ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL
Minutes of
February 4, 2004

Attendees: Lauren Adamson, Shelia Bradley, Roberta Byrum, Mary Jane Casto, Julian Diaz, Anne Emanuel, Bill Fritz, Janice Griffith, Ron Henry, Charlene Hurt, Susan Kelley, John Marshall, Robert Moore, Linda Nelson, Nancy Peterman, Jerry Rackliffe, Sonya Richburg, Sterling Roth, Edgar Torbert, Sally Wallace, Carol Winkler

Minutes of November 5 were approved.

RiF

Ms. Nelson opened discussion of revisions to the reduction-in-force policy. She noted issues raised by OFCCP/EEOC and the change in the budgetary climate since the original policy was written in 1996. She observed there were generally more vacant positions to accommodate RiF’ed employees at the time the policy was written. She pointed out positions with the same title varied in requirements across units, and so it was not reasonable to guarantee relocation based on title alone. She advised that training for managers about RiF would be stepped up.

Ms. Richburg added that clarification of language was a major objective of the proposed revisions. She also called attention to the addition of step-by-step information for managers.

Dr. Marshall commented that the old policy was so vague that it could be used to make management decisions about marginal employees. He emphasized that this was not the intent of the RiF policy.

Ms. Casto suggested attention to the distinction between RiF's and layoffs.

Ms. Hurt suggested clarification of the sequencing of requests for approval to the dean or vice president, provost, and assistant vice president for opportunity development.

Dr. Winkler asked about a situation when an irrelevant position was eliminated and at the same time a new position with different requirements was created. Dr. Henry responded that this would be an example of RiF.

Dr. Adamson asked about applicability to positions funded by grants. Dr. Henry replied that these would fall under the limited-term employee category, which the policy excluded. Ms. Richburg injected that limited-term employees were technically restricted to 3-years employment. Mr. Rackliffe cited grant-funded employees with much longer periods of employment; e.g., Language Research Center employees. Dr. Marshall responded that a footnote could be added to the effect that the policy did not apply to grant-funded employees.

Mr. Rackliffe asked about a policy, which would apply to grant-funded employees. Dr. Marshall replied that the basic rule was that employment ended when funding ending. He elaborated that in some cases employees were partially funded by grant funds (and the rest from state funds), and that a specific policy was needed for this category. He advised doing a better job of notifying
employees either fully or partially funded by grants of their risks. Ms. Nelson responded that a
document of this type had been developed to give to employees funded by grants, but that it was
time to revisit that document in consultation with Legal Affairs.

Dr. Adamson recommended deleting the mention of grants and contracts in the first paragraph of
the proposed RiF policy. Ms. Nelson agreed with this change.

Mr. Rackliffe suggested designation as grant-term employees with limited-term positions used for
bridging between grants. Dr. Henry reacted that there could not be a guarantee of bridge funds.
Mr. Rackliffe said this could be at the discretion of the deans and vice presidents.

Ms. Hurt asked about job performance as a factor in RiF. Dr. Henry responded that job
performance could come into play only if a portion of like positions were eliminated. Dr. Marshall
cautioned again against pretending to do RiF when the intent was to eliminate a poorly
performing employee.

Ms. Hurt asked for clarification about the lead time for notice to RiF’ed employees. Dr. Marshall
replied that the 60-day requirement of the Warren Act did not apply to state employees, although
the proposed policy does stipulate a 12-week notice when possible.

Dr. Marshall responded that Board of Regents policy avoided the topic for grant-
funded employees because of vacation pay issues.

Dr. Colarusso asked about the factor of seniority. Dr. Henry replied there was no formal role for
seniority, but again in cases of RiF’ing a portion of like positions, seniority could come into play if
performance levels of the employees were equal.

Ms. Nelson reiterated the objective of giving managers consistent answers to questions about
RiF. Ms. Richburg added that sample letters would be provided to managers.

Dr. Marshall requested that further suggestions on RiF be e-mailed to Ms. Richburg. He indicated
the policy would be finalized at the March meeting of the Administrative Council in order to have
in place by April 1, if doing RiF for FY2005.

