanjo; Dalton State College: Sarah Mergel; Georgia Gwinnett College: Beth Cavalier; Gordon State College: Jeremy Richards; South Georgia State College: Frank Pridemore; AAUP: Robert Scott; USG Retiree Council: Mildred (Missy) Cody; USG: Steve Wrigley, Tristan Denley, Karin Elliot, Marti Venn

Minutes

I. Welcome (8:45 AM)

Dr. Elizabeth F. Desnoyers-Colas, USGFC Chair, Georgia Southern University Armstrong Campus

Elizabeth F. Desnoyers-Colas (EDC) welcomed all the participants to the meeting at the system office. She also thanked the staff in Atlanta for helping to facilitate the meeting arrangements.

II. Call to Order

Elizabeth F. Desnoyers-Colas, USGFC Chair

Having established a quorum, EDC called the meeting to order at 8:49 AM.

III. Approval of the Agenda

Elizabeth F. Desnoyers-Colas, USGFC Chair

EDC asked for a motion to approve the agenda. Julie Farmer made a motion; Brian Ring seconded. After no discussion, the council unanimously approved the agenda.

IV. Approval of the Minutes

Previous Meeting, December 1, 2017, Elizabeth F. Desnoyers-Colas

EDC asked if everyone had a chance to read to the minutes; she then asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Wendy Turner made a motion; Celeste Walley-Jean seconded. After no discussion, the council unanimously approved the minutes.

V. Remarks (9:00 AM)

a. Elizabeth F. Desnoyers-Colas, USGFC Chair

- i. EDC once again welcomed everyone to the meeting; she then asked all the participants to introduce themselves.
- ii. EDC began by mentioning what a privilege it had been to serve in the capacity as chair for during this busy year.
- iii. EDC explained how the new executive committee worked to address faculty concerns in the wake of the passage of the campus carry law over the summer and into the fall. Simultaneously, the chancellor and vice chancellor also changed. She felt the council worked successfully with the system office to help faculty adjust to and manage conceal carry. EDC also mentioned the vice chancellor was very receptive to faculty input on the issue.
- iv. EDC noted in the last year, the council has pushed for and received more faculty representation on system-level committees. The council voice definitely has become louder at the system level, but it could still be more so.
- v. Finally, EDC said the council more productive than ever, and she hopes it can continue to be an active voice for system faculty.

b. Dr. Steve Wrigley, Chancellor

- i. Steve Wrigley (SW) mentioned how delighted he was to once again meet with the USGFC because meeting with the council is very important for his team as it provides an opportunity to learn more about faculty concerns.
- ii. SW also pointed out the good work Tristan Denley is doing with the campuses to promote and implement the Momentum Year since it rounds out the Complete College Georgia initiative. Furthermore, he firmly believes in these efforts to promote success because the project is very student focused. He noted the Board of Regents supports it as well. Finally, SW would like to encourage the council to be involved in the process.
- iii. The legislative session ended about a month ago, and SW wanted to highlight a few items of interest to the USG.
 1. The legislature fully funded the enrollment funding formula. In fact, the enrollment and capital budgets are larger than they have ever been for the USG.
 2. The legislature did not fund the employer portion of the health care premium (which amounts to approximately \$7-\$8 million); the state is moving away from funding health insurance premium for all state employees as a separate budget item. The legislature maintains the entity should fund health care from the allocation in main budget.
 3. The legislature did not provide funding for a pay increase for system employees, which was a major disappointment for the system office. The governor came out against supporting raises because of his concerns about revenue growth. At the same time, the state also needed to infuse money into the Teacher Retirement System and Employee

Retirement System. Any possible money for raises went to fund to shore up the retirement systems.

4. SW noted his office continues to emphasize the need for pay increases; however, the state would need \$140 million needed to fund a 1 percent increase for system faculty/staff as well as public school teachers. SW also noted individual campuses could decide for the upcoming academic year to fund pay increases internally through its allocation or other financial resources. Some campuses will provide increases and some campuses will not.
 5. The legislature passed a free speech bill (SB 339) relating to free speech, particularly the heckling of speakers on campuses and allowing groups to obtain permits to speak on campuses. SW indicated the language in the final bill did not really change how the system office or the campuses are dealing with the issue since the Board of Regents updated its policy last year.
- iv. SW is anxiously awaiting the College 2025 report to see what it recommends the system institutions consider so as to meet the needs of today's students and tomorrow's students. He also mentioned it is important for the system to regularly reflect on what it does since the state is changing, the demography is changing, and the students are changing. Collectively the system office and individual institutions need to factor those changes into their thinking when it comes to awarding financial aid, admitting students, and educating students.
 - v. SW noted the comprehensive administrative review (CAR) is well underway. The purpose of the initiative is to look at ways to improve the process while also saving money. The system office and every campus is going or will through the process with the help of a consultant. The system office is presently going through the implementation phase. SW said the issue of administrative review, while not fun or exciting, is important especially when making the case of funding to the governor and the legislature (i.e., when asking for more money it is helpful to show conscious efforts to economize).
 - vi. The chancellor then took questions from the council members some of which related to the morning discussion items.
 1. Juone Brown wanted to thank the chancellor because the faculty at Fort Valley State University were pleased to see the institution's budget had not been cut (as the faculty had expected). She asked how the change came about. SW mentioned FVSU has worked hard to grow enrollment. He also noted that every campus needs to be mindful that it cannot spend more than it takes in.
 2. EDC asked the chancellor if there had been any change to how the system planned to handle future presidential searches (especially since Georgia Southern might have to go through one in the near future). She worried specifically about the impact rotating upper administration had for the campus community in terms of keeping the continuity. SW reiterated that the system's default for presidential searches is a nationwide search, but in some circumstances or situations a search does not make sense. When an institution struggles with enrollment or financial issues, the presidential position might not attract qualified candidates. Moreover, searches take time and money and for some institutions providing stable leadership is more important. SW also said he does not like long interim presidencies.
 3. Wendy Turner asked what the system is doing to help employees with the optional retirement plan (ORP) especially since the state address concerns about TRS whereas

