**Budget Committee of Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes**

Brad Yates, Presiding

October 26, 2016

Approved November 10, 2016

Attendance: Liz Baker, Laura Caramanica, Tom Gainey, Myrna Gantner, Anne Gaquere, Kyle Marrero, Meg Pearson, Leslie Shields (substitute for Maurice Crossley) Andrea Stanfield, Brad Yates, and Henry Zot

1. Call to Order (3:05 p.m.)
2. September minutes unanimously approved
3. Review FY18 Budget Requests
   1. K. Marrero presented an overview of the FY18 Budget Requests that will be made to the Board of Regents on February 3, 2017.
   2. See documentation for full details of FY18 Budget Requests (note: Tiers 1-3 have been combined for the BOR presentation, but internally we will continue to use the Tiers to help prioritize our needs)
   3. Summary highlights
      1. Tuition: currently UWG is 10th among USG institutions in terms of cost; there is some potential of a 2% tuition increase for FY18 (approximately $1.2 million)
      2. UWG Growth-What does it mean?
         1. In last 3 years, $7.3 million has gone to equity pay
         2. The stress of our growth is now catching up to us ($3.6 million to hit 100% of CUPA median currently; $1.75 million to get staff to entry level of pay bands = $5.35 million). Given our growth, should we use our growth money to hire people? Consider these items:
            1. Over last three years we could have had 100 new positions if we had allocated the monies for personnel and not equity
            2. Staff increases will also pull from our growth monies
            3. We will use growth monies to support the 45 faculty going up for promotion, which increases the allocation to $355,902
            4. Further, in Tier 4 Growth we must include catalogue software maintenance, which is $14.6K recurring
            5. Student representative L. Shields offered an example of a need to hire new personnel: She and her student colleagues made a request to the Department of Mathematics to identity a faculty member willing to teach a specific lower level class so they could progress in their program of study.
      3. There is a major investment in ITS this year, and these requests are in the top tiers
      4. First-Year Experience receives additional allocations to accommodate the move of the academic First Year Programs to Academic Affairs in Fall 2017. This move requires a new position called the Director of First Year Programs and also some administrative support to get the new office started.
      5. The police force, including a new Chief, must be increased given a larger student body (Chief Tom Mackel announced his retirement recently)
      6. There is a demand for more transfer credit evaluators because we only have two now
      7. An adult recruiter is needed because our numbers have dropped from 1,300 to 900 adult learners, and we must increase these numbers.
         1. We are losing market share and population, and we must stabilize market share.
         2. What does 15,000 mean by 2020? To achieve this growth we must focus on retention and these populations: adult learners (non-traditional), military, graduate students, and transfer students
      8. There are 25 faculty positions requested and a large number of operations staff as well (note that the dollar amounts for requested positions include fringe: $7,500 plus 20% of salary as well as $2000 for faculty for travel and $500 for staff travel)
      9. There is a request for $1 million for wireless connection in the residence halls
      10. There is a $2.5 million request for fiber optic replacement to make it a circular system (small cap proposal)
      11. Current prioritization is fluid given other needs and mandatory implementations may arise after the budget is confirmed in April
      12. Equity adjustments may be very small or not at all this year
          1. T. Gainey notes that acknowledging a problem and providing an explanation of why there is a problem and how we are addressing it transparently goes a long way
          2. B. Yates suggests a narrative for the Budget Committee and K. Marrero is to continue to note the positive gains in the recent years and further emphasize the commitment to 100% of the median, but also highlight the advantages of using the monies to ease the strain of growth while equity adjustments remain in a holding pattern
          3. The budget requests call for 60 new employees because we must have people there to serve the growth
          4. L. Baker notes that increased staff could help in significant ways
          5. K. Marrero indicates we need to award staff and reach the entry point of the market place for each position
          6. There is a need for more people to implement and oversee compliance with Fair Labor Standards
          7. T. Gainey notes that if we don’t make the reallocation now, it is going to hurt more later. Focus on the investment of $7.3 million over three years rather than phrasing that indicates we are missing the mark of 88% and 89% of the CUPA median
          8. A. Stanfield-Emphasize that the cyber infrastructure will improve work quality of life because it will help do tasks easier and more efficiently
      13. We hope for merit dollars from the state, but they are not guaranteed
      14. Budget Transparency
          1. There will be a Town Hall after the BOR Defense
          2. Once we hear of our allocation we will have another Town Hall