Ms. Hurt urged training for managers. Dr. Winkler asked about the responsibility of the
department for helping find another job at the university. Ms. Nelson responded that the
responsibility of the department was defined in the proposed policy at the beginning of the step-
by-step process. Dr. Henry added that assisting with the look for another job at the university
was the responsibility of the university.

**Wireless communication devices/cellular telephone policy**

Ms. Byrum introduced a draft wireless communication device/cellular telephone policy and
procedures document. She explained that the Office of Planning and Budget had established a
policy in 1992 that only agency heads (e.g., Chancellor of the University System of Georgia)
could have state-funded cell phones unless approved for an exemption by OPB. She added that
Georgia Tech was cited by Board of Regents auditors for failing to comply, and that Georgia
State was preparing for a similar audit. Ms. Byrum noted Mr. Paraska and the college administrative officers had been involved in drafting the proposed policy, which upon approval by the Administrative Council would be sent to the Board of Regents and OPB for their approval.

Dr. Adamson suggested softening the "prohibited" language regarding personal use given the other statements in the same paragraph about incidental personal use. Mr. Rackliffe offered "should be avoided" language as a replacement. Ms. Byrum also noted the situation of incoming personal calls.

Ms. Casto asked about specifying guidelines for approvals; e.g., weekend duties, off-campus duties. Dr. Henry advised it would be impossible to anticipate all legitimate uses, and hence "such as" language should be employed. Mr. Rackliffe observed that cell phones were less expensive than walkie-talkies, and might be a better option for police.

Dr. Moore commented that a policy was needed, but expressed concern it could lead to similar policies for PCs and regular telephones. He added that one of the CIO candidates had mentioned a plan in another state whereby a university negotiated a special group rate for cell phones and then paid employees a stipend to cover the expense. Dr. Emanuel responded that this would be an end run if still funded by the state.

Dr. Colarusso pointed out that SDOE employees pay the difference if personal use extends charges beyond the contract base amount. Mr. Rackliffe injected that in any case personal use cannot be funded by the university.

Dr. Adamson encouraged an approach which would not add workload to staff administering the program.

Dr. Henry recommended language to the effect that for qualified employees, the standard package would be paid by the university and for any charges beyond the standard the employee would pay unless documented as university-related expense. Dr. Marshall commented that it might be necessary to stipulate the DOAS provider of the service.

Dr. Griffith asked about current employees provided cell phones with state funds. Dr. Henry answered that IS&T had a number of employees on call for computer system breakdowns.

Dr. Emanuel recommended further investigation of the stipend idea. She suggested approving the policy with the understanding it would be refined.

Ms. Casto suggested removing the process sections of the draft statement. Dr. Henry noted the only major change was the substitute language proposed by Mr. Rackliffe. Mr. Rackliffe stated that the shortened document would contain only sections 1.1, 1.2 and 1.4. Dr. Adamson asked for an additional statement about over-contract charges. Dr. Henry asked for an additional statement about reimbursement for use of personal cell phones. Mr. Marshall noted that devices such as Blackberries were also included in the policy, not just traditional cell phones.

Dr. Colarusso made a motion to adopt the policy with the discussed changes. Dr. Marshall seconded the motion. The motion passed.
Legislative/budget update

Dr. Henry announced Georgia State would have its annual budget hearing with Board of Regents staff on March 11. He reported that spring enrollments were disappointing. Dr. Fritz distributed enrollment reports. He commented that there had been a push for earlier registration, and consequently fewer students registered late. He noted that the fall enrollment was bolstered by 1,500 returning seniors, but this was not the case for spring. Dr. Fritz pointed out that more than 50,000 students are eligible to enroll in any given semester.

Dr. Marshall asked about the drop in percentage yield of accepted applicants. Dr. Fritz replied that as the quality of the accepted applicants rises, the options open to them increase. He added that more than 2,000 freshman applicants had already been accepted for next fall. He announced that these included 5 National Merit Scholarship semi-finalists, a first for Georgia State.

Dr. Henry welcomed Dr. Diaz, the newly appointed associate dean in the J. Mack Robinson College of Business.