the system contribution has been flat for several years. Before addressing the question, SW provided a brief overview of the difference between TRS (a defined benefit plan) and ORP (a defined contribution plan). The state's financial relationship to supporting those plans is different. That said, every three years, the system office reviews the contribution to ORP, and it has had conversations about increasing the funding. The chancellor also noted that TIAA told him the employer contribution for system employees is higher than many other employer contributions.

4. Wendy Turner asked a follow up question about the proposal before the legislature to allow people in ORP to make a one-time switch to TRS (a bill discussed at the previous meeting). SW said he did not foresee the legislature supporting the bill. In the last legislative session, the proposed bill did not make it out of committee.
 5. Robert Scott asked when the system office would begin crafting a policy to implement the newly passed free-speech bill and would the faculty be included in that process. SW said the system office already had a policy in place that meets the requirements of the legislation. Question: When the process to create a policy on free speech as defined by the bill, will the faculty be included. Should the situation change, SW said he is amenable to including faculty members in the discussion.
 6. Brian Ring asked a question about the changes in the tuition rate for online classes. SW said the recent change designed to charge the same rate for face-to-face classes as online classes came in large part because the governor and legislatures were asking questions and the differential. SW said when online courses first because charging more made sense; however, doing so makes less sense as online education spreads. (FYI: Originally, the system planned to have institutions charge the same amount for face-to-face and online; however, the decreases will now be phased in.)
 7. Joseph Hughes noted understands the pressures the system is facing related to affordability, but he wanted to know if the system office does look or planned to look at undergraduate and graduate tuition differently. SW said the system office does look at the differences. While some graduate students receive funding through grants thereby feeling the increases less, other graduate students pay out of pocket so tuition increases are harmful. At the same time, he believes going forward the system will need to do more to differentiate between grad/undergrad, in-state/out-of-state, fees, etc. in terms of pricing strategy.
 8. Neal Thomson wanted to know why the border state waiver policy applied only to undergraduate tuition. SW said the purpose of the tuition waivers is to increase undergraduate recruitment. The decision is not universally liked, especially by the legislature, so the USG is cautious about expanding the waivers. Members of the state legislature do not think waiving out-of-state tuition makes any difference in enrollment.
- vii. Before the chancellor had to leave for another meeting, EDC wanted to bring up two of the morning discussion items: textbook initiatives and focus on faculty.
1. SW said Tristan Denley had kept him up-to-date on the council's work in looking at open textbook usage. He also said he hopes to see students at USG institutions be able to earn a degree without having to buy a textbook. He knows it is an ambitious goal; however, any decrease in costs for students is a gain as far as student completion. SW

reiterated asking faculty to consider lower cost resources is not about invading the space of faculty, but rather, it is about lowering the costs of higher education.

- a. Celeste Walley-Jean mentioned a colleague's concern that students will pick their course based on the cost of the textbook. She wanted to know if the chancellor had an advice for how the council can help convince colleagues to see the value in looking for lower cost options. SW was not sure why this should be an issue, because the old model of textbook selection and pricing is hard to defend. Sarah Mergel pointed out this faculty concern might not just be about a lack of willingness to change resources. Some faculty, who have concluded the best resource for their students is not an open resource, might lose students to faculty using an open resource. In summer sessions, where enrollment really matters faculty could then lose out on income.
 - b. Julia Farmer asked whether telling students they do not have to pay for a textbook might lead to complaints about fees or supplies; SW said communication is key in terms of setting expectations for students about the costs they face.
 - c. Babs Onabanjo mentioned an initiative on his campus where faculty are working with publishers to allow students to pay for one book and have access to all the books in the publisher's catalog. He wanted to know if the system had considered something like that as a low-cost option. SW asked Tristan Denley to explain the publisher partner program the system office has been looking into. He said the system has been in discussion with publishers to offer \$35 digital textbooks for use across the system. In the plan, the digital textbook chosen by the faculty member (from one of the participating publishers) would be available in D2L at the start of the semester. Students would have to opt out within the first two weeks or pay for the book. Denley recommended campuses not try to negotiate these agreements since publishers are most likely to provide the best price to a larger audience. The system is trying to use its scale and weight to reduce costs. Scott Pegan asked how many different publishers the system talked to as part of the initiative because he worried if all publishers participated then none would really have an incentive to keep the costs down. Denley said he believes that the four publishers main will likely participate if it means continued sales, but he also wants to create a system where everyone would want to participate.
 - d. Joya Hicks also mentioned council members could encourage faculty to work with the bookstore and the library. If faculty build those relationships, then they can together to work to find resources. Zephy Okonkwo mentioned that many faculty are working through the ALG system to develop resources. He also mentioned faculty, not textbooks, are responsible for achieving the course outcomes (i.e., faculty should be able to work with most books).
2. Juone Brown took a few minutes to explain the "focus on faculty" initiative the council wants to promote in the coming year. She wants to enlist the system office support, perhaps in the area of advertising, to promote the idea that USG institutions have some of the best faculty in the state and the country.

