Minutes
Faculty Affairs Committee of the University Senate Meeting
April 15, 2004

Members present: Glenn Abney, Pam Barr, Barb Carroll, Gayle Christian, Harry Dangel, Valerie Fennell, Nancy F
Emanuela Guano, Hugh Hudson, Beth Jones for Jerry Rackliffe, Charlotte Petrek, and Cherian Thachenkary

Members absent: Ben Baez, Margo Brinton, Denise Donnelly, Shelby Frost, Ron Henry, Charles Marvin, Mona Matt
Linda Nelson, Lloyd Nigro,
Ted Poister, Wayne Reed, Ralph LaRossa, Jim Senn, Debra Snell, Marta White, and Armenia Williams

Hugh moved to accept the minutes of the last meeting as amended by Barb. Harry seconded the motion, and the group approved the minutes as amended.

Cherian began the meeting by discussing the minutes of the meeting of the ad-hoc subcommittee on the Faculty Affairs Committee self-review. Amy Lederberg asked all of the committees of the University Senate to consider:

1. Is the mandate or description of your committee appropriate?
2. In what way might it be changed to be more effective for its own work and that of the entire Senate?
3. Is the membership (size and composition) appropriate?

The ad-hoc subcommittee began by reviewing the Senate bylaws which define the composition and duties of the Faculty Affairs Committee.

Recommendation 1 - Approved
The bylaws currently specify the non-voting membership of the Director of Affirmative Action only. To the members of the ad-hoc subcommittee wishes to add: The Assistant Vice President of Human Resources, the Assistant Vice President for Auxiliary Services, and the University Faculty Ombudsperson. Barb pointed out that the Director of Affirmative Action position has been re-titled and is now called Assistant Vice President of Opportunity Development/Diversity Education Planning.

Recommendation 2 - Approved
The ad-hoc subcommittee recommends changing the punctuation in the duties section to read: including: recruitment; faculty development; and so on. The colon was added, and the items are separated by semicolons. During the meeting, Gayle moved to add the evaluation processes to the list of duties, to be added before promotion and tenures.

There was some discussion in the ad-hoc subcommittee about adding classroom control or classroom management to the list of duties, but this did not receive a majority vote in the subcommittee.

Recommendation 3 - Approved
Because there is no Raymond F. Dominick Fund any longer, the ad-hoc subcommittee recommended that administering this fund be dropped from the duties of Faculty Affairs.

Cherian moved for adoption of the three recommendations, and Emanuela seconded the motion. The group voted to adopt the three recommendations. Cherian will now send the approved changes to Amy Lederberg.

Beth Jones from Finance and Administration discussed the Provost’s reactions to the brainstorming on the Rec Center issue. The Provost thought that the following ideas might be reasonable:

1. Institute a sliding fee scale linked to salary levels.
   This would have to be revenue neutral and would have to be presented to FACP.

2. The University is asked to find the resources from its “fringe benefit pool” to subsidize access fees, along the subsidy.
   This would have to be presented to FACP.

3. The University to provide a general benefit subsidy in the amount of $21 per month (the current rec center mor
employees. Employees would be free to decide which benefit to subsidize. This would have to be presented to FACP.

4. Offset reduced fees with new or increased fees for rec center classes or programs. This would be okay for faculty and staff, but not for students.

Barb pointed out that item three might be contrary to BOR policy on fringe benefits. The BOR allows only 100% employee-paid fringe benefits, so there may be an issue of what this subsidy could be used for. On a question from Cherian, Barb felt that the issue wasn’t the university’s right or ability to give a subsidy (e.g., the present MARTA subsidy), but rather (e.g., health premiums?) employees might be allowed to defray using such a subsidy. Beth suggested that perhaps host more free days for faculty and staff, or perhaps offer §1 days. Harry suggested that perhaps offering a new membership per month could lower the rate for all if many people took advantage of joining. Cherian asked Harry to serve on the subcommittee studying this issue. The group asked the Benefits subcommittee to take another look at these four options which option(s) might be pushed forward.

Cherian then discussed the draft proposal to replace the current administration of a paper survey with the administration of an online survey for the triennial evaluation of administrators. Hugh Hudson will reactivate his subcommittee on the evaluative study to study this proposal. This subcommittee will begin its work on this issue beginning with the new Senate year in August that a recommendation could be put before Faculty Affairs would be November, 2004, making Senate approval Spring 2005 at the earliest. Hugh lamented that it is always technology which is the driving force for change at Georgia State University.

Nancy reported on her subcommittee’s progress in reviewing the Administrative and Support Unit Review report on the Office of Legal Affairs, the Office of Affirmative Action (now renamed), and the Office of the Ombudsperson. This review resulted from Tim Crimmins’ motion in Planning and Development to have Faculty Affairs look closer at this report. There is concern as to how these offices work, i.e., which office to consult for which type of problem. Nancy’s group has met with the Office of the Ombudsperson and still has the other two units to consult to see what issues are. Nancy plans to finish meeting with these units this spring. The subcommittee report will not be presented before fall, however. Barb offered to share Human Resources’ perspective with the subcommittee.

Cherian brought up the fact that there is a bill in the legislature that would grant membership in ORP to assistant coaches to allow this group to transfer 100% of their TRS accounts (employee and employer contributions) to ORP. This would be in conflict with past practice, which allowed only the employer contribution to TRS to transfer to ORP. This legislation was initially meant to correct the inequity between campuses. Some schools let coaches participate in ORP as faculty, because they teach, and others attempting to resolve one problem, another might be created. Cherian has reported this matter to Dene Sheheane of University External Affairs and he has agreed to take it up with his counterparts at the Board of Regents.

Lastly, Hugh asked for input from the group on the issue of faculty hiring rates. Typically, FACP looks at unfilled positions as a vehicle for addressing salary concerns. Hugh asked the group to comment on whether they felt that:

- There should be a floor of at least $45,000 set for hiring faculty members.
- The floor for hiring faculty should vary by discipline.

The issue is one of a living wage versus a market wage. The group agreed that retention and quality of faculty were important issues. Realistically, however, in times of extremely limited funds, it would be most practical to look at the minimum hiring faculty.

To look at the hiring rate by discipline would require significantly more funding than could be found by merely looking at positions. Gerry Gay expressed his strong opposition to establishing any salary floors, and argued that floors and living wages in markets for faculty will destroy faculty quality.

In closing, Cherian asked the group to be certain to attend the Senate meeting on April 29th, at which Faculty Affairs motions on online evaluation, senior lecturers and an amendment to the Faculty Handbook.