
Others Attending: Lauren Adamson, Ron Colarusso, Dean Dabney, Bill Fritz, Charlene Hurt, Robert Moore, Edgar Torbert

[The minutes of February 28 were approved at the March 14 budget hearings.]

Dr. Henry announced the Board of Regents would hold a called meeting on May 2 to approve allocations and tuition rates for FY2008. He stated there was no new information concerning the FY2008 budget.

Dr. Henry outlined Provost area new funding requests including Target of Opportunity faculty hires, animal care, the second half of a biotechnology faculty position in the College of Law, an alumni relations position in the College of Law, a faculty position in the Middle East Institute, a sculpture technician, a matching position for a Howard Hughes Medical Institute grant, areas of focus, salary compression, and GRA support. Dr. Henry noted the items other than salary compression and GRA support were prior commitments.

Dr. Rackliffe reported on discussion by Dr. Patton and the vice presidents about split merit raises in October and April, rather than one raise in January, in order to strengthen performance feedback to staff. Dr. Rackliffe indicated support among the vice presidents for the concept, but cautioned that it was too late in this budget cycle to develop support for split raises at the Board of Regents. He reminded that one of his new funding requests was to increase the university-wide minimum salary to $19,000.

Dr. Henry commented that the intention was to apply compression raises on July 1, rather than submerge them in the January 1 merit raises. Dr. Hudson asked about efforts to sell the compression raise proposal to the Board of Regents. Dr. Henry responded that this proposal had been part of the annual budget discussions with the Board of Regents staff as the top priority request from Georgia State. He pointed out that this request was in tandem with the University of Georgia and Georgia Tech.

Dr. Huss asked how the compression funds would be allocated among units across the university. Dr. Henry replied that the Oklahoma State salary study provided benchmarks for average faculty
salaries by department and rank. Dr. Morris asked how staff would be considered. Dr. Henry answered that a plan for staff had not been developed, and that there was also the issue of how to divide overall funding for addressing salary compression between faculty and staff.

Dr. Huss urged that salary compression funds be linked to performance as with the regular merit raises, and noted that the Robinson College of Business had been taking this approach with its discretionary pools in order to adjust the salaries of highly productive faculty.

Dr. Henry speculated that the amount of available funds would allow for correcting approximately 1/3 of the current gaps identified through the Oklahoma State study. He stated that the Oklahoma State report would be distributed to FACP members prior to the next meeting, April 4. Dr. Huss asked about the institutions participating in the Oklahoma State study. Dr. Adamson responded that the institutions were a good comparison group for Georgia State. Ms. Hurt added that the Oklahoma State study information would soon be posted on the Institutional Research web site.

Dr. Adamson requested action on the regular merit raise pool so that work on that part of the FY2008 budget could begin right away. Dr. Hudson made a motion to recommend the raise administration methodology used for FY2007 with 3% of filled positions as the raise pool for the colleges and vice presidential units plus discretionary pools for the deans and vice presidents from the residual amount for vacant positions. Dr. Tai seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Dr. Henry invited discussion of how to split salary compression funds between faculty and staff. He noted one option would be to take the ratio of total faculty salaries versus total staff salaries. He warned that in some areas keeping key faculty was more difficult than keeping staff.

Dr. Tai observed that reclassification of staff positions allowed more flexibility in dealing with staff salary issues than for faculty. Dr. Rackliffe cited total faculty salaries and total staff salaries as approximately equal. Dr. Moore pointed out differences in the labor market between low-level positions, which generally do not have salary compression issues, and high-level technical positions, which in some cases do. Drs. Morris and Fritz noted loss of key staff in their respective areas. Dr. Farnham called for data on staff turnover. Dr. Dabney responded that a task force was working with Ms. Posey to obtain data for such discussions.

Dr. Henry reminded that staff market salary issues had been addressed by job categories on several occasions, including academic advisors in FY2007 and information technology staff in prior years. Ms. Hurt observed that salaries for information technology staff were again below market.

Dr. Adamson emphasized that the message to the Board of Regents should focus on the importance of addressing salary compression among faculty. Dr. Colarusso reiterated the issue regarding faculty salaries, and suggested that any staff initiative should target jobs in such areas as the Research Office and Enrollment Services. Ms. Hurt spoke in favor of targeting job categories rather than particular departments.

Dr. Henry advised that discussion of the salary compression initiative would continue at the next FACP meeting on April 4.

Dr. Henry distributed copies of “Projection of impact of 300 new freshmen on 1000 and 2000 level
courses, March 2007” advocating allocation of $1.6M in additional tuition revenues from these students toward new instructional resources ($1M) and new support resources ($600K). Dr. Henry explained the calculations of new sections needed by department and course.

Dr. Huss asked about the impact of increased numbers of transfer students. Dr. Henry replied that 100 additional transfers could be consequential, but that the influx of transfer students could be controlled for spring semester.

Dr. Adamson encouraged putting aside funds for unmet demand.

Dr. Huss asked about the mix of tenure track and non-tenure track faculty to handle the additional sections. Dr. Henry answered that the bulk of the new load would be handled by lecturers. Dr. Adamson added that decisions were needed earlier in the year in order to target tenure track hires. Dr. Henry responded that discussion for FY2009 would begin in October 2007.

Dr. Alberto asked if there was any reason to doubt the multi-year enrollment growth progression? Dr. Henry expressed reservations about annual increases of 300 freshmen after FY2008. He pointed to the difficulty of attracting a sufficient number of qualified applicants. Dr. Fritz characterized the current year recruiting efforts as “beating the bushes”. He added that the applications were clustered near the minimums and that additional funds (publications, scholarships, etc.) were needed to go after top students.

Dr. Tai asked about classroom capacities to meet the additional new freshmen. Dr. Henry replied that the conversion of the 4th and 5th floors of Classroom South from offices to classrooms was essential to meeting this need.

Dr. Dabney asked about improvement in retention as a factor in the projections. Dr. Henry responded that the projections assumed improvement in retention.

Dr. Alberto raised the issue of growth in graduate student enrollment. Dr. Henry responded that graduate student growth would be part of the subsequent year model. He added that financial models showed that graduate students cost money more than they add. Dr. Huss injected that in some departments this was not the case. Dr. Alberto noted that research faculty can bring in external funds as a result of having the graduate students.

Dr. Tai made a motion to recommend allocation of $1.6M in additional tuition revenues to instructional and support resources as outlined above and to hold an additional $200K for unmet demand. Dr. Hudson seconded the motion. The motion passed.
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