- a. SW agreed that faculty and their contributions to education is important. However, as faculty, institutions, and the system address the topic, they need to be mindful of the factors that contributed to the negative image of faculty/high education. While the images are unfair, but they are somewhat rooted in the reality. The system is trying to change the reality (by looking for ways to make quality education more affordable and adaptable) in order to change the image.
- b. EDC reported that she mentioned the initiative to said she mentioned the initiative to Charlie Sutlive, the Vice Chancellor for Communications, and they have started conversation about what the stakeholders want to see. SW reiterated that he recognizes faculty work hard and are good at what they do. The focus needs to be on the relevance of faculty.
- c. Scott Pegan mentioned a possible engagement piece in coordination with the system office where legislators could come to the campus and see what is happening. SW said that should happen at the campus not system level. He recommended that faculty council representatives and senates work with their president or government relations on ways for the local legislators to get to know the faculty and vice versa.
- d. Joseph Hughes asked how does the system attract the best faculty. He has heard from several places that professional development opportunities would help, but he worries about the competitiveness because of salary. SW again thought institutions should engage in initiatives where legislators get to see faculty as real people with real issues, problems, and concerns.
- e. Juone Brown asked if the system could do more advertising through social media to highlight faculty in a way to attract students. SW said they have discussed it at the system level, but at the same time they are not sure if it would be effective because people do not know what the USG is. The system office has encouraged individual campuses to put resources into advertising (though he knows in time so shrinking budgets advertising dollars often are reallocated).

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

- i. Tristan Denley (TD) began by thanking the council for helping make his transition go smoothly. He is just finishing his first year with the system office and has appreciated the opportunity to visit almost all the campuses. In his visits, he has sought to get a feeling for each campus. He waited until September 2017 to start his tour to ensure he could see the campuses in action. TD also thanked the faculty for the feedback he has received on the initiatives of Academic Affairs so far, and he wants to keep working toward more faculty input.
- ii. TD then provided an update on the Momentum Year initiative.
 - 1. Since the December council meeting, Academic Affairs has had a meeting with the top leadership form the campuses (i.e., the mindset summit) to look at data concerning retention, progression, and student success.
 - 2. His office is also working to ensure the leadership on each campus supports creating and implementing the plan for the Momentum Year. The campuses are now having conversations about implementing the plans

3. The system office hopes to be a constant presence in helping faculty make the changes necessary to support this initiative. Moreover, the system office has secured \$2 million in grants to support the work that is coming up.
- iii. TD also provided an update on the Gateways to Completion project (part of the Part of the Momentum Year). After the council meeting, he will be heading to Macon to launch Cohort II of the project. Cohort I, a subset of campuses, began about 18 months ago in response to an initiative developed by the chancellor. Cohort II will essentially be all the rest of the campuses. By way of context, TD said he does not really like to use the terms gateway courses or gate keeper classes. Instead, he wants to use the term “catapult” courses. In these four foundational courses, he envisions changing and deepening the learning which will launch students to success in future classes. The system and its faculty need to investigate ways to help all students succeed. Cohort II will look to introduce the practices and lessons learned in Cohort I over the next two years. TD believes the lessons learned in the redevelopment of these courses will ultimately benefit all faculty in all disciplines.
- iv. TD also took a moment to explain the creation of the “Nexus Degree”—the first new degree classification since the introduction of the associate’s degree in the late 1800s. The new degree will be an 18-hour credential created in partnership with major industries. In planning selecting the courses, institutions work with industry to look at the essential skills needed of employees in that industry. It is ultimate an effort to pair faculty knowledge of how to learn with the business knowledge of skills needed. TD sees the degree as having utility across the system as a new kind of technical transferable associate’s degree. The 18-hours fills the Area F requirements, so it can be a foundation for a bachelor’s degree (i.e., a nexus degree in cyber security with a bachelor’s degree in languages like Farsi). He said there is also some conversation about how this could be used in preparing education students for the workforce.
- v. TD also mentioned the College 2025 group which has been looking at what higher education will look like in the future. He said the conversations had been really, really, extraordinary. The members have worked hard in looking at the themes including becoming more adaptable or nimbler in terms of degrees offered, looking at ways of offering courses, identifying ways to inform students of opportunities, and creating partnerships to strategically work with other entities to provide for the students on an on-going basis. The draft of the report, he said, is well on its way.
- vi. The vice chancellor then took questions from the council members some of which related to the morning discussion items.
 1. Neal Thomson wanted to know if the system had thought about providing any guidance for universities on suspension policies as it relates to the Momentum Year. He particularly noted the policy of asking poor performing students to take a semester off. TD said he was skeptical that forcing low-performing students out of college is good for moving students forward because many simply do not return to schools. His office has been discussing the issue. It has also been looking at ways to identify students needing an intervention before it becomes an “autopsy.” TD also wanted to reiterate that successful students need to learn the material; the programs coming from the Momentum Year are designed to help students do that.
 2. Timothy Brown asked what were the four gateway courses. TD said each campus is selecting at least four courses. The project is in partnership with the John Gardiner Institute. Individual provosts work with the campus community to determine what