          3. K. Marrero asked that the Committee read through the budget narrative and budget topics in the shared documents.
          4. K. Marrero requested that the FY18 Budget Request documents be kept internal until the BOR presentation is complete.
4. Proposal: Incentives for successful post-tenure review after achieving full professor
   1. It is estimated that we have 118 full professors, and if all current full professors get $2,000 a piece for a successful review, then we need $240,000 in the budget
   2. Early Concept: use the post-tenure review process to evaluate full professors’ meritorious contribution to the University, College/School, and Department. (Review happens in 5th year and monies go into effect in 6th year)
      1. Those on schedule for review this year receive full consideration and an increase for a successful review
      2. Those already in rank may submit an abbreviated dossier/application for a one-time increase to assess his/her contribution to the University over time. This is not a years of service acknowledgment.
      3. Future reviews will be based on post-tenure review cycles as determined by the Office of Academic Affairs.
         1. The first year of this incentive program is the most expensive
         2. The base salary of each successful candidate will be increased by $2,000 (recurring dollars)
   3. Open discussion of proposal
      1. Currently there is variation in the post-tenure review process and criteria across departments
         1. K. Marrero wants nomenclature and definitions of nomenclature; have departments own it (e.g., excellent, outstanding—what do these mean in terms of achievements)
         2. M. Pearson suggested it go to Dean’s level to even the playing field
         3. M. Gantner reinforced the Dean’s Level conversation
         4. H. Zot-have the President set the criteria for what to apply for the post-tenure Review
         5. B. Yates reinforced using current post-tenure review guidelines
         6. A. Stanfield noted the R3 status has some concerned with standards and how they are changing
      2. Post-tenure review is to be completed in Fall semester; L. Baker notes this allows the allocations to be included in the budget cycle
      3. T. Gainey suggested it will be helpful to know how many full professors typically go up for post-tenure review each year
      4. H. Zot asked what is the overall purpose of increase.
         1. K. Marrero explained that there is no other incentive for full professors to work toward and this proposal would provide one
         2. Too, there is a desire to reward exemplary service/work and create an incentive to strive for
      5. What about post-tenure review for associate professors? Are they included? Original thought was that there would not be a need to include associate professors
         1. But, it was noted by several committee members that not all associate professors are successful in their bid for full professor due to strict departmental guidelines for promotion
         2. A. Stanfield suggested to pilot a phased-in program this year for full professors and then address associate professors who go through post-tenure review
      6. H. Zot suggested that crafting language that accurately addresses the policy could be a hurdle to overcome and may slow down the implementation of the program
      7. Teaching vs. Research Track was raised in terms of how one assesses a full professor for post-tenure review
         1. H. Zot asked for a point of clarification about how “tracks” were defined…teaching vs. research?
         2. K. Marrero and M. Gantner (M. Crafton, too, it was noted) support different tracks to tenure and promotion, and these   
            tracks may include teaching, research, or other expertise areas
         3. In an ideal setting, teaching track allows faculty to specialize and department chairs to strategically hire
         4. Traditionally, lecturer and Instructors are hired to focus on teaching, but how do affiliate researchers fit in the mix?
         5. T. Gainey noted that categories of faculty positions might work well (e.g., practitioner academic; scholar academic, etc.)
         6. Multiple tracks are one of K. Marrero’s goals
      8. Action item: M. Gantner will research the number of full professors in rank who have completed a post-tenure review and how many are going up this year. Too, M. Gantner will get input from the Deans and present it at the next meeting
      9. Action item: L. Baker will get an estimate of the cost to provide $2,000 to each successful post-tenure review candidate for this year and the one-time retroactive candidates
      10. Action item: B. Yates will e-mail David Boldt, chair of the faculty development committee and copy K. Marrero, M. Gantner, and J. Farmer, chair of Faculty Senate, the excerpt of the *Faculty Handbook* that speaks to post-tenure review guidelines and ask that the FDC include this post-tenure incentive program as an agenda item for one of its future meeting. The goal is to develop language about this incentive program to include in the *Faculty Handbook* as part of the post-tenure review process. Further, nomenclature for what it means to achieve a successful post-tenure review is also needed.
5. Next Meeting: November 10, 2016 @ 9 a.m. in 2nd Floor Library Conference Room
6. Adjournment (4:44 p.m.)