classes will influence other course the most on their campuses; TD said for the most part people teaching those courses know about Gateways to Completion because it affects them TD said he could send members of the faculty council information about the courses. Brown also asked whether discussions about limiting the attempts on some courses was coming from the system or the college level; TD said college level.

3. Joseph Hughes, as a follow up to the previous question, said he did not know what the critical courses were at Georgia Tech, but he knew they were not likely the same as at other campuses. He wanted to know how the Gateways to Completion/Momentum Year works at campuses where there are multiple populations of in-coming students (advanced to remedial). TD responded that the Momentum Year is about figuring out what the campuses and students need based on the student population. Each campus is different. He has encouraged campuses to choose classes based on data-driven strategy.
4. Neal Thomson, in relation to the push to see students take three courses in their field of study, what happens when programs cannot control the Area F classes. He specifically noted the Area F for business is designed to weed-out students, but those same classes can deter students because they are not engaging students in the broader principles of the major. TD indicated there is a conversation going on now at the system level about changing the core so that students get a realistic take of what studying for their chose degree will be like in the first year.
5. Sarah Mergel asked how will campuses deal with the strong recommendation that student stake 15-credit hours in their first semester if students have multiple learning supports. TD said the data suggests that a fuller schedule advantages every student. Student with learning support actually take more credit hours because they have a co-requisite course. Furthermore, if a student with learning support only planned to have six hours, then 9 hours is an improvement/advantage. TD also recognized that students at institutions across the systems sometimes have unique situations. That said, he believes that sometimes faculty/institutions prevent students from taking more classes (i.e., assigning cost-prohibitive textbooks or scheduling classes at times that do not work for students). This aspect of the Momentum Year is about encouraging campuses to find ways to enable students to take more hours.
6. Celeste Walley-Jean followed up on the question on credit hours to ask whether or not the system is following up on the trends with data collection to ensure the trends are playing out as expected. TD said yes it was doing so. He also noted many of the Momentum Year ideas resulted from data he collected and studied while working in Tennessee. That data showed students who took more credit hours found increased success. As the system implements the Momentum Year, it will collect more data to study the developments in Georgia.

d. Dr. Marti Venn, Deputy Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Karin Elliot, Interim Vice Chancellor for Human Resources

- i. Marti Venn (MV) asked Karin Elliot (KE) to address some of the faculty questions relating to human resources/benefits issues.
- ii. Before taking questions KE talked a little about the challenges posed by the legislature not specifically funding increases in the healthcare plan. Given the financial realities posed by the

current budget (and likely future budgets), her office has been working to manage benefits and keep costs down. The Total Rewards Steering Committee continually reviews the benefits provided to system employees; its membership includes faculty and human resource expert from the different institutions. For 2019, health care costs will increase about 7 percent while the claims costs for pharmacy coverage will increase about 12 percent. The system office is trying to educate the covered population on ways to save money so it can continue to provide services based on the funding it does have.

- iii. Regarding the recent situation with Piedmont and BCBSGa, she mentioned an agreement has been reached, and it will take effect on June 1, 2018. BCBSGa committed to honoring the old plan through May. Scott Pegan asked what might the system human resources office do to avoid a similar situation in the future. By way of explanation, KE mentioned the system must abide by the state procurement rules: the office must bid for a vendor once every five years. The USG has a self-funded plan administered by BCBSGa. In other words, the system office decided on the benefits it would like to provide to employees and it then pays BCBSGa negotiates with contractors on its behalf. BCBSGa has been the provider because of the vast coverage around the state. In the next contract, the office will look to include language to safeguard against a Piedmont issue. The system, however, is wary of trying to negotiate with independent contractors because of the time and money doing so would require.
- iv. Robert Scott asked whether the system looked at the possibility of having paid parental leave since the current options for new parents are not all that great because it requires using sick leave and disability coverage. KE has heard from institutions who would like to see this benefit added, and she knows that some of our competition does provide leave. She did note that the legislature does not support paid parental leave for state employees and the system has to follow the state laws. Scott asked whether the law mandated floor or ceiling, because if the former that might provide a window for coverage. KE did not know, but she would look into that as well as into conducting a study of the issue.
- v. Joseph Hughes asked in terms of contracting for benefits, would the system office continue to pursue statewide options or would it look at regional variations. KE said the human resources office did look at the issue, and when they bid next, they will explore the possibility of the regional variations. The benefit of system-wide is scale because the system can get better financial deals (i.e., the best plan, for the best coverage, for the lowest cost). Scott Pegan asked whether the system might consider a different or multiple insurance providers; KE said yes, but multiple providers could increase prices or the costs could be different. Hughes also asked a question about coverage for pre-retirees, and KE said they will be covered under the system's primary plan until their retirement. As a side note, she mentioned most retirees on the retiree health care exchange seemed to like their plan.
- vi. Brian Ring asked if the system looked at combining the USG health coverage with the the state health benefit plan. While the system office has talked about the issue, their preference is to stay as a different system because the state government/state agencies recruit different types of employees. Being on a separate plan allows the system to benchmark the plan against other systems, and universities across the country as opposed to all state employees.
- vii. KE also mentioned that in August the BOR passed a new policy on compensation in which every institution needed to create a systematic way to pay employees. If an employee was receiving more than 10 percent increase plus the merit increase the system office needed to review the increase. Since that time, the human resource office has received and reviewed 20

to 30 notifications a week regarding faculty and staff increases. Given the amount of time and effort these reviews have taken the office will devise more guidelines on what types of salary increases must be submitted for review. This policy change stemmed from the legislatures view that system employees are paid too much in comparison to other state employees. The BOR devised the policy to get more information about what is happening on campuses. Joya Hicks asked about how many have been rejected; KE said none so far, but some have required more information and documentation on market data and analysis to support necessity. TD wanted to point out that many cases these requests were attempts to keep qualified faculty from leaving an institution; KE also said some of it reflects restructuring on campuses as well.

- viii. Zephy Okonkwo asked how the system justify the continued penchant for hiring administrators from the outside when faculty cannot have raises and departments cannot hire needed faculty to meet demand. KE reiterated there is a system-wide study (the CAR) to look at what is happening on campuses regarding this information. If it has not come to a campus, it will come to the campus soon.
1. MV said this faculty the concern is legitimate; the CAR requires offices to rethink what they can do and should do. The review looks at every position on campus except faculty. Could things be centralized; could technology be used?
 2. EDC hoped that doing this study would not lead to using more consultants since there are faculty experts on campus that could be resources to help meet campus needs. MV said the system will be provided some focused professional development with chairs and deans so they are accountable for what they are paid to do.
 3. Scott Pegan wanted to know how revising what faculty, chairs, and deans might affect shared governance, and how might it service versus research expectations. MV mentioned the system office has not looked at “grow your own” leadership program but that might be an option. Sarah Mergel and Celeste Walley-Jean both mentioned initiatives at their home campuses to train future leaders.
 4. Celeste Walley-Jean wanted to know if the review would lead to a standard pay scale for administrators. wanted to ask about standard pay scale; KE said the system does not have a standard pay scale but there is some guidance on comparable pay for comparable work.
 5. Joseph Hughes wanted to know if the new review of compensation increases had biased institutions not to promote their own (i.e., it is easier to hire from the outside than wait for the system to review an offer for an internal candidate). KE mentioned that human resources had discussed this concern. They hope to clarify the guidelines for submissions to reduce the paperwork and processing time. The updated guidelines will be available soon.
 6. Juone Brown did not want to forget that as the system economizes on the side of administration it also then needs to address growing and supporting the faculty.
- ix. Zephy Okonkwo asked whether the system office supported the concept of rotating chairs; KE and MV said yes, but only if chairs are properly trained.
- x. KE and MV also addressed the issue of 10-month salaried employees being paid over 12 months.
1. As the system addresses changing how faculty can be paid, there are several questions it needs to address. At the present time, the last system institution, Georgia Tech, will go live with One-USG in January 2020, is fair to provide the benefit to some but not all

faculty? Also, if you receive a merit raise or become an administrator how will that affect your pay? Since every year faculty would need to elect to be paid over 12 months, when would they need to make the decision? How would institutions adjust the 7/5 benefits issue (where in spring institutions deduct more for benefits than in the fall)? The human resources office can work behind the scenes to support the option, but it will take time to figure out the details.

2. MV also said there are huge tax implications for faculty at a certain salary level who might face penalties for deferring compensation. The system institutions will need to provide adequate information on how the change might affect faculty positively and negatively.
 3. Frank Pridemore wanted to know if the council members could get some information to share with institutions. Robert Scott also mentioned how it would payroll would deal with charitable donations and parking fees across 12 months. Scott Pegan mentioned the change would also need to factor in how research money is distributed. MV said those were good questions.
 4. KE asked was this an important issue to the faculty; the council members said yes, they would like to have the option to spread their pay over 12 months. Neal Thomson encouraged the system to adopt the change when it was feasibly available and not wait until after all schools are on OneUSG. Wendy Turner explained the issue first came up when the number of summer courses dropped a few years ago. Many faculty, especially those with lower pay, had become accustomed to teaching summer classes to supplement their income and carry them through the summer. They struggled to meet their expenses. Because the change came rather unexpectedly, they did not have time to plan ahead to set aside some income.
- xi. MV mentioned that as the system reviews its policies and procedures, the chancellor asked all the policy units to look at the proposed changes. She will be sending the council some proposed updates for Section 3 and Section 8 that will go before the board at its May meeting or a meeting in the fall.
1. Section 3—Faculty: Changes to this section for May seem to be relatively minor—mostly attempting to clarify the meaning of the policies. Included in the proposals will be an update on the language relating to the USGFC. Academic Affairs has drafted possible language, but MV said the council might want to make some changes or possibly additions for the procedures manual. MV indicated there will be no substantive changes to the information on degrees, but there will be language updates on terminating programs and the comprehensive program review. Notably, academic affairs wants to clarify the information on teaching out terminated programs. She noted official termination comes two years after the board officially terminates a program. MV finally recommended looking at what comes under faculty policies in this section.
 2. Section 8—Personnel: Although the human resources and legal offices usually handle personnel policies, there are portions in Item 3 which affect faculty as it discusses faculty classification, appointment, tenure, resignation. MV said the one substantive change is key (which might go before the board at its next meeting or in the fall). Georgia Tech had requested a change in the classification for lecturers—lecturer, senior lecturer, and new category for principal lecturer. MV and TD liked the idea of creating a career trajectory for that category of employee. If approved, the change will

require changes in OneUSG as well as evaluation policies at campuses to include criteria for principal lecturer. Celeste Walley-Jean asked if course load for principal lecturers would change, and MV said it would be left to the institution. Robert Scott asked about how creating a tiered system for lecturers was different from a tenure track position. MV said it was still a year to year contract. Robert Scott then suggested that lecturers should become tenure track faculty where institutions had two-types two types of tenure track faculty—teaching and research. Discussion ensued about the nature of tenure track and lecturer.

3. Sarah Mergel asked a question about Section 8.6 on Discretionary Review which had recently come up in the process of revising the statutes at Dalton State College. MV said there is an internal committee that reviews appeals, but it does not any decision made by a president. The committee only looks at whether or not the stated process was followed. If the process is not followed, the committee would make a recommendation to review the decision following the proper process. The policy for discretionary review is the only recourse a person or campus entity has for review of a presidential decision.

VI. Morning Discussion Items

- a. Focus on the Faculty
- b. Updates to the BOR Policy Manual/Section 8, Discretionary Review
- c. USG Budget for 2018-2019
- d. Open Education Resources/Faculty Choice
- e. Textbook Book Initiative
- f. Health Benefits/BCBSGa Changes
- g. OneUSG/10-month-12-month pay

The council discussed all the morning discussion items in its sessions with the representatives from the USG. See the information under Remarks for more information.

VII. Reports

- a. Elizabeth F. Desnoyers-Colas, USGFC Chair
 - i. EDC did not have anything to add to her morning comments.
- b. Robert Scott (RS), AAUP Update
 - i. The AAUP has three issues of concern to raise with the USGFC: (1) free-speech bill, (2) definition of faculty in the BOR policy manual, (3) the recently released Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges White Paper on shared governance.
 - ii. RS indicated the chancellor had already addressed the first issue on faculty input to policy changes related to the free-speech bill.
 - iii. RS said at the recent AAUP conference faculty discussed who should and should not be included as voting faculty at an institution; the AAUP supports removing all administrators including chairs from the status of voting faculty but including part-time faculty in the voting faculty. The council then discussed whether or not the issue was a campus-level conversation or system-level conversation.

- iv. RS wanted to let the faculty council know about a recent study AGB White Paper in support of shared governance. He recommended the council forward the white paper to the BOR and ask for their endorsement as a member of AGB. Since the council was not familiar with the document, RS will send the document to council as well as MV who will share it with the chancellor.
- c. Mildred Cody (MC), USG Retiree Council Update
 - i. MC brought greetings from the retiree council; she also had four items to discuss with the faculty council,
 - ii. The council is working on a brochure regarding information about retirement that will go to all retirees which campuses can then supplement with their campus specific information. The council also wants to create webinars to help retirees find information. The council would also like to have listserv for questions where someone would respond to the question and the council would have a repository of potential issues to include in its brochure. MC is looking for a couple of volunteers to review brochures to see what information might be missing for potential retirees.
 - iii. The retiree council is represented on three of the Total Rewards Steering Committee's subcommittees: retiree, communication, and wellbeing.
 - iv. The Association for Retirees gives away an innovation award yearly, and the USG retiree council has applied for it because the system-wide nature of the retiree council is unusual.
 - v. The retiree council is still looking for a liaison from the USGFC. MC mentioned that retirement is a transition; the liaison will help the council to see what current employees are dealing with as they look to retirement. Juone Brown mentioned having a representative would help current employees because then the council members could share information on their own campus. MV also mentioned provosts appoint the representatives to the system-wide council, and not all campuses have appointed a representative so faculty council members might want to follow up with their provosts if their campus does not have a representative. She also suggested faculty senates might pass a resolution encouraging the institution to fill the position. MC said representative information can be found on the USG Retiree Council webpage. EDC suggested since council members tend to be quite busy, they could reach out to other people on their campus who might be interested in this avenue of service.

VIII. Old Business

- a. ORP Sick Leave Resolution
 - i. At the fall meeting, Brian Ring presented a resolution regarding how the system treated sick leave for employees in the ORP. The council tabled the resolution, so a subcommittee could work on the language. The purpose of the resolution would be to bring attention to the discrepancy. The committee added a sentence about treating all employees equitably.
 - ii. Discussion ensued about whether the system would support the change since employees opt into ORP. Joseph Hughes pointed out that paying employees for sick leave in TRS happened more recently. Moreover, not all employees receive the same information about the differences between TRS and ORP.
 - iii. The council also discussed how benefits might be calculated for equitably treating the two plans; Neal Thomson said they there has to be a mechanism to ensure comparable value. Scott Pegan mentioned that the institutions they paid out the sick leave based on what would have

been contributed to the ORP, retirees could invest the money and it would accumulate value. Neal Thomson mentioned that there would not accumulate if you collect at the end.

- iv. In order to forward the discussion of the resolution along Sarah Mergel made a motion to adopt the resolution; Scott Pegan seconded. Scott Pegan then made a motion for a friendly amendment to revise the language to request that the chancellor explore ways to implement this resolution. Joseph Hughes further suggested changing same to comparable as well as to delete the last paragraph. The council approved the friendly amendment.
 - v. EDC then asked if there was any further discussion. Neal Thomson said he liked the resolution, and Brian Ring mentioned that because the one-time switch option to TRS no longer seemed like a viable option for employees, then addressing concerns about sick leave seemed like a good alternative. After determining there was not more discussion on the amended resolution, the council voted unanimously to adopt it ([Appendix A](#)).
- b. Summer Salary Resolution
- i. Scott Pegan presented the summer salary resolution. Celeste Walley-Jean made a motion to adopt the resolution; Juone Brown seconded. The purpose of the resolution as stated is to apply real-world principles for the contracting process (i.e., use good business practices). The purpose is not to address questions related to the funding of summer pay or how much faculty are paid to teach courses outside of their normal contract.
 - ii. Neal Thomson asked about provisions for prorated rates; Scott Pegan mentioned the language in Item 3 of the proposed policy addressed that issue.
 - iii. Jennifer Purcell asked about the provisions in Item 5 since altering the contract after the start of classes could benefit not hurt faculty members. Juone Brown mentioned that the first sentence Item 5 was unnecessary.
 - iv. Wendy Turner, who worked on the resolution, wanted to clarify the intent of Item 5 was to say at some point the two parties make an agreement for an amount. Both have then agreed to the terms where no matter how many students (plus or minus) a faculty member would know how much she or he would be paid. Wendy Turner and Scott Pegan said they could accept the proposed change (to delete the first sentence of Item 5).
 - v. Scott Pegan said this resolution does not solve or address every concern, but it is a start at ensuring faculty are paid for the work they do in the summer. EDC mentioned the proposed language is not a solution but a resolution to encourage the chancellor to look at this issue.
 - vi. Neal Thomson pointed out that faculty not being paid for teaching a portion of a class is a violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Discussion continued about possible changes to the resolution, such as how far in advance should the contract be signed.
 - vii. Sarah Mergel reiterated the idea for this resolution was not to present a complete solution, but it was a way to let the system office know this is a problem. Brian Ring said the committee kept the language vague, so the USG could make guidelines for campuses to make their own policies. The resolution is not intended to create a universal system policy for summer salary.
 - viii. After some minor revisions to the proposed language, the council unanimously approved the amended resolution ([Appendix B](#)).
- c. Bylaws Committee
- i. Joseph Hughes said the committee has not made much progress, but he will send the bylaws to everyone for comment.
 - ii. By fall they will have recommended changes for the council to consider at its next meeting.

- d. Consolidation Committee
 - i. The committee did not have a report.
- e. Administrative Staffing Committee
 - i. The committee did not have a report.
- f. Administrator Evaluation Committee
 - i. Brian Ring presented the progress of the administrator evaluation committee, which had been tasked with gathering information on the level of faculty input in the evaluations of administrators at system institutions. He shared a copy of the status of the committee's survey; so far, thirteen of the twenty-six schools have responded. He also asked some schools to talk about the responses provided.
 - ii. Scott Pegan pointed out he answered not whether there were evaluations, but whether faculty had input into those evaluations. Sarah Mergel asked if faculty council representatives should edit their responses to indicate yes only if faculty participate in the process; Brian Ring said yes. The committee will update the council on the information collected at the next meeting.
 - iii. As of now, the council just wants to gather information in the event it wants to make a recommendation to the chancellor about encouraging more faculty input.
 - iv. Neal Thomson mentioned the senate at Columbus State is not included in administrator evaluation, but the senate created an evaluation for the faculty to provide input. While the evaluation does not carry any weight in decision making, the senate publishes the results.
 - v. Celeste Walley-Jean asked whether the administrator evaluations conducted on campuses were required by system policy or they were option. MV said the system policy states that every five years an administrator needs to be evaluated by the people serving one level below him or her. Chadwick Gugg asked whether there was any way for faculty to request participating in reviews up to the provost level. Joya Hicks mentioned Kennesaw State has a very robust review; it is all public with no redaction.
 - vi. Celeste Walley-Jean recommend sharing the policy as it existed with the council members, and updating the survey to look at whether institutions are complying with the policy. Scott Pegan mentioned this issue originally came up because faculty wanted more input. MV suggested the council put this item on the agenda to discuss with the chancellor at the next meeting.
- g. USGFC Budget/Meeting Plans
 - i. Scott Pegan explained to the council members that the executive committee had been looking to make the faculty council function more like the staff council, where meetings have more funding, meet across two days, and combine professional development with council business.
 - ii. He also asked the council members to let him know if council representatives are not receiving funding from their institution to attend the bi-annual meetings. He will follow up with the system office. Expenses include hotel, mileage, and food outside of what is provided during the meeting.
 - iii. Wendy Turner said the fall council meeting will be at Augusta University from October 18 to October 19, 2018. The even before the meeting and the even after the meeting she will also arrange for an optional dinner in the August area. The plan will be to have some time for professional development, some time for committee meetings, some time to meet with system representatives, and some time to conduct the council business.

- iv. Sarah Mergel also suggested scheduling time for the institutions to meet by sector to discuss common issues at their institutions which might be different from concerns of faculty in different sectors.

IX. New Business

a. Election of Executive Committee

- i. Chair Elect: Juone Brown nominated Sarah Mergel for the position of chair elect; Joseph Hughes seconded the nomination. She accepted the nomination. Amanda Urquhart nominated Wendy Turner. However, she declined the nomination since she will be out of the United States on an extended research trip in the spring semester. Sarah Mergel was chosen as the chair elect by acclamation vote.
- ii. Secretary: Scott Pegan nominated Brian Ring, and he accepted the nomination. Brian Ring was chosen as secretary by acclamation vote.
- iii. Webmaster: Timothy Brown nominated himself to continue to serve as the webmaster, and he chosen as webmaster by acclamation vote.
- iv. Parliamentarian: Because the bylaws currently do not outline the position of parliamentarian, Sarah Mergel made a motion to have an ad-hoc parliamentarian until such time the bylaws include the position; Wendy Turner seconded. The council unanimously approved the motion. Babs Onabanjo and Joseph Hughes nominated to serve as parliamentarian. Joseph Hughes won the parliamentarian election.

b. Other Items

- i. Juone Brown asked the council to look at issues related to promotion and tenure for faculty moving between institutions (especially in cases of a merger). Brian Ring suggested looking at tenure for incoming administrators as part of the discussion.

X. Adjourn

EDC passed the chair position to Scott Pegan. He made a few comments about continuing the good work of the council. After determining there were no questions or other business, the meeting officially adjourned at 3:00 PM.

**USG FACULTY COUNCIL
RESOLUTION
(APRIL 27, 2018)**

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 a comparable 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 explore ways to implement this resolution.

**USG FACULTY COUNCIL
RESOLUTION
(APRIL 27, 2018)**

WHEREAS, The University System of Georgia has adopted no standardized system for offering summer term teaching contracts to faculty members teaching outside the normally scheduled times within their regular contracts.

WHEREAS, Faculty members from numerous USG institutions have experienced pressure to perform instruction outside their regular contracts.

WHEREAS, Faculty members from numerous USG institutions have experienced irregular contracting to include but not limited to: no compensation for courses canceled after initiation (first day of class) as well as having to perform instruction prior to agreement on compensation and establishment of a formal contract.

To resolve these outstanding issues, we recommend that the University System of Georgia adopt at individual colleges, schools, and universities by Summer 2019 the following standard operating procedures related to summer faculty pay. These are based on best practices across the United States.

Standard Operating Procedures for Summer Faculty

Standard Operating Procedures for contracts related to faculty teaching during Summer or other times outside of their normally salaried and off-contract times. Throughout, please read “summer” to include all times that are outside the normally scheduled times within the regular contact of each faculty member (e.g. “May-mester”, etc.).

1. Summer contracts must include a clear understanding of pay.
2. Prior to the first class of instruction, both faculty and administration must sign the contract.
3. Contracts can include agreed upon prorated pay if, for example, the course has fewer than a reasonable number of students to pay for the faculty member’s time.
4. The faculty member can turn down the offered contract for any reason.
5. If a course is cancelled for any reason, the faculty member will be compensated based on the agreed rate in the contract.
6. At a minimum, the level at which the course is offered along with the number of contact hours, or equivalents, should be reflected in the compensation